

- 77-1900); the Attorney General of Connecticut has rendered no opinion thereon and has taken no position thereon in litigation which presently is pending at the trial level; the Attorney General of Michigan has expressed the opinion that the legislature may not, except by the enactment of a law, validly suspend the operation of a rule or regulation; the Attorney General of South Carolina has expressed the opinion that the General Assembly may disapprove rules or regulations only by means of an act or a joint resolution having the effect of law; and the Attorney General of Wisconsin has twice expressed the view that the Legislature lacks the constitutional ability to empower a committee to void an administrative rule.
- 14 On March 4, 1974, a member of this office informally advised the Chairman of the House Constitutional & Administrative Law Committee that then House Bill 517, which would have authorized the AELR Committee to disapprove or amend a proposed rule or regulation, was unconstitutional because it: (1) contravened the separation of powers mandate; (2) attempted to delegate the authority to legislate to a body of legislators which was less than a majority of both houses; and (3) constituted a delegation of authority unsupported by a standard sufficient for its reasonable exercise.
- 15 See, *Atkins v. U.S.*, supra; *Clark v. Valeo*, 559 F. 2d, (D.C. Cir. 1977) (en banc), aff'd mem. sub nom. *Clark v. Kimmitt*, 97 S. Ct. 2667; *Buckley v. Valeo*, infra; Opinion of the Justices, 266 A.2d 832 (N.H. 1970); Opinions of the Justices 83 A.2d 738 (1950); *Watrous v. Golden Chamber of Commerce*, 218 P. 2d 498 (Colo. 1950); *People v. Tremaine*, 168 N.E. 817 (N.Y. 1929). See also, *Jay v. Boyd*, 351 U.S. 345, 351 (1956) (in which a "legislative veto" provision of the Immunity and Nationality Act of 1952 is discussed, although not at issue); *Carlson v. Landon*, 342 U.S. 524 (1952) (in which a concurrent form of the veto was referred to, although not at issue); and *Morgan v. Tenn. Valley Authority*, 115 F. 2d 990, 993 (6th Cir. 1942), cert. den. 312 U.S. 701 (1941) (in which the court suggested doubts about the constitutionality of a legislative veto provision).
- 16 *Atkins v. U.S.*, supra, 556 F.2d at 1057-1071 (in which the court sustained the "one-house veto" provision of the Federal Salary Act of 1976).
- 17 See, Code, art. 40, §40A(g) (AELR Committee approval of emergency administrative rules); § 107 (Joint Legislative Committee on Metropolitan Mass Transit's review and approval of plans for the future development or extension of the rapid rail system in Baltimore; art. 41, §15B (AELR Committee approval of certain