

DELEGATE LORD: The language is not exactly what you have stated. The first amendment offered by the Minority, will be an amendment to substitute our section 8.03 for sections 1 and 4 of the majority report. The language of the amendment will only differ in one respect from that of the report which you have in front of you, and that is in line 8 of the Minority Report, following the word "school", there will be the phrase, "headed by a board appointed by the governor." Then, the new sentence will begin, which will say, "the State shall also provide."

It is an addition of, I think ten words, and certainly, if I did not mention it in my presentation, I certainly intended to.

The reason basically for this is when the Minority Report was written, the executive article had not been fully debated and completed on the floor. You will recall that there were floor amendments on this very point, and the subject was more or less deferred until we reached GP-6. Because of the open nature of the executive article, this language was added to make it clear that the head of the principal department, the executive branch in education will be a board appointed by the governor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mitchell.

DELEGATE MITCHELL: Delegate Lord, did your minority consider the fact that in many areas of the State essential educational services such as vocational training, training for physically and mentally handicapped children, health services for the pupils and library facilities are absent?

DELEGATE LORD: Delegate Mitchell, the majority and the minority considered this in that two witnesses from a group, I believe it was in Prince George's County, that worked with handicapped children did appear. They did not bring any specific recommendations to the Committee, and I believe that they were the only witnesses of the eighty-three witnesses that did make any mention of this subject.

We of the minority are certainly aware of this problem and are deeply concerned about the problem. We do not feel, however, that we possess the omniscience and the expertise to solve these problems by constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mitchell.

DELEGATE MITCHELL: Well, Delegate Lord, in your decision to drop the concept of equal educational opportunity, did you consider that the equal opportunity of the

children of the State to get these services is very important?

DELEGATE LORD: Mrs. Mitchell, first let me clarify the minority's position: we do not oppose the concept of equal educational opportunities. There are two things that should be mentioned on this point: First of all, we oppose the language as presently drawn, simply because it is a requirement, a mandate upon the General Assembly to cure all situations where unequal opportunities exist.

I suggest that this area that you mentioned is probably one of them, but it is certainly not the only one. I do not think anyone knows, and for the lack of testimony before the Committee we did not feel we were in position to get ourselves into this kind of language at this point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Winslow.

DELEGATE WINSLOW: Mr. Chairman, Delegate Lord, may ask first, what would be the structure and organization of the school system of the State of Maryland now if in 1867, the writers of that Constitution had frozen into the Constitution the educational system and organization of that date?

DELEGATE LORD: Dr. Pullen's capsule history of that period, would suggest it would have been radically different from the existing structure that is lauded by the majority.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Winslow.

DELEGATE WINSLOW: Another question: in the areas of sections 6 and 7, I find reference to the powers of the boards over the financial matters of the institution. Do I correctly interpret this language as holding that it would be possible for the board of such an institution, as a community college to take the money appropriated by the General Assembly for faculty salaries and use it for landscaping the stadium?

DELEGATE LORD: I think that the principle that you have stated is certainly true, and the answer would have to be yes. I have some reservation about landscaping a stadium to the extent that it may be a capital improvement, and it is my understanding that the capital improvement budget may not be tampered with by these institutions; but certainly they could reduce and slash faculty salaries, use the money to create entirely new programs that were not in the budget as submitted and approved by the General Assembly, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Kathleen Robie.