

lic education, secondary and elementary?" Here is what he said, and I think that you people should remember this, because certainly you have made some bold changes and extensive changes in the constitution up to this point.

Here is what he says. It comes from an article in *The Star*, written by Ralph McGill, "Crisis in Education, Students and Finances": "We are in a grave and deepening crisis in public education," says Mr. Bundy. "The burden of proof is not on those who urge change. The burden of proof is on those who do not urge change."

I would like for you to keep that in mind also. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Lord, you have a little less than four and a half minutes to allot.

DELEGATE LORD: Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, I will use probably most of this time, and then will yield back the remainder.

I want to make perfectly clear what the Minority Amendment No. 1 does. It strikes out the entire language of sections 1 and 4 of the Majority Report, and substitutes the language contained in the amendment. By doing this, the resultant substitution will be roughly one-third as long as the language for which it is substituted.

Section 1 is redundant in light of section 4. In fact, it is difficult to see why it is repeated; so I will not dwell on that subject.

We have already discussed the fact that the minority, in light of the executive article as adopted, has agreed to dovetail this section with the executive article in providing that the statewide system of free public schools shall be headed by a governing board appointed by the governor. Hence, I am somewhat at a loss to understand the discussions brought to this floor by Delegate Kathleen Robie in urging that the board be recognized in the constitution. Indeed it is if this amendment is adopted.

What you are doing by adopting minority Amendment No. 1 specifically, from the standpoint of draftsmanship, is to improve considerably the language, and as I say, the language is roughly one-third as long as the language for which it is substituted, but more specifically we are striking the language that the board must represent geographic areas, whatever that means. It is submitted that in its present form it is meaningless; striking the language on page 2, lines 4, 5, and 6, that the

state board shall formulate policy and exercise control and direction over the public school system, and also striking in effect the right of the board to appoint the state superintendent of schools who by virtue of this language of the majority would become a constitutional office for the first time in the state history.

We feel, and for the reasons eloquently stated by Delegate Gallagher, that these are extremely important deletions, and must be made by this body.

Delegate Kirkland talks about the fact that change must take place and cites McGeorge Bundy. I believe it is the recent report he has submitted on the New York City public school system. We of the minority agree completely with that statement and suggest that there is nothing in section 4 that represents change in the slightest. This is statutory language. At the risk of being redundant it has been in the statutes for decades, and in some instances almost essential. There is no reason to think that this language is ever going to be changed by the General Assembly, but in the event that the General Assembly should wish to change it, this change, exactly what Delegate Kirkland is talking about, should be fully considered by the General Assembly, which meets every year, rather than by a Constitutional Convention, which may meet only every one hundred years.

In closing, this amendment does not affect in any way sections 2, 3 or 5 of the Majority Report; amendments to delete these sections will be offered later on. At this time we urge the adoption of the minority Amendment No. 1.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Wheatley, you have one minute.

DELEGATE WHEATLEY: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Convention, I find myself in a rather awkward position in that the minority having incorporated reference to the State Board makes it difficult to vote against this particular amendment. However, in further considering this it would seem apparent that if this amendment were adopted, we would then be faced with additional questions concerning language of the state superintendent section. Therefore, I would urge the Committee of the Whole to vote against the particular amendment, even though it does not appropriate the reference to the board and suggest further that the debate could be limited to more specific issues in section 4.