

A majority of the Committee felt that this dispersion, or this dilution of executive authority, interferes with the governor's ability to implement and carry out his programs; that when the people elect a particular individual as governor they have a right to expect that the man they vote for will not have hobbles on his feet in initiating and carrying into effect the programs which he promises in his election campaign.

The Committee concurred in the statement contained in a book published in 1960 by the National Municipal League:

"The greatest single impediment to executive unity lies in the constitutional designation of top officials who obtain office by popular election or by legislative action."

It also concurred in the statement that William G. Coleman, executive director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, made before the Committee. In that statement Mr. Colman said:

"The Commission believes that the state constitution should provide for a 'short ballot.'

"In other words, executive authority should be pinpointed in the governor, and should not be scattered among many separately elected administrative officials and boards and commissions. Just as fewer and fewer cities find the 'commission form' of city government with its political fragmentation tolerable, states are finding a similar need to focus executive power in their chief executive. Not only does the 'long ballot' make it extremely difficult for the governor to develop, propose, and carry out coordinated policies and programs; it also adds to the burden of the voter in the voting booth and contributes to the low visibility of state government which we all deplore.

"From the point of view of intergovernmental relations, moreover, the scattering of executive authority among many separate elected officials places the governor at a tremendous disadvantage in trying to keep informed of and to coordinate the flow of federal grants-in-aid into the state.

"Here again, if we insist on the dilution of gubernatorial power among a group of independently elected officials, we place the governor at a tremendous disadvantage in dealing with the President of the United States on questions of federal-state relations. We do not in-

sist that the President share his executive powers, so why do we insist on doing the same thing at the state level? So I say to you, if you want weak state government, a good way to achieve it is through the long ballot."

This Advisory Commission is not made up of theoreticians. It consists of top-flight people who have had years of practical experience in government. Here are some of the members:

Frank Bane, Chairman of the Commission; many of you will remember him; he was the executive director of the Governors' Conference for years.

Other members of the Commission included: John Anderson, Governor of Kansas; Richard Batterton, Mayor of Denver, Colorado; Neal S. Blaisdell, Mayor of Honolulu, Hawaii; Howard R. Bowen, citizen member, Grinnel, Iowa; Anthony J. Celebrezze, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who I believe was also the former Mayor of Cleveland; Edward Connor, Supervisor, Wayne County; C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; Michael V. DiSalle, former Governor of Ohio; Clair Donnenthirth, Supervisor, Plumas County, California; Robert B. Duncan, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Salem, Oregon; Florence P. Dwyer, member of the House of Representatives; Sam J. Ervin, Jr., from Tennessee, Member of the Senate; L. H. Fountain, North Carolina, Member of the House of Representatives; Ernest F. Hollings, Governor of South Carolina; Eugene J. Keogh, Member of the House of Representatives from New York; Karl E. Mundt, Member of the Senate from South Dakota; Edmund S. Muskie, Member of the Senate from Maine; Arthur Naftalin, Mayor of Minneapolis.

These are just some of the people who are on the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations that endorsed that statement which I just read.

These, then, are the principles that have governed the majority of the Committee in making its recommendations set out in Report EB-1. The committee's recommendation as to what not to include in the new constitution had widespread support among witnesses who appeared before us, or who submitted statements to the Committee at our request.

Mr. Chairman, I now come to the committee's recommendation with respect to the Board of Public Works.

I want to emphasize at the outset that we are not recommending that the Board