

whether they should be headed by a single chief executive of each department, accountable, so that you do not lose visibility, so that you do not have a game going on where you get a state road's commissioner who gets a call from one of his citizens, and he says, help me out on this road, and he says "I will", but he comes back and says the board voted five to one against me.

We ought to get professionals and let them be responsible for heading departments of government which have major responsibilities that we are enunciating in our article. I feel that you cannot do this through a board.

I would hope that we could once and for all settle the question either way, and decide whether we feel that the philosophy which has been so well enunciated in 32 of the states of this nation, as well as by the federal government, and a practice which prevails throughout counties, cities and also throughout industry, of having a single individual responsible for the administration and the execution of the affairs assigned to that department is the better one.

I would hope that this Convention would act favorably upon this amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to question the sponsor of the amendment?

Delegate James?

DELEGATE JAMES: I would like to oppose it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let's get questions to the sponsor first.

Delegate Mason.

DELEGATE MASON: Delegate Fornos, what other boards or commissions will be provided for in this constitution?

DELEGATE FORNOS: I would have to say on that, whatever the majority of the Convention decides to do on the other boards.

A board of review has been provided for so far, and we have had some discussion, I guess which will again arise when we are confronted with the educational article, on whether the principle that has prevailed and now prevails with some 27,000 school boards throughout the country, that education is somewhat a trusteeship for all the people and would be headed by a board should continue.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mason.

DELEGATE MASON: Would this provision preclude advisory boards?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fornos.

DELEGATE FORNOS: No, sir, it would not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Raley, do you have a question to put to the sponsor of the amendment?

DELEGATE RALEY: The question that I would like to ask is does every single department have to have a single executive?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fornos.

DELEGATE FORNOS: Yes, those departments which are designated as principal departments under the concept which we adopted of no more than twenty principal departments.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Raley.

DELEGATE RALEY: I will ask the question in just a second. I am reading this other section as quickly as I can.

If you are following that, there is no other place provided in the constitution that I know of for a board if you take it out of there. It would seem to me you would also have to take out of 4.21 the section on administrative offices, et cetera, would you not?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fornos.

DELEGATE FORNOS: The reason we tried to get this simple enunciation is that I think if this passes, then the Committee on Style and Drafting can clean up the rest of the language which was provided for to solve the philosophy of allowing boards to head up principal departments.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Raley.

DELEGATE RALEY: Let me get it then clear, so that we all know what we are doing here.

As I understand it, if you vote for this amendment then every principal department in the State has to be under the chief executive and as it seems to me, it will, it almost precludes any other boards from being a department head; is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fornos.

DELEGATE FORNOS: He is absolutely right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Maurer, do you have a question?

DELEGATE MAURER: Yes, sir. I wanted to direct a question to Mr. Fornos.