

board, or the administrative assistant or the administrative officer of any board that has heads of departments.

So therefore when you take this action on this amendment you take that right away, which means that the head would have to be subject to advice and consent of the Senate.

Just a little bit of practical knowledge that I had in this case, and why I support what Senator James said, that public policy might dictate many things that are needed and we cannot always tell today what is needed. I served on a board, the Department of Economic Development, for some time, for a couple of years, and in that case the governor controlled the administrative officers. In effect, the administrative officer reflected the governor's policy. He was responsible to the governor, but he got the best of it in that the board was very helpful in advice, and I think it worked very well.

To adopt this amendment might very well do some harm that we do not know about, and I think it will certainly take away the flexibility and the good things that have happened, as the Committee has submitted to us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

Delegate Grumbacher?

DELEGATE GRUMBACHER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Convention, I believe that this amendment follows good management practice. I believe that one of our major problems in our present government is the inability of the governor to get to and work with the direct case heads of the department when there are administrative boards between.

There is absolutely nothing wrong with advisory boards. They are fine. They are extremely helpful, extremely useful, but time after time, we have seen cases where boards which were in full charge of the department were very difficult to reach and it insulated the executive in charge of the department from the governor.

I believe that this particular amendment clarifies the situation and is extremely useful.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Marvin Smith.

DELEGATE M. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to say that for the next

hundred years we will not need boards in some instances to head some of these departments. The example that was given here was with reference to Chesapeake Bay affairs, and being from the only county on the Eastern Shore that is neither on the bay or the ocean, I probably know less about it than most of my fellow Eastern Shoremen, but I cannot conceive but that that department would not be a major department.

Yet, if you adopt this proposal you are saying that it must have a single head.

It seems to me that what the executive committee has done here is an excellent thing. They have said that the general policy shall be that there shall be a single head, but at the same time, they have left to the General Assembly the discretion to meet changing situations, to meet the numerous problems that may arise.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

*(Call for the question.)*

The question arises on the adoption of Amendment No. 27 to Committee Recommendation EB-1.

The Clerk will sound the quorum bell, please.

Delegate Bothe.

DELEGATE BOTHE: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this is an inquiry or some remarks in opposition, but it would seem to me that the adoption of this amendment would require us, when at the time the education article is debated, to adopt language which constitutionalizes the State Board of Education, and probably also sets forth the manner of its selection.

I do not want to argue the case at this time. However, it is my intention at that time to oppose constitutionalization of the State Board of Education, and I want to point out to those delegates who share my position that they cannot vote in favor of this amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question arises on the adoption of Amendment No. 27 to Committee Recommendation EB-1. A vote Aye is a vote in favor of Amendment 27. A vote No is a vote against.

Cast your votes.

Delegate Boyce, announce your vote.

DELEGATE BOYCE: Aye, sir.