This came into being because the State, like private individuals, wanted to be sure that we were going to pay off our debt within a period of time that was fixed. And it set 15 years so this meant that whatever the capital improvements of the State were, that when you offered the bonded indebtedness to get the money to take care of this particular object you were seeking to accomplish, you had to pay it off in a 15 year period. This meant exactly what it said, you pay it off in 15 years. It does not mean that it is paid off 1/15th each year. The first two years you may only pay interest. Then a good state treasurer, a good governor, a good comptroller, a good director of the budget, they all look to see how you can scale this in such a way that you won't have high peaks and valleys so that during each year you will be able as best as you can to adjust your payments of principal and interest and then, of course, you have to think pretty seriously about the problems that arise when you go into the money market.

Now, this has served the State well. But over a period of time, new problems in the financial world, a new dynamic development in the life of the State is taking place. And a thorough and complete study was made by the Commission of the need, if any existed, for extending this period of maturity beyond the 15 years. They reached the conclusion, and you will see this in the Eney Commission Report, that the maturity date extend to 25 years rather than 15 years. You will also know that in the course of the committee studies and reports and hearings that these are the philosophies and views that developed. There are some who believe that you ought not to have any requirement built in to the constitution as to a maturity date. Those who feel this way say sometimes you are going to build or provide for something that is going to have a rather long life and if that is the case, maybe you ought to pay it off over a longer period of time so if it is 30 or 40 years or even longer, you would have the right to do so. There are others who say: you have done well with 15 years, why should you want to change it and there are others who say, we have looked into this whole picture and we think 25 years maturity is right.

Now, I am not trying to be cute about this, but I do say to you that there is an element of right in what all of them say provided they were all smart enough to know what the next 100 years is going to bring forth, because there are developments in this field that if you are tied in a straight jacket may do great harm to the State.

We had before our Committee I would say almost every fiscal officer of the State, and in its distillation it came down to this: if you are going to ask us how has it worked in the past, we say 15 years is good. If you are going to make it a blanket 25 years without any restriction, then we feel that the legislature may decide to make them all up to 25 years. If you reach the conclusion that there ought to be some form of flexibility, go ahead and see what you can work out.

We had before us one man whom I would say for this record, and I hope it is an imperishable record that will live for a long time, James Rennie, one of the great servants of this State. He was budget director of the State of Maryland after Walt Perkman retired, having organized this Department of Budget and Procurement.

James Rennie is a great public servant. We had reached a conclusion, the majority of our Committee, that we would ask ourselves and then ask these people this question: If we left it at 15 years but provided that it could be extended to 25 years upon a three-fifths vote of the General Assembly, which then would recognize that this was out of the ordinary, indeed was extraordinary, and would require a three-fifths vote of the membership, that in so doing, would this provide a kind of flexibility that would give us all of the good of the 15 year proviso, give us the full benefit of the extension by the majority to 25 years, give us the recognition that the legislature could not willy-nilly go into this extension, but must know that it is different and that it does require special attention, and then would not become law, even then, unless the governor signed that particular bond indebtedness law?

So coming back to Jim Rennie, I posed this to him, and his answer was: This is good. It combines the best features of each of the proposals.

One of the others who we have great faith in because of his tremendous experience, because of his background and knowledge, is the State Treasurer of Maryland, John Luetkemeyer. He has been our State Treasurer, sits on top of all these problems relating to bond issues, and said very frankly before our Committee: "If you are making no change other than a flat 25 years, I would prefer to see it at 15. But if you are going to provide the flexibility such as you contemplate, then I say to you, this is a better solution." That is a fixed