

community colleges and representatives of private schools of higher education.

For that reason we suggest that the majority bases its report not on any motives of individual members of the Committee as has been alluded to in certain charges of special interest, but rather requests that you impute good faith both to the majority and minority reports and at worst after hearing the deliberations conclude that one was conscientiously right or conscientiously wrong. The majority recommendations make the case for recognizing that lay persons who have volunteered to serve without pay should be continued in order to insure that position and political expediency shall have no place in the educational structure of the State.

For the last thirteen weeks we have been attempting to fashion a constitution for the State of Maryland, a body politic to serve the needs of the people of this State. We have attempted to make this body politic a living one. In the traditional three branches of government, we have provided the torso, the local government, its appendages, taxation and finance its blood streams, suffrage and elections and rights and preamble, its heart, and now that we have included God, I might add its soul.

Now we turn to the question of the mind. What kind of mind will this new being have, this is the substance of the report I bring to you today, a question which asks each one of you who are thinking delegates to keep an open state of mind as we attempt to fashion a mind for the State.

We further suggest that the differences between the Majority and Minority Reports in some instances are matters of semantics, in others, they are much more. It is not, however, merely a question as might be suggested by the minority of the long form compared to the short form or the specific compared to the general. The differences which we suggest are differences of substance and not merely of form. We of the majority, and with the minority, are saying to you that we should complete the picture that has begun. I am certain that the advocates of brevity will disagree. The most that can be said is that we have been in many instances specific in some areas and we say specific as distinct from any concept of freezing-in concepts. I think that the best that can be said for the entire argument of specific versus general is the adage that I heard in my first week of the Convention from the gentleman who said "I think this Constitution should be very general except in those areas in which I

am particularly knowledgeable." In those he suggested they should be very specific and with that brief background, I should like to now go into somewhat of the step-by-step determination.

I might add in parentheses that many actions have been taken by the Committee of the Whole in our wait for the presentation of this article. Consequently these actions will have affected some of the decisions made by the Committee in its initial presentation. We will therefore move at the appropriate time to amend or strike out those provisions which have been accomplished by other committees of the Convention.

Section 1 and 4 which will be taken together, will be considered first in our Majority Report. The most that can be said for the language here is that it appears in many instances for the most part to be identical. Again we would like to illustrate the difference by the story of the man who loved children. There is a story of the man who loved children and we contend, as our Chairman indicates, that both the majority and minority love children. This man had a new driveway put into his home, and after the driveway had been poured, as is traditional with children, they began to inscribe their initials in the cement. After it was apparent that they were doing some bit of damage to the driveway the man ran out and began chiding them in a loud and unequivocal voice. Two of the neighbors came out and they said, "My, this is very strange, we always thought Mr. Jones loved children." To which the wiser and more discreet neighbor said, "Yes, but Mr. Jones has always loved children in the abstract, but not in the concrete." If this can in any way summarize our position, I think it will.

We believe in our Majority Report that the general concept of the State as suggested by the minority should instead be the General Assembly, the State being a more indefinite term than the General Assembly the latter having been pointed out by our Legislative Committee to be: "That group with broad plenary powers to carry out the mandates of the people as expressed in its Constitution."

The majority further states that we believe the responsibility for education should truly be statewide and that it should be the responsibility of the General Assembly to see that this is carried out in each of its subdivisions.

The further provisions are basically the same in the majority and minority reports