

submitted, is not only desirable, but necessary to give the maximum assurance that boards will be able to speak independently as to needs free from partisan politics, rather than serve as mere insulators from the public for local elected officials who appointed them in areas which become controversial.

In conclusion, we claim that those who would claim that is mere excess verbiage would do well to ask themselves this question: is the local board of education that can be changed by referendum and which for over a century has proven its worth, less important and therefore not mentioned in the same constitution that mandates non-judicial commissions or nominating commissions which have yet to be tried and can only be changed by constitutional amendment. Ask yourselves that question in determining whether this is mere excess verbiage. The citizens of this State through their PTA's, lay boards and civic groups would certainly give a resounding yes in preference for the mentioning of local boards. They are aware that it is this system that influences their most precious possession, their children. I have two children in this system and I can tell you that there is nothing more precious to me than their future. They are affected on a daily basis, not occasionally, as in other areas of government. Their minds are molded for better or for worse. Their futures are directly at stake in the type of education they receive. The majority further suggests that the real answer to the question which I pose is not an either/or choice, but rather one that would say that both are desirable, that it might be desirable to have the delegates of this Convention prove, as has been stated by many, that it is not merely a majority of lawyers only interested in providing a judicial system free of politics but rather an educational system which is more sensitive to political abuse, and that this educational system has also been recognized without freezing it in absolute terms. The principle at issue is a guarantee of local boards of education composed of nonprofessional members. This is not a protection of the establishment. Those are nonprofessional members. Professionals cannot serve on them or do not serve on them. We suggest it is important to assure that the people have the right to be represented on these boards; that it is a board that is checked by another organ of the government from overzealous action; that this balance between those who are not professional educators and those who are not the officials responsible for running the entire

county should be placed inbetween to valiantly assess the need without fear of reprisal and yet to be required to go to the elected officials of the entire county and raise the money for the entire county and thereby get their needs recognized in proportion to other needs of the county. The boards were first established by local referendum in 1826.

Next we move to the section on higher education. There is a basic reason for debating them in this order. It is part of the recognition of the tripartite concept which has so recently been adopted in many states of the country. What is autonomy? Is it a blank check? No.

Is a power grab? No.

It can best be summarized by several quotations from the Eisenhower Committee which expresses it much more eloquently than I could.

I would like at this point just to briefly quote a few of the observations made by the Eisenhower Committee on "The Efficiency of Freedom" concerning autonomy. The people who composed this Commission, included the Chairman, Milton S. Eisenhower, names like Father Kavanaugh, James B. Conant, Herbert R. O'Connor, Sargent Shriver and many others.

"The founders of our colleges and universities, both public and private, sensitive to this need of intellectual freedom and the desirability of protecting faculty, students and administrations of institutions created governing boards of laymen to whom the responsibility for the welfare and perpetuation of the institutions we entrusted."

This tradition of trusteeship carried into the establishment of the land grant colleges. In creating their state universities, six states and now more have given constitutional autonomy to the institution for the purpose of protecting it from the freeze of public or political interference and having to accept staff appointments on the basis of political patronage. And yet in other states, autonomy has been given to the universities by legislative act as it has been at this point in Maryland. The courts have been eloquent in supporting such devices and I quote the case of *Chase v. Maryland* in which the court speaks on this:

"It was put to the management of the greatest state educational institution, it put them beyond the dangers of vacillation policy, ill-informed or careless meddling and partisan ambition that would be