

relationship between the state board of education and the local boards? I am thinking specifically of the ability of local boards to initiate programs, for instance in Baltimore City, special ghetto schools, or in a city, community type schools?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Wheatley.

DELEGATE WHEATLEY: This question can best be answered by saying we believe the existing balance between state and local boards should be continued. The local board should be given the widest latitude in initiating programs and planning activities within the subdivision and the state boards should be responsible for seeing that all subdivisions maintain those standards which are considered to be inimicable to the best interests of the education of all. It would be a positive allowance and if the language is not clear, certainly we would have no objection to making it so, so that the local boards are certainly in control subject to the normal statewide limitations that are imposed.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Bard.

DELEGATE BARD: Delegate Wheatley, I hope you have the right answer on this one which would be yes.

*(Laughter.)*

Are you saying that the school funds of the State shall be kept inviolate? You are willing to let this thing go out?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Wheatley.

DELEGATE WHEATLEY: As I have indicated earlier, we have since that time discussed the matter with the Committee on Taxation and Finance and they have assured us that the provisions now would make diversion of any funds, not only educational funds, impossible.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Bard.

DELEGATE BARD: In section 4, would you have any objection on line 5, and this is somewhat related to Mr. Schloeder's question, to limiting the word "control" so it will read "state boards of education shall formulate policy and exercise coordination." You have "direction" but I am very anxious to know your feelings about the word "control". I too am concerned about the fact that it is contradictory with what is stated in section 5. Would you have any objection to eliminating that word?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Wheatley.

DELEGATE WHEATLEY: I personally would have no objection to clarifying any word which does not convey the meaning which the majority ascribes to it. The words were designed by those who drafted them to convey the meaning of the majority of the Committee that if the State would insure statewide regulations that were promulgated they would be able to continue under its existing procedure and would give them no greater or lesser latitude than they enjoy now.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Bard.

DELEGATE BARD: In section 7, a new element, first, knowing that most community colleges by present law have to use the word "community" officially even though they may sometimes be known as junior colleges would you mind eliminating all of line 44, this sounds a little like Delegate Scanlan, "by whatever name they may hereafter be known"? That seems so redundant. Would there be any objection to that?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Wheatley.

DELEGATE WHEATLEY: I would say in this matter it would be strictly an objection based on taking away flexibility in cases. There has been a case in Baltimore City. The name would be changed to some other institution. That was the purpose in the second line.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Bard.

DELEGATE BARD: In line 46 where it says "shall be controlled by local boards in accordance with law", in order to clarify the fact that the law there would be because these are local community colleges, it would be the local instrument of government. Would there be any objection?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Wheatley.

DELEGATE WHEATLEY: When we use "law" throughout, we had no idea what the various ramifications and delineations would be. We had used the law to refer to the broadest concept. We certainly refer in this instance to the concepts that would be in local rulings as well as in the regulations which would be of a statewide nature. We are changing nothing which is existing. We are merely reaffirming it. So if there was a local charter or whatever you might call it, we would certainly want the local sub-