

agement of these schools in the Department of Public Welfare. The four separate managerial boards would be replaced by a single advisory board of ten persons, seven of whom would represent designated interests, and three of whom would represent the public at large. This advisory board would have no power, but would be charged generally with advising the Department of Public Welfare on policy matters and with frequent visits to the training schools.

There is considerable logic in the position that the State Department of Public Welfare, charged with responsibility for general administration of these schools, should also have the authority and responsibility of day-to-day management, including personnel selection. Considered surveys of the problem on at least five occasions in recent years have all made such a recommendation. The study groups have, however, differed as to retention of the present separate boards of managers for each school in an advisory capacity, as compared with one central advisory board. The advocates on each side of this question are sincere, well-intentioned, public spirited citizens who have given considerable time and effort to the problem. I am particularly familiar with the intensive application of the Legislative Council Sub-Committee, whose studies in this field inspired the present Bill.

I believe, however, that the possible advantages in retaining separate boards of managers has not received adequate consideration. These unpaid boards number among their members some of our finest citizens, whose personal and devoted attention to the affairs of the particular schools under their respective management is well known to me. Most of the members of these boards have communicated with me concerning House Bill 100. They complain that because of the lack of time in the recent thirty day session, with consequent inability to marshal their members for a convenient hearing date they were unable to present the complete case against the revisions sought to be accomplished by the Bill. They furthermore feel, and I concur, that the abolition of these separate public boards, in even an advisory capacity, reflects unjustly, although probably unintentionally, on their work. Retention of separate boards for each school, even if restricted to an advisory capacity could well provide more adequate and efficient visitation and correspondingly, more effective and intelligent consultation with and advice to officials of the Department of Welfare.

In addition, existing authority permits wide selection from the best available people to serve on these boards and imposes no limitation that they represent any particular interest or agency. House Bill 100, in specifying the sources from which seven of the ten members of the new advisory board must be selected, imposes an unnecessary and unwise restriction on unhampered executive action, now and for the future. It would not assure a completely independent board, nor one whose full membership would necessarily be available. At least one of the State agencies from which a selection would have to be made has advised me that it could not very well afford to spare the necessary time for this service of one of its employees of the desired calibre. Further, the inclusion of a Welfare Department representative to act as one of the advisors to the Department itself would appear to serve no beneficial purpose.

I am sending a copy of this message to the Legislative Council with the thought that either the Council, or one of its committees, will again address itself to the problem and secure the benefit of an adequate expression of the opposing viewpoints from the various boards of managers. Such further study will be coupled with the more ade-