

I could read you what their presidents have said in these letters, which came completely unsolicited to me. Obviously, the proponents of this amendment are afraid of what those letters say.

I rather think that Delegate Bothe is like a Boy Scout who is helping the old lady across the street. You can see this Boy Scout Badge. I got involved in this thing. I came across the couple. Here he was dragging the old lady across the street. I said, "What is the matter"? She said, "I don't want to go across the street." I say to you, many of these laboring people do not want this thing in the constitution. This does not belong here.

Now, Delegate Bothe explained that there are four states out of fifty which mention this matter in their constitutions. Two of them specifically spell out that there is an entirely different ground rule between public employees and private employees. She has stated unequivocally, this amendment would apply down the line to all employees.

I say to you ladies and gentlemen, this should not apply to all employees up and down the line, and in those two states where they made no differentiation, Missouri and New York, the courts have held that the right to bargain collectively does not apply to public employees.

This is an action by a strong group of people, who came down here. I know they have their hand on your shoulder. They are urging you and looking down from the balcony wanting to know how you will vote. I hope you ladies and gentlemen will not be like that girl in the famous musical "Oklahoma" who sang "I'm just a girl who can't say no."

I hope you have the guts to say no. This is a tough situation, I know. I am not against labor, but this amendment does not belong in the constitution. It can be adequately handled by the legislature. If you do not do your duty on this amendment, if you let this amendment go into the Constitution, you will open the door to put many other things in. This is not a matter just of helping labor; even laboring men are fighting amongst themselves.

I urge you to reject it and reject it resoundingly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bothe.

DELEGATE BOTHE: According to my calculations, Mr. Chairman, we have used nine minutes, is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: You have eight minutes left.

DELEGATE BOTHE: I will allot four minutes to Delegate Gallagher.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, I do not think I will need four minutes, but I think it is significant to note that were this the 1867 Convention, this very proposal would be an attempt to put into the constitution what was then a crime.

I think that is one of the ironies of the situation, because this is an example, a classic example, of an evolving right. I think it is a right which was won at considerable difficulty and sacrifice, and I think it is a right which becomes of additional and more significant importance as the years go by.

We have moved from an agrarian economy into an industrialized society. The great concentration of population continues to take place in the urban areas.

I submit that the recognition and installation of this particular right in the constitution will promote the opportunities for stability within our society and within a very large segment of our society.

While recognizing that it can be accused of being class legislation, it covers so significant a portion of our society that I believe it has general public application and therefore is not parochial or individualized in the usual sense of the word.

Now, it seems to me that simply because the legislature has not acquiesced in attempts to make this right known in statutory form is no argument against it. Indeed, it may be an argument for it.

I simply state that here is an opportunity to put into the constitution a right which seems to me to be very significant for orderliness and for genuine opportunities for communication in our society as we know it today.

It is, as I say, an unusual right in that it has evolved from a crime to a right, or at least recognition as a crime, to recognition as a right. I do not think we ought to distinguish our vote on this, as Chairman Kiefer said, between pro-labor and anti-labor. I agree with him in that respect.

I would not hope anybody would vote simply with the definition of that attempted