

Article I, the Declaration of Rights of the draft Constitution, is concisely and courageously drawn with imaginative flexibility. I commend those who assisted in the drafting for their care and precision. **However, I would like to make just a few observations about Article I.**

In that respect, I think it most important that Section 1.02 be adopted as in the draft, and particularly that the words, "each person remaining responsible for abuse of those rights," be retained. We have recently seen the error of allowing criminal incitement to riot attempt to hide behind the cherished constitutional right of freedom of expression. The draft language of Section 1.03 courageously faces the truth that the right "not to worship," alien though it may seem to us who believe in God, provides the only absolute guarantee that we will not later be told how and to what degree we must worship. In my opinion, Section 1.06, to be totally accurate, should be amended to read as follows: "Every person shall have the right of trial by jury of issues of fact in civil proceedings at law in the courts of this State, where the cause was recognized at common law and where the amount or value in controversy exceeds such minimum as may be fixed by statute." This change is suggested because there are certain administrative and purely statutory actions at law which did not exist at common law and for which no jury trial is assured.

I want to particularly commend and emphasize the need for the extension of the search and seizure protections of Section 1.08 to cover the unreasonable interception of communications. The uncontrolled wiretap and other snooping devices must be outlawed. Reasonable use of such surveillance is assured under the warrant procedures and court jurisdiction. The protection against double jeopardy, not extended to the States by the Federal 14th Amendment, is a progressive addition to our Declaration of Rights. Section 1.11 wisely leaves to the Legislature the question of capital punishment.

Article II governs our most precious right as free citizens — the right to elect those who govern us. In referring to voting age requirements, it is my intention to raise a question, not to criticize. I urge you to join me in serious consideration as to the logic and justice of retaining the traditional age of twenty-one years as a qualification for enfranchisement. If a man is old enough to die for his nation at eighteen, is he not old enough to vote? If a citizen is required to perform civic obligations — to pay taxes to and defend his government — is a responsible government not obligated to guarantee equivalent rights?

Consistency of logic is a cogent constitutional objective. In Maryland, statutory provisions as to legal majority vary, but these are sub-