

is that we are writing a constitution for the people to see.

As a lawyer who has dealt with these clauses, due process and equal protection of the law, it is always necessary to go into the law books to get a definition, because the courts have decided that these things apply in many ways and in many fashions.

I would suggest to you that the basic rights in the Declaration of Rights in the federal and state Constitutions are perhaps the most widely read provisions by the people, not only of this State, but of the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have one quarter minute.

DELEGATE HARGROVE: I think they are entitled to be able to read exactly what the provision means, that is, that there shall be no discrimination by the State because of race, color, religion or national origin, and they do not have to look in a law book to find a definition of the word due process and equal protection of the law.

I therefore support the majority amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mitchell.

DELEGATE MITCHELL: Delegate Koss.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Koss, how much time?

DELEGATE MITCHELL: One minute.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Koss, one minute.

DELEGATE KOSS: Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, a great deal of what I want to say has already been said here.

I would just like to emphasize the fact that while due process and equal protection clauses might be very explicit and their meaning clear to the legal profession, they are neither explicit nor understood by the vast majority of the people whose rights we are considering here.

It is absolutely inconceivable to me that we should write a constitution in 1967 and not give explicit recognition to one of the major problems facing Maryland today.

I certainly was one that found that the language of the 1867 Constitution was archaic, but it becomes clear that that document did reflect the major problems of the day and spoke to them; that to do less

than that here today would be dishonest and completely unresponsive to the people of this State.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mitchell.

DELEGATE MITCHELL: Delegate Bard, one minute.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bard.

DELEGATE BARD: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to speak to the matter of being colorblind, and second, the key words "subject to discrimination by the State".

I hope the day comes when we can really be colorblind. Let us be realistic. We know that this is not so and will not be so for many years. As an educator, I would like to say that as far as young people are concerned, they suffer from the fact that we are not colorblind.

The State for a long period of time, this very State, Maryland, underscored and subscribed to the concept of segregated schools. This certainly was not a concept of being colorblind. Furthermore, I would like to say this: Each new learning is assimilated to some previously learned concept. The new is conditioned by the old.

It is necessary for us to set forth in all aspects of life the fact that the State is making it crystal clear that it will be no part to discrimination, and this will make it so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mitchell, you have slightly more than one minute left.

DELEGATE MITCHELL: I am going to ask the others who have agreed to speak if they will speak in the uncontrolled time.

I would like to call on Delegate Sickles for the last minute.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Sickles.

DELEGATE SICKLES: Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and it seems to me that there are essentially two purposes for the amendment. I think it offers hope in an area where hope is needed, and I think it offers clarity in an area where clarity is needed.

If one were to go into the community where this amendment would have the most impact, and read to him the expression, equal protection of the laws, or the expression due process, I am not sure if it would be clearly understood.

But if one would say, in the constitution we have banned discrimination because of