

sition that this should not be in the constitution.

I have heard what has come to be called the Scanlan argument that we should not clutter the constitution with unnecessary provisions, but even Delegate Scanlan is willing to accede in that we did not worry very much about that when we voted on such things as natural resources and consumer protection.

I am told that this is a provision which should not be in the bill of rights, because it only affects a part of the people; that is, those people who work in industries that would be affected. I do not buy that argument. I believe that the right to organize, labor peace, and equal bargaining rights between employees and employers affects all of us, and I think anyone who argues otherwise fails to remember the history of the last 30 or 40 years in this country.

I am told that I should be concerned, because it may give to policemen or firemen or those who are concerned with protecting the public safety some right to walk away from fires and crimes. I thought it was made clear in the initial debate that that was not allowed by section 1.17, as written. If there was any doubt it seems to me that doubt is erased by the words in the amendment adopted here today, and by the explanation of the intent offered by Delegate Scanlan.

I really do not understand why on an issue which is so important to so many people we cannot hear what the real reasons are why this should not be in the constitution, and I respectfully request those who feel strongly that section 1.17 should not be in the constitution to tell me in public and on this floor just what it is that worries them.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Bamberger, you have one quarter minute left out of three minutes.

DELEGATE BAMBERGER: I urge that we reconsider and I urge that by a substantial vote we defeat Amendment No. 5, and put section 1.17 into the constitution so that next May we can have the support of the people for the document on which we have labored so hard and I think done so well.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any further discussion? Are you ready for the question?

*(There was no response.)*

The Clerk will ring the quorum bell.

The question arises on the motion to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 5 was adopted. This is a motion to reconsider. A vote Aye is a vote in favor of reconsideration. A vote No is a vote against reconsideration.

Cast your vote.

Has every delegate voted?

Delegate Boileau.

DELEGATE BOILEAU: Record me as voting Aye.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Boileau votes Aye.

Has every delegate now voted? Does any delegate desire to change his vote?

*(There was no response.)*

The Clerk will record the vote.

There being 79 votes in the affirmative, and 59 in the negative, the motion carries.

The question now arises on the adoption of Amendment No. 5. The Chair recognizes Delegate White.

DELEGATE WHITE: I move the previous question, if I am in order.

*(The motion was duly seconded.)*

THE PRESIDENT: All those in favor signify by saying Aye; contrary No. The Ayes have it. It is so ordered.

For what purpose does Delegate Rybczynski rise?

DELEGATE RYBCZYNSKI: To make a parliamentary request. Would the Chair be so kind as to state the effect of this vote at the time that it states the question with particular reference to what is now referred to as the Scanlan amendment.

THE PRESIDENT: Very well. For what purpose does Delegate Jett rise?

DELEGATE JETT: Same purpose.

THE PRESIDENT: Very well, the question arises on the adoption of Amendment No. 5. Amendment No. 5 is the amendment to delete section 1.17. A vote Aye is a vote in favor of the amendment, that is, in favor of the deletion. A vote No is a vote against the amendment, that is, against the deletion of the section. If Amendment No. 5 is adopted, section 1.17 is deleted. If Amendment No. 5 is rejected, section 1.17 as amended by Amendment No. 13 is before you open to your further amendment.

So that there will be no misunderstanding, a vote Aye is a vote in favor of