

Cast your votes.

Has every delegate voted?

Does any delegate desire to change his vote?

*(There was no response.)*

The Clerk will record the vote.

There being 118 votes in the affirmative and none in the negative, the motion is carried and the resolution is adopted.

The Chair at this time proposes to recognize Delegate Beatrice Miller on a matter of personal privilege, a statement of great importance to this Convention. Following the statement by Beatrice Miller, the Chair intends to recognize in succession five other delegates.

I request all delegates to remain in their seats, to remain in the Chamber to give close attention until after the six speakers have made their statements. The Chair at that time will make a statement which will indicate to you that the statements planned have been concluded and if there are any other delegates who desire to make further statements, it can be done at that time.

The Chair recognizes Delegate Beatrice Miller.

DELEGATE B. MILLER: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, I rise with considerable trepidation to explain briefly why the proponents will not request further consideration of section 1.17 on collective bargaining.

I stated the other day that we would seek a compromise. Since then I have found out that the compromise was impossible. We had pared that statement in 1.17 down to a fundamental right which could not be further compromised without injuring the rights of half a million organized workers who now enjoy collective bargaining.

I had sought to allay the fears of those half million workers and the other half million of unorganized workers, the great block of people, one million whose vote and support is needed for this Constitution.

Despite the many good and wonderful things that we have wrought here, these people express a real fear that somehow this Constitution, like the federal Constitution, when it was first offered to the people, is lacking in its protection of basic rights. I share their fears, and I would like to explain.

I came to this Convention with only one real conviction and that was that the State

needed to be put back into the business of government, that unless we did that, we would have even more powerful federal and local relationships and continued by-passing of the State.

Where had the State failed? Why had it been by-passed? The answer was obvious. To the extent that the state government failed to accept their new role in the new philosophy of government, to that extent, they have been ignored.

What was that new concept? Surely no one can deny that since the 1930's the federal government adopted the concept that the economic and social welfare of all of its citizens was the trust of government. To the extent that local governments accepted that philosophy and state governments rejected it, to that extent were state governments by-passed.

This, fellow delegates, is the basic crisis that we face, not reform. Important as the reform is, reform of the judiciary, reform of the executive, and reform of the legislative, the basic question is the acceptance by the State of the philosophy of social and economic responsibility for its citizens.

As I review this constitution, I am concerned. In this area we have failed and we have failed because of the most ignominious reason of all: We failed not because we did not recognize our responsibilities, not because we rejected the philosophy, but we failed, as delegates on this floor have admitted, because the business community selfishly and short-sightedly threatened to scuttle this constitution and we responded to the pressure.

The honest conviction of eighty-three delegates who supported on first reading 1.17 was then thwarted. Unfortunately, most of what happened on this floor was fully reported by the press and is no secret to the one million workers in the State of Maryland. Some of it was not reported, and I do not intend to wash that dirty linen in public, but I want to go on. The morality, the ethics, and the basic right, and the sheer need of this provision for collective bargaining was admitted on this floor. The right of these unprotected workers to organize and bargain collectively was not questioned.

The argument was made that this is a matter of legislation for the General Assembly to enact. Therefore, it is my hope that in the next few months affirmative action by the General Assembly will help erase that fear, that bitterness, that frustration and disappointment. I hope that