

Now I remind you that perhaps the best example of the exhortatory statement and its value is the classic one from the U. S. Constitution, to which Dr. Pullen referred, "to secure the blessings of liberty." For the long way you needed to go, this was enunciated, and made it clear to the world that we needed to get there.

Finally, and I think this is my fundamental point, because a constitution should reflect the deep concerns of our times, and that the 1967 Constitution should give serious attention to these particular standards. As an example, I believe that the Constitution should give attention to the economic and social requirements of our times, and herein I disagree strongly with Delegate Scanlan, I believe that these concerns reflect our most deep-seated needs, just as in the 18th and 19th century, political requirements did.

Perhaps housing as such should not get into the Constitution, but this document would indeed be remiss in terms of our times if it did not concern itself with the economic well-being of man, or what good is the ballot without bread and without the joy of living.

It seems to me that the question, for whom does this recommendation exist, was not really answered well, and I am sorry that it was not. It exists fundamentally for man; the conservation of resources, the enhancement of natural beauty, the purification of our air, is for man's benefit. It is not for the birds and bees, and I think unless on this particular recommendation we make it clear that those of us who are here shall go beyond political structure as our sole task, we are going to get into difficulty because we will not reflect the major differences between the concerns of man in the last third of the 20th century.

Mr. Chairman, we are living in times that are demanding, and I mean to crowd into each moment of life that which is possible, but I want to get back to my crescendo point, that conservation exists fundamentally, as I see it, for man, not for the bird, and for the beast.

I want to make a special appeal finally to those who wanted the word "shall". There will be an amendment to substitute "may". It may well be that you will be disappointed with this but the significance is that this is the beginning, and this fundamentally is the first of a number of recommendations that is deeply concerned with this broad area which I have set forth, and now may I yield to Delegate

Adkins? Is that possible for an amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN. No.

Delegate Boyer, Delegate Bard suggested a modification in line 8 to change the word "shall" to "may". I take it from your earlier presentation that you would be unwilling to agree to that. Am I correct?

DELEGATE BOYER: Yes, sir. We felt this would dilute the entire intent of the Committee and that it should be mandatory and not optional with the General Assembly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bard, do you have an amendment?

DELEGATE BARD: Delegate Adkins has.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Adkins.

DELEGATE ADKINS: I have such an amendment prepared, on page 1, line 8, to strike out the word "shall" and insert in lieu thereof the word "may".

THE CHAIRMAN: We have an amendment. The clerk will read the amendment. It will be Amendment No. 2.

READING CLERK: Amendment No. 2 to Committee Recommendation GP-3, by Delegate Adkins: On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "shall" and insert in lieu thereof "may".

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the amendment seconded?

*(Whereupon, the amendment was duly seconded.)*

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes Delegate Adkins to speak to the amendment.

DELEGATE ADKINS: I feel, Mr. Chairman, in some sense in this debate we have lost sight of the purpose for which we are here. We are not here to draft a legislative program for the solution of Maryland's problems. We are here to structure a state government which can in turn solve Maryland's problems.

Mandatory legislation in a constitution is not wise. I would therefore urge that if the proponents of this proposal feel that the policy must be declared to be a state policy, at least it be left to the orderly processes of law for that policy to be developed.

I urge it be made permissive and not mandatory.