

is a free choice, but if they want to organize, if they want to be active in union affairs, they then can go into private employment and become just as active as they want.

Now, I ask you, please, do not put this wart on the nose of the beautiful woman that we are trying to make this constitution like.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Chabot.

DELEGATE CHABOT: Mr. Chairman, Delegate Sherbow read section 1.17 in its present form, stopped at one point and said "et cetera." I am afraid the "et cetera" was the most important provision. It was the Scanlan amendment that we just added making it very clear that the General Assembly can, if it sees fit in its wisdom, enact exactly the same provision that Delegate Sherbow would now have us put into the constitution. I suggest, therefore, that this does not add anything in terms of the powers of the General Assembly. On the other hand it clearly subtracts from the powers of the General Assembly to handle the matter because it does not permit the General Assembly to make distinctions between different categories of employees. Once again Delegate Sherbow indicated the sort of employees whom many of us would feel ought not to be permitted the right to strike if they are governmental employees, but many other people are governmental employees. Whether we like it or not, government—federal, state, municipalities—is creeping more and more into our lives and more and more people are employed by levels of government in all sorts of capacities which were formerly considered to be the type of employment characterized as private employment. All of those people without exception, notwithstanding the desire of the General Assembly to make appropriate distinctions, would be forbidden to engage in any of the activities listed here which include far more than the right to strike.

I suggest, therefore, that this amendment is the wart on the nose and this is the amendment that ought to be defeated.

THE PRESIDENT: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

Delegate Neilson.

DELEGATE NEILSON: Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there a second?

*(The motion was duly seconded.)*

THE PRESIDENT: The previous question has been regularly moved.

The Clerk will ring the quorum bell.

All those in favor to order the previous question signify by saying Aye; contrary, No.

The Ayes have it. It is so ordered.

The question arises on the adoption of Amendment No. 16 to Committee Recommendations R&P-1 and R&P-2 as amended by Report S&D-9. A vote Aye is a vote in favor of the amendment. A vote No is a vote against.

Cast your votes.

*(Whereupon, a roll call vote was taken.)*

THE PRESIDENT: Has every delegate voted?

Delegate Boileau.

DELEGATE BOILEAU: Mr. President, please record me as voting no.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Boileau votes no.

Has every delegate now voted? Does any delegate desire to change his vote? The Clerk will record the vote.

There being 43 votes in the affirmative and 90 in the negative, the motion fails and the amendment is rejected.

Delegate Jett, the Chair will, in a moment, recognize you to make your motion to reconsider.

Is Delegate Grumbacher in the chamber?

*(There was no response.)*

Apparently he has just gone out.

Delegate Jett, you have indicated a desire to move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 5 was rejected and Delegate Grumbacher has indicated that he intends thereafter to move the previous question, I believe.

The Chair points out to you, to both of you, that if there are no other amendments to this section, the question arises on the adoption of section 1.17 as amended. Therefore this would be essentially the same as if we voted on your motion to reconsider and then again voted on the amendment and then another time on the adoption of the section. The same would apply to Delegate Grumbacher's motion.

The Chair will recognize you if you desire. I suggest to you that there is to be