the people who framed this particular section relied

1

2

3

Б

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

> 18 19

> > 20

21

entirely upon this final provision, provided he believes in the existence of God, and so forth, and so forth. I think the whole reason for this language that we are now trying to go back to is completely lost because we can't put in here, provided that he believes in the existence of God, and I think that is the crux of this whole Article 36, and it is an anachronism to say we shall retain the old language that is so closely associated with the provision that you must believe in God in a new Constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Miller?

MR. MILER: Mr. Chairman, in the interest of not having too many words and we are supposed to do this in as short a space as possible rather than argue civil and natural, why can't we just say rights, and let it go at that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you accept the amendment,

Mr. Bond.

You are deleting the words, natural, MR. BOND:

civil, or religious?