

1 stated it that way, you wouldn't even need the refer-
2 ences to civil or political rights. It is just that
3 no one shall be subject to discrimination by the State,
4 period. I would think that would be a better way to
5 put it.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask Dr. Jenkins a ques-
7 tion? Dr. Jenkins, would the purposes that you seek to
8 accomplish be served if you added to the first sentence
9 the phrase, Because of religion, race, color, ancestry
10 or national origin, so that the second clause would
11 then read, Nor shall any person be denied the equal
12 protection of the laws because of religion, race, color,
13 ancestry or national origin?

14 DR. JENKINS: I would prefer this statement.
15 I would yield to that.

16 MR. SCANLAN: I would object to it on the
17 grounds you would be contracting the protection in other
18 areas.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: I am just trying to clarify
20 his point for the moment. I am well aware of that. It
21 seems to me that the Connecticut language embraces two