

of our world leadership, and perhaps, too, because of conscience, we are saying that race and color should not be a determining factor in the rights of people, and I think this Constitution should set that forth. I am not a lawyer, and yet I have presented this particular view.

MR. HAILE: If you inserted the words, By law, after the words, No person shall, by law, be discriminated against, as we did in the previous section where we said, No person shall by any law be molested, et cetera, on account of his religion, I have an open mind on this; but I would like to know whether you think that if we insert, By law --

DR. JENKINS: I would agree to that insertion.

MR. HAILE: I would be willing to vote for it.

MR. SCANLAN: I had a similar thing in mind, add, Nor be subject by law, be subject by it, since you already had law once in the sentence, it would make it clear it would be on the same basis as equal protection. It would have to be official action of the State we are talking about.

Mr. Sayre?

What you are suggesting by law existing language?

No person shall by law be discriminated on account of religion, race or color.

Are we keeping the, No person shall, by law, be discriminated on account of religion, property, et cetera?

Yes.

The question I have then, Dr.

asked about the broad coverage

of the language like race,

some encompassing statement that

is necessary to include race, color,

and religion?

Yes.

Because of what?

Are you suggesting we might

have language like race, color, creed?

If you have language that encompasses

the nature, why would you have to

repeat it, when I think that actually