

1 in as exact language as possible.

2 I might point out that the change "and to secure
3 against unreasonable interceptions" perhaps broadens this
4 much further than we intend to broaden it.

5 Since this language has no interpretation behind
6 it, it might prohibit the testimony of conversations made
7 in the presence of one individual. It could prohibit the
8 recording of a conversation -- this is permissible, for
9 example, where a police officer would go into an interview,
10 say, with a buyer of marijuana, and he would have this on
11 his own person as corroborative of the testimony. This
12 might conceivably prohibit that type of interception.

13 The language as drafted was extremely carefully
14 drafted and it was checked over by at least two con-
15 stitutional professors of law.

16 What happened was that "the right of the people
17 to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects
18 again unreasonable" is to be modified by "searches, seizures
19 and interception of their communications".

20 In other words, that "interceptions of communi-
21 cations" refers back to the first four categories of "person,