

1 precise document we could, and it has been expanded in  
2 a lot of directions. A person could have much less ob-  
3 jection to expanding in this direction than some of the  
4 directions we took last night.

5 MR. SCANLAN: Dr. Jenkins, or someone support-  
6 ing the point of view that we ought to be more specific  
7 in this area, can any of you anticipate a situation  
8 where a court would find that a person had not been  
9 denied equal protection of the laws, whereas if they had  
10 the language that you suggest they would have found that  
11 he had been subject to segregation or discrimination in  
12 the exercise of civil rights because of his color or  
13 national origin?

14 DR. JENKINS: I don't know. It is a hypothetical  
15 situation. I don't think I could answer what the court  
16 might say.

17 MR. SCANLAN: Do you really feel that this adds  
18 a substantive protection, constitutional protection?

19 MRS. BOTHE: I am a lawyer, I would comment  
20 on that. I don't think that there would be any distinction,  
21 and I didn't advocate adoption of this language, because