invited to talk about whether a lunatic should vote or not, but during the committee inspections on this subject I did make certain statements because I have had some experience with lunatics in my law practice.

(Laughter.)

I know that the court does adjudicate people as incompetent, and the thing that frightens me is to allow the disqualification for voting to be tied to the certification. I have tried cases where an instant defense has been made, and having heard psychiatrists for the prosecution as well as the defense, I have often felt that the jury thinks the psychiatrists are the ones of unsound mind.

I have often believed that within the medical profession a man has been led into the specialty of psychiatry to find out what is wrong with himself.

It has been pointed out that this adjudication would involved very few people, but it is a judicial process, and we cannot get into determining whether people are sound enough in mind to do everything but vote. We have got to have some sound test, and I submit this test is adjudication.

Now, whether you use the word "remove" or "vacated" we all know that if a court does pass a judgment that that same court has the power to vacate or to remove the judgment.

I do not know whether you all know this or not, but Delegate Price is a Methodist minister and, as you know, he has talked about services that he had attended at Delegate Dukes' farm.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have one-half minute, Delegate Taylor.

DELEGATE H. TAYLOR: I understand that this Sunday Delegate Dukes is going to reciprocate, and he is going to watch Delegate Price conduct services in his church, and I hope that you will all join with me in conducting services in the burial of this amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

Delegate Bamberger, will you take the floor and yield to a question?

DELEGATE BAMBERGER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Clagett.

DELEGATE CLAGETT: Delegate Bamberger, can the General Assembly provide and is it your intention that it can provide that the removal of disqualification be death?

DELEGATE BAMBERGER: I did not hear that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the legislation provide that removal of this disqualification be death?

DELEGATE BAMBERGER: I think not. I think it would be such a foolish act on their part it obviously would not be in the constitutional provision.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Koss, will you take the floor and yield to a question?

DELEGATE KOSS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you desire to question, Delegate Sybert?

DELEGATE SYBERT: Would the Committee agree to revamp lines 1 and 2 of section 5, that is lines 34 and 35 as printed, so that they will read "no person who has been adjudicated", or may be, "judicially adjudicated non compos mentis or mentally incompetent," which would cover everyone who has been declared by court action non compos mentis or judicially incompetent?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Koss?

DELEGATE KOSS: Delegate Sybert, am I correct, then, that either the non compos mentis or the mental incompetence would require a judicial determination?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Sybert?

DELEGATE SYBERT: Yes, that was my question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Koss.

DELEGATE KOSS: Legally, is there a difference? I do not understand, really, what is added.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it, Delegate Koss, that Delegate Sybert is suggesting more as a matter of style than anything else that if there is any question about the word "adjudicated" meaning judicial adjudication, it could be included. I do not think that is the burden of his question.

He is really asking you would you object to inserting after the words "non compos mentis" in lines 34 and 35, the words "or mentally incompetent".

Is that correct, Delegate Sybert?

DELEGATE SYBERT: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Koss?