

1 bewilderment, there. I thought he was going in circles,
2 too.

3 DELEGATE MACDONALD: My question is this:
4 If it was necessary to have the provision in the Constitu-
5 tion previously so that the father who failed to support
6 his children could be held in contempt of court, and in ef-
7 fect imprisoned for that particular debt, why isn't it
8 necessary today?

9 DELEGATE SCANLAN: If the Constitution has a
10 provision preventing imprisonment for debt, problems are
11 raised as to exactly what that means.

12 As I understand the majority's report, they con-
13 cede in their report that the General Assembly has absolute
14 power to prohibit this sort of thing; and that even if the
15 General Assembly took no action the common law would pre-
16 vail.

17 The cases of which you speak are traditional. It
18 is imprisonment for failure to obey a court order.
19 I see no reason for retaining this provision in the Constitu-
20 tion.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Macdonald, I could give