DELEGATE BLAIR: Mr. Chairman, I think that can best be answered by the basis of the affirmation, substituted for the oath. I has been construed by an opinion of the Attorney General actually that the affirmation would substitute for the oath, and that a belief in God would not be necessary.

The answer to the previous question on Article

37, I think, of the Declaration of Rights, would indicate
that no religious test ought ever to be required as a
qualification for any office of profit or trust in this
State, other than a declaration of belief in the existence
of God, nor shall the legislature prescribe any/oath of
office other than the oath prescribed by this Constitution.

That was declared unconstitutional under the case that you tried, I think, Judge Henderson.

DELEGATE HENDERSON: That was overruled.

DELEGATE BLAIR: That was overruled. That particular provision was declared unconstitutional. That is the only reference I have come across, with regard to God being a part of the prescription for oath, but the Attorney General has ruled, and I think it is an acknowledged