

1 taken, in our opinion, by everyone.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure that is an answer
3 to the question of the Chair. The question is, did the
4 Committee on General Provisions intend by this proposal that
5 a person who did not believe in a Supreme Being could never-
6 theless take the oath or affirmation required by this sec-
7 tion and could nevertheless hold an elected or appointive
8 office under the Constitution and laws of this State.

9 DELEGATE BOYER: Yes, they did consider it, and
10 yes, they can hold office. There are two questions there.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions
12 for purposes of clarification? Delegate Blair?

13 DELEGATE BLAIR: Mr. Chairman, I would like to
14 call the attention of the Committee of the Whole to the
15 very well written opinion of the Attorney General's Office,
16 which was dated November 2, 1965. The opinion was writ-
17 ten by Morton Sachs, an Assistant Attorney General, fol-
18 lowing the Schowgurow case, and it is a very excellent
19 piece of work, which covers the whole philosophy of what
20 is under discussion. That is, the background of the oath
21 and the transition from the belief in God to the present