may be able to comment more fully about it.

DELEGATE BOYER: I would be very glad to answer Delegate Bennett's question if I could. I received a copy of the opinion about, I guess a half hour ago. We were in the Committee Room, and to be perfectly honest, I haven't read it myself yet. All I know is what I have heard on the radio, driving down here this morning, that it was a 6 to 3 decision in which the majority said that the Ober Law of Maryland was too vague to reach the constitutional test, and the minority said the only thing they could find in the majority opinion was that they didn't like loyalty oaths.

I have not read the opinion to really, truly answer that, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Blair?

materially affects the question today regarding the oath, because pertaining to the vote on the oath, because in the case of Shub versus Simpson, in 177 Maryland, the Court of Appeals held that the oath in the Ober case was not an oath. It was alleged to be an oath, but the Court actually to found it not/be an oath; so, therefore, it is more in the