

At the time this amendment was proposed, if I may refer to it as "the parenthetical God phrase", there was some question about whether there would be a reference to a deity in the constitution. Since that time our preamble has included "Almighty God and His beneficence." However, we include Him without the dubious crutches of the parenthesis.

I feel, first, it is not necessary in the oath. Second, that it may be unconstitutional, and I would personally prefer my deity out of the parenthesis, standing alone.

I would like, if possible, under our procedure, to yield the floor to two delegates who have the right to speak to this.

THE PRESIDENT: You do not have the right to yield the floor; but they will be recognized when they ask for it.

DELEGATE CARDIN: I would like to say one thing which does not refer to the amendment.

Even though I am against censorship I would like the editors to know they have my permission to use editorial license on the tape and transcript if they feel it is required.

THE PRESIDENT: Does any delegate desire to speak in opposition to the amendment?

DELEGATE BLAIR: Mr. Chairman, I am not necessarily speaking in opposition. My position is one in which I was the chairman of the subcommittee on oaths, and today I thought it was expedient to prepare something in connection with the position of the research committee on the constitutionality of the oath. I did this to try to step this debate along tonight and so that the Committee would have the opportunity of reading the memorandum, the research article in connection with the views on the constitutionality of it. I therefore, with the approval of Mr. Boyer and also Delegate Rybczynski, who was also the one who offered the amendment originally, putting God into the oath, I thought if we could possibly bring it to a head it would be helpful.

I would like it to be known this is not a position paper in any way and that our names appearing on here, Rybczynski, Blair, and Boyer, does not represent any position that we have taken; but I do think that it is interesting to bring to the attention of the Committee that the research article does not formulate any judicial opinion but still leaves the matter up in the air.

I thought we could possibly resolve it if it could be done by research. Apparently it cannot be done, but the conclusions that you would draw from reading the thing would be purely wrong without any judicial interpretations establishing a principle or precept.

THE PRESIDENT: Does any delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment.

Delegate Fornos.

DELEGATE FORNOS: Mr. President, I move the previous question.

THE PRESIDENT: The motion is not debatable. Is there a second?

*(The motion was duly seconded.)*

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Bamberger.

DELEGATE BAMBERGER: Point of parliamentary inquiry.

What vote is required to approve the motion to move the previous question?

THE PRESIDENT: The majority of those present and voting.

Delegate Grant.

DELEGATE GRANT: Although the previous question has been moved, did the Chair not make the statement that he intended to have two delegates speak? Would that not take precedence over the previous question?

THE PRESIDENT: It would not.

The Chair has no control over the matter.

Under the rules, the motion for moving the question takes precedence, and it is not debatable.

For what purpose does Delegate White rise?

DELEGATE WHITE: In the interest of fair play I would ask the Convention to permit the maker of the original motion, Delegate Rybczynski, to put —

THE PRESIDENT: Your motion is out of order.

The Chair has to put the question.

The question arises on the motion for the previous question. A vote Aye is a vote in favor. A vote No is a vote against.

All those in favor, say Aye; contrary, No. The Noes appear to have it. It is so ordered.

Does any delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment?