

1 of including specific language requiring either oath  
2 or affirmation, or other means of assuring the truth of  
3 the statements made. Any further discussion of that  
4 point? Are you ready for the question? Those in favor  
5 of including specific language requiring that witnesses  
6 be examined on oath, affirmation or by such other means  
7 as would insure the truth of the statements made, indicate  
8 by a show of hands.

9 MR. BROOKS: Nine.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Contrary.

11 MR. BROOKS: Seven.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: The motion carries 9 to 7.

13 Now, Mr. Miller's point is that the Committee  
14 consider elimination of the phrase, Against him, after  
15 witnesses, so as to make it clear.

16 MR. MILLER: I am not wanting to eliminate,  
17 against him. It was the right to some witnesses, and  
18 leave out, in his favor. I might explain, I have known  
19 of instances, and of course, each court has its own  
20 way of doing things, where continuances have been denied  
21 by a judge, probably very conscientiously, because he