1

2

4

5 6

7

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

20

21

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, the question to be presented this time is whether the Committee shall include specific language requiring that the witnesses be examined on oath or affirmation. Is there any discussion of that proposition?

JUDGE ADKINS: May I make one comment in connection with the point Mr. Sayre made earlier about the the word, oath? It was not discussed here, and i don't want to discuss it except to say that the Rules Committee of the Court of Appeals has had a good deal of problem with the use of the word, oath, in the new rule, subject to, I don't know how you pronounce it, Showgurow casé, and they wrote a new oath -- well, they wrote a new statement which a witness must make which eliminated the word, oath, because of a serious question on that Committee as to whether or not the use of the word, oath, was not unconstitutional. I don't press that point except that the Committee might take another look at the use of that word.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would rule then that the question referred to the Committee is the question  $\sigma^{-1}$