

They are our own Mary Hartman here on the floor of the Legislature and I personally was one of those who supported the doing away with the chaplaincy because I think we have a duplication of service. We get a two-for-one shot with Senator Chambers. He is the best unfrocked Baptist minister that the Legislature has going for it and we certainly don't need that daily prayer. We have several minutes of prayer every day as led by our ethical leader, Senator Chambers. His arguments on this case, however, on this issue, I do not agree with and I find specious. Apparently Senator Chambers argues that since the individual is weak and cannot say no the law has to step in and prevent him from acting in the first place. Criminal statutes are not for that purpose. They are curative. They are compensatory. Following a commission of a wrong, the law steps in and creates a penalty and that is why the criminal statutes exist. However, Senator Chambers says this criminal penalty that you pointed out, Senator Landis, is ineffective because people haven't used it. I guess that line of argument would say that since many rapes go unreported what we really need, since the rape statutes are ineffective in punishing this, is a law that prevents women from walking out into the streets at night or because muggings go unreported, what we really need is a law that says you cannot carry money with you at any time because the criminal penalties are not effective at bringing about an absolute retribution in every case prescribed the individual's rights of action and, therefore, there will be no cause, no reason for the crime to be committed. Now what I need to point out and I believe is to say that the law can do no more than penalize wrongs. It can't stop every wrong from occurring but it can penalize those that do occur and that is what the statute that I read earlier does. The point that Senator Chambers makes is this. He says the law is inadequate to prevent coercion and what he says then is in order to prevent coercion we need to surrender individual liberties and individual rights rather than allow this kind of wrong to occur. Interestingly enough in his first speech he talked about the coercion of deputy sheriffs. However, by the time that his second speech came around, he said, well, it is not the coercion of the deputy sheriffs so much, it is the coercion of voters that these deputy sheriffs can effect. The point is the same on both counts. I for one believe that deputy sheriffs and individual voters and bar owners and everyone else that Senator Chambers pointed out has the stomach to say no to somebody who tries to push them into doing something they do not want to do. The law has done enough. It has created a criminal statute penalizing coercion and that is a sufficient response by the law. We do not need to surrender individual liberties