

doctor did not want to go through with his deal but since the deal had been sealed in blood there was no way for him to back out and Mephistopheles or Beelzebub whoever the messenger was came and took the doctor on to a home and a faith which he apparently so richly deserved. I don't know if he deserved it because he was a doctor or because of the things he did while he had the powers the devil gave him. Now I have been cast as a minion of Satan on occasion. Speaking against this amendment, this type of amendment is probably one of the reasons. However, that can not deter me from doing and saying what I think is right on a very serious matter. I am concerned about the way children are dealt with. I, unlike Senator DeCamp, have opposed the Christian Science amendment at every stage at any time that it is offered to allow with impunity the handling of children any way parents feel they should because of their religion. Not only are there Christian Science people who feel that they should be able to do whatever they please with their children, but Jehovah's Witnesses feel the same way too. They don't believe that blood transfusions are proper. There are other religions which do even worse things than that, but from where I stand and the position that I maintain, being a member of a certain religion should not give you immunity from laws and principles that apply to everybody else in the society. Denying this amendment adoption is not a slap against the Christian Science religion, denying this amendment is simply saying that a system which is designed to examine deaths, and the state has an interest in determining the cause of deaths, when that system applies to everybody in the state, there should be no exceptions based on a person's religion. How are you going to determine if there is anything else involved in a death, if there is no autopsy? Why should it be that my child would have to be opened, as they say, with the usual "Y" incision, but your child because you belong to a certain religion does not? The first question that we ought to ask is does the state have an interest in determining how the citizens die. Children are citizens of the state. There are hypocrites even in the Christian Science faith as there are hypocrites among the Baptists, the Methodists and every other religion. The murderers on death row belong to some religion and go to church. They have a Chaplain out at the penitentiary. So merely hanging a religious label does not mean necessarily that you even adhere to all of the principles of that religion. So when we are talking about children, every protection that we can erect around those children, we ought to do it. People should be made aware of the fact that if they are even going to conceal a child so that nobody knows proper medical attention is being denied, if they somehow withhold from these children the things that they need, there may be a price to pay for it. We can not go into every home and make certain that every sick child is receiving proper medical