

sympathy for that particular issue. I am not constructed temperamentally or any other way to avoid dealing with an issue that comes to my attention as an issue about which I should do something. This is one of those issues, the concept contained in my amendment about which I must do something. So however long and however difficult the task will be I have got to pursue it and, Senator Higgins, if you don't mind, I make a reference to the Bible to the person that the Christians worship. He and I feel the same way about this thing. Maybe He and I are the only ones who consistently do it besides Senator Dworak and a few others but a lady was brought to Jesus caught in the act of adultery. Again, men are the ones who initiated that as men are the ones who provide the preponderance of votes to deny women certain other considerations. So they said, the law says this woman should die and Jesus didn't deny it. He said, that is right. The law says she should die and one of them who were smart might have said, and you've been going around here saying that your job is to fulfill the law and He would say, that is right. That is my job. All right, then she should die and that is what the law says. So He said then let the one without sin among you cast the first stone and not a stone was cast. So what are we to learn from that? That Jesus himself was not sinless? Because he didn't cast the stone after stating the requirements for the stones to be cast and the law that He came to fulfill said that the stones should be cast. Is the message that Jesus was not sinless, Senator Higgins, or is the message that one who indeed is sinless would not cast a stone to take the life of one of the children that He supposedly came to save us? It is a rhetorical question and I don't have enough time to give you the answer but if it is another subject I will accept your answer. I want to use my time to the best advantage. Had I been around when they hung Jesus on the cross, He would have had at least one person, not like the religious people saying, crucify Him, crucify Him, because it was the religious people and the politicians, he would have had one person like an earlier black man who carried his cross for Him when it got too heavy for Him. Here is a little guy with the whole society arrayed against Him. They whipped Him. They brutalized Him. They degraded Him. Now they are going to make Him carry the means of His own execution and He couldn't take it. So He said, little fellow, at least I can lighten this burden and this load for you and for those of you who are religious, maybe Jesus said, yes, and the day will come when I will take a heavier load off you. So those things sound nice, don't they? But when time comes for us to apply it in our lives on a difficult issue where the only one whose ire we have to oppose is somebody who may cast a negative vote or who may say I don't like you for doing that,