

primarily by James Madison who is considered to have been one of the founding fathers. He was short also which my words will not be and he was also President of the United States and here is one thing, a comment made about Madison, and Senator Higgins is not looking but if she would figure what I am reading from, I am reading from a law book, "Madison opposed every form and degree of official relation between religion and civil authority. For him religion was a wholly private matter beyond the scope of civil power either to restrain or to support. Let the two be separate." And here is a little bit further, "In no phase was he more unrelenting absolute than in opposing state's support. Not even three pence contribution was thus to be exacted from any citizen for such a purpose." Their objection was not to small ties, it was to any ties whatsoever. In those days Virginia and some of the people there who had fled England because they did not want to be oppressed by the church began to try to exact taxation from the citizens to support an organized church in Virginia and Madison said, "No good in England, no good here," but even beyond that it is not the amount but the principle of assessment which was wrong. In this field the authors of some people's freedom would not tolerate the first experiment on those people's liberties or wait till usurp power had strengthened itself by exercise and entangle the question in precedence. Now that is Madison long, long ago so we will come up to a more recent individual, U.S. Grant, who was a President of the United States and a general for the United States in the Civil War and in order to get some of your attention I will tell you something that Lincoln said when he was told that Grant was a drunk. Grant won a lot of battles so the other generals were not as successful when an individual came to Lincoln complaining about the fact that Grant was a drunk. Lincoln said find out whatever it is he is drinking and send a barrel to the rest of my generals. Now after this man became president, let me read you what he said in Des Moines, Iowa. "Encourage free schools and resolve that not one dollar appropriated for their support shall be appropriated to the support of any sectarian school. Leave the matter of religion to the family altar, the church and the private school," get this, "supported entirely by private contributions. Keep the church and the state forever separate." Now no matter what form support takes when it goes for a religious purpose it entangles the state with religion in a way that is prohibited by the Constitution. Now it would seem to me that people could understand that and I know Senator Koch may have a lot invested in this bill in terms of time. He said he is mad. Being an educator he meant to say "angry" but he was using that word mad for emphasis and in the vernacular it does stand for angry too, but remember whom the Gods would destroy they