

tions simply say that what is, is what is. That is all. Neither one of them say anything based on their language. But if, as Senator Landis has said and the newspapers have indicated, there is a hidden message in Senator Koch's resolution, I think for the sake of the public the resolution should be clarified to say precisely what the intention of the introducers is. If that intention is to tell those who are prosecuting these cases, "don't prosecute them," if it is to tell the sheriff, "don't you carry out the order of the judge," that ought to be stated in the resolution. On the other hand, if, as Senator Labeledz implied, that is not what the resolution intends to say, there is no reason to have either one of them. What I am making a plea for is honesty and straightforward dealing by the Legislature. It is kind of ironic that on an issue related to religion where we talk about ethics, honesty, being upstanding, honest and all the rest of it, duplicity is being resorted to. Suppose the Bible itself were written in these types of terms? It says one thing but it means something else. Isn't that what causes all the problems among the various denominations now? Everybody reads the words but they give a different meaning to them, so now the Legislature is engaging in the same type of thing and I believe it is totally wrong. It is ironic again to me that the one, myself that I am referring to, who makes no confessions or professions relative to religion am constantly bewildered and amazed by those who profess religion when they use these kind of tactics. Why should I become like that? I like people to say to me what they mean. I like to say to people what I mean but when we become hazy like religionists seem to become, it seems to me to be a contradiction of all that religion stands for. So personally I see no reason to have either one of the resolutions. Both of them say the same thing in different words. So why don't we either vote down both of them or just adjourn and leave this thing alone? I intend, if pushed to it, to use certain tactics to try and stop a freeway from destroying my community. Now if you are going to say these people in violation of the law should not be touched, then if somebody interprets my conduct as in violation of the law, I ought not be touched either because I am dealing with what I perceive to be the welfare and the very life of my community.

SENATOR CLARK: You have one minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But here is the difference between me and the religionists. Whatever consequences my conduct carries, I am prepared to bear them. I am not going to make grandiose statements and declarations about how my beliefs cause me to do this or that but then when I act on my beliefs, I come whimpering and crying to the ungodly people and say, "lift from me the penalty of the law." I won't do that. I will