

be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in this state, otherwise than for punishment of crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted." Now prison is deemed to be involuntary servitude. Jail is deemed to be involuntary servitude, but if the Constitution says that can occur only when a person has been convicted, how can somebody be held in jail when they have not been convicted because they can't make bond? If you have to be convicted before you constitutionally can be held in this way, why do we have laws that allow a person who has not been convicted of a crime to be jailed? Well, people don't consider those things and they don't read other parts of the Constitution that might have a bearing on it, but we ought to. The purpose of my amendment though and the others that I'll offer will be to take specific parts of the Constitution, if we don't adopt this amendment that is pending, and point out the importance of those rights. And for some people it may be the first time that it was brought to their attention that such things are specifically set out in the Constitution for protection from infringement by the state or by the courts or any other agency or department of government. But if you look at something which I don't have the least use of in my personal life and that's Section 4 of Article I that talks about the following, "All persons have a natural and inalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience. No person shall be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship against his consent, and no preference shall be given by law to any religious society." So that would mean, if we're talking about preferences to religious societies, no society can be singled out by the Legislature as being legitimate and others not legitimate and those that the Legislature chooses to deem legitimate will be given tax breaks and other concessions, but other religions that are deemed to be on the fringe will not get the same consideration. Unfortunately, those who speak the loudest about protection of religion and protection for those who want to practice their religion mean just that, their religion. They don't want all these others competing. They want themselves to be the standard and anybody who doesn't measure up cannot be a part of the club. But, as far as I'm concerned, any religion is as good as any religion, any religion is as bad as all the rest of them and if you put them all in a basket and drop them in the ocean and they were never seen or heard from again, I don't think civilization and good society would be diminished in the least. Here is another statement. "No religious test shall be required as a qualification for office, nor shall any person be incompetent to