

prevaricator, stretcher of the truth, careless with the truth. If I address a flower in the name petunia, to use what somebody said the other day, then they'd feel better. No, we all realize that in these bills, even when some grow tired and begin to think of them in the abstract, we are talking about things that are going to affect living human beings. We are talking about things that will impact on their lives, and one of the most important things in the life of a woman is whether or not she is going to keep a child, and when I talk to these women, it is not where they are trying to get me to do something for money, like represent them in court. They need help of a kind that they felt they couldn't get from their preachers, lawyers or anybody else. So when one person stands here and tries to arrogate to himself knowledge because he represented some clients in court, we have to take that for what it's worth. It is in the very narrow context of a lawyer dealing in legalisms. On the floor of the Legislature, we are talking about policy, and the policy goes beyond an individual or specific case. It relates to the attitude this state takes toward rights that people ought to have. And it seems to me, from what has happened thus far, the majority of the Legislature feels that when a woman makes this very important decision, it should be irrevocable. I think it should not be that way, and for that reason I have offered the amendment, and I will debate it. But I wonder how many people, if this woman in the article who lost her child and wanted to reclaim it a couple of days after she gave the child up, were to be asked her opinion on an issue like abortion, and if she said I believe abortion should be allowed, I am sure the antiabortion people would say, well, she only has an IQ of 72, why do you take her word on anything? But with an IQ of 72, the court is saying that she understood things that the court knows she did not understand, but the court takes that dishonest position, I call them liars. These lying judges say that somebody with an IQ of 72 understands that which some people trained in the law do not understand. Look how long it took to discuss and make clear to people some of the things in this bill, and I'm not going to say anybody on this floor has an IQ as low as 72, but you want to say that this woman, with that IQ, when it came to giving up her child, pursuant to some papers which she could scarcely read, she can scarcely read anything, but because they wanted to take her child...

SPEAKER WITHEM PRESIDING

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.