

it. And Thomas told them, you can sign the paper without violating your conscience; if I sign it, I violate mine. And, Senator Landis, you were not here the other day so maybe it's the first time you've heard me tell it. Thomas told them...then the friend at the table told him, Thomas, that he ought to sign it for companionship's sake, to be with everybody else who had done it. And he said, when we die and we're going to be standing before God to get our reward and you go to heaven because you didn't violate your conscience and I am ordered to hell because I did violate mine, will you then go to hell with me for companionship's sake? And I said that because I was very disturbed that Senator Beutler had agreed to allow an amendment to be pulled from a bill because he did not want to hurt that bill. I stated that I was opposed to its being done but I understood the things that made him do it. And I cannot be another man or woman's conscience. We each have our own, whatever conscience means to us, whatever that guiding principle is, we should have a core of values around which our life is built. To you all it's a bill that deals with divestment. To me, it has become a matter of principle and what I call my honor. I didn't say what I was going to do with this bill as a strategy or stratagem. Had I not believed that the MacBride Principles are right and correct and the adding them to a piece of legislation was the right thing to do, I would not have supported them and I certainly would not have supported them being added to a bill that I did have to do some work on. But the most important thing to me is what I think of me and not anybody else. Senator Landis, there are groups and organizations and individuals with whom I've worked and fellowshipped with on this issue down through the years and they'd be so happy when this bill passes. But they know that I'm the kind of person that I am and were not I what I am, we never would have had divestment in the first place. And now I'm being asked to cease being what I am for the convenience of investing some money, and my answer to that is no. I brought the bill. I said what my position on all of this is, and it was not in a fit of pique because I had told people this days ago that it's important enough to me to say that if this other item which I feel is right and proper to be addressed is not, then this bill does not go anywhere and all these people who have been knocking on doors and saying we need to be able to invest again can just wait a year, they're not going to die. But if you vote to take the MacBride Principles off, that is your prerogative. But 28 people voted to put them on, and we knew what we were doing. Well, because some are saying now that one