

who have a busybody mentality and feel that they should intrude into the affairs of others and force their own particular brand of morality and conduct on other people and use the power of the state to carry out that type of coercive activity. There are other people in every society, no matter how oppressive, how heavy-handed it is, who will believe that there are certain areas of private conduct that ought to be exempt from intrusion by the government, whichever kind it is, whether communist, democratic, republican, capitalistic, socialistic, whatever. There comes a tendency on the part of people who've been in government a long time to feel that the people belong to the government, that society exists for the government to act upon rather than for the government to act in behalf of. There was an old, tall, lanky man with a beard and a mole who talked of government of, by and for the people, not people who were of, by and for the government. So when busybody and unjust legislation is attempted to be foisted on the people, I'll do everything within the rules to stop it, as others will do everything within the rules and outside the rules to push it. And the fact that they're willing to vote to disregard their rules shows a lack of regard they have for the rights of people. Much talk is engaged in using terms like unborn child, or preborn child. Whenever we're dealing with a biological universe, there are terms that apply throughout, whether applying to a so-called lower animal or human being. They speak of embryos in the lower animal kingdom, they speak of embryos in human beings. There is a branch of scientific study called embryology and it includes the study of embryos of human beings. And that term designates the development of whatever organism it is during its early stages. So people can call me a murderer because I think a woman has a right to make a choice. And do you think that will deter me from speaking in behalf of a woman's right to choose? Not in the least, it shows how bankrupt the people are who have to resort to that because they have no arguments to support their position. What must be done in this discussion is to balance the rights of the woman to make a choice about a decision that is as personal, unique and intimate as any decision that any human being can make. You weigh her right to do that under a constitutional right to privacy against the power of the state in disregard of every right to use its coercive power to compel her to do what certain people, who operate the state at that time, say she must do. In Romania, and there was a good article on the front page of the Lincoln Journal yesterday, was a situation before the overthrow and assassination of the former leader of that country that made it impossible for women to get