

litmus test for abortion. It's by Curtis J. Sitomer, S-i-t-o-m-e-r, Sitomer, Sitomer. While the United States Supreme Court has grappled with this term with peripheral abortion issues revolving parental notification and judicial consent for teenage termination of pregnancy, the real test for abortions are yet to come. They may, however, be around the corner. A federal ruling in Boston allowing public funds to be used for family planning groups that give information on abortion is almost certain to be routed to the Supreme Court, so is the state legislative decision in Idaho banning abortion in all but extreme circumstances. Abortion has become the major social controversy in the U.S. with both sides airing the issue in state and national political contests before Congress and at the presidential level. The justice department of President Bush has picked up the cudgels of Reagan law enforcement with an avowal to dismantle the landmark 1970's abortion ruling, Roe v. Wade. Roe set up a trimester structure allowing abortions in the first three months of pregnancy but permitting states to impose restrictions after that time. The issue for the justices up to now has been, how far a state may go to limit abortion. A year ago, in a Missouri case, the court upheld the restrictive abortion law but sidestepped the central issues in Roe and refused to rule on the question of whether...or when life begins. A main contention of the antiabortion movement, including some religious groups, is that life begins at conception and abortion, therefore, constitutes murder. The two abortion disputes now in the news may not settle that argument but they deal with basic issues that could change Roe. They also show the wide split among state lawmakers and judges across the nation on the abortion issue. In Massachusetts, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, last week, strongly reasserted abortion rights of poor women, ruling that the Reagan administration regulations withholding federal funds from clinics giving abortion advice were unconstitutional. Chief Judge Levin H. Campbell, writing for the Boston-based court, not only endorsed Roe but probably also expanded it. He wrote, as the Supreme Court, in Roe v. Wade, ruled that a woman's right to an abortion was unconstitutionally protected, was constitutionally protected, I do not see how the government consistent with the 1st and 14th amendments can deny funding to those who would give objective advice...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...on this constitutionally protected