been made by a majority of those voting here this evening, and my motion is an attempt to rectify that situation. So I am asking that we vote yes on this motion to reconsider that last vote.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Landis, discussion on the motion to reconsider.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, actually the outcome of the vote is somewhat irrelevant in that the proponents of the measure, if they are successful, and get to the issue at hand, which they would like to, which is the motion to return to Select File, and then adopt either the Lindsay amendment or the Labedz amendment, would have this measure at a different level of debate, and you just read the rule on bracket motions, and at that moment a bracket motion today would be in order. It is only on the same day and on the same stage. So, in fact, if the proponents of this measure are successful in their course of action, Senator Chambers motion will again become available to him even under the existent rule that the body overruled the Chair on at such times as the success of the amendment is brought back to the floor. And so in that sense, it seems to me that really we are about where we are at to begin with, and we might as well discuss the underlying issue. The underlying issue is whether or not parental notification is good policy in this state. I would like to recount, at least in part, some of the history of reproductive rights in the United States to remind us all that the state that we are in now, which is a constitutionally guaranteed right of privacy, is not unlike large portions of American history. Prior to 1820, abortion was legal by common law in this company...in this country, rather, prior to quickening, and that meant prior to the first fetal movement. That is about a week earlier than the end of the first trimester, given the Roe v. Wade analysis. In 1812, for example, the right to abortion prior to quickening was upheld by the Massachusetts's Supreme Court as a right existing at common law to be shared in by the women of Massachusetts. In 1821, Connecticut law permitted a woman to abort prior to quickening, and that was by statutory law. However, someplace along in the 1830s, medical writings, medical journals, suggested that because of the presence of midwifery and folk healers performing abortions that they were risky, that there were primitive techniques, that they were dangerous, and following those suggestions, states began to outlaw this practice. But I should