tell you that the overwhelming history of Anglo-Saxon American law is to recognize the right of the individual to abort prior to quickening, which is, basically, the law that we have today. It is only the period from about 1830 to about 1960 which that has been the opposite. The firmness with which states acted, however, was quite compelling by the turn of the century. The original medical reason, which was the danger involved in the procedures, was replaced with a moral rationale which was not present at the time these statutes were initially passed. Instead, there was a rise in the late nineteenth century of the claims that this was an immoral act, not just a dangerous one, and at that time, contraception was regarded as a moral evil as well. Attempts to pass information about contraception through the mails was ruled obscene material and was stricken from the mails because it was regarded as immoral to learn about contraception. As a matter of fact in 1962, an Arizona woman who had taken thalidomide tried to obtain a legal abortion claiming that not only her life was in danger but that...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you. ...that there was a great risk involved, she was denied it. She did obtain it in Sweden and it began the concern with the availability of abortion rights. 1965 brought Griswold v. Connecticut in which the State of Connecticut's statute, statute which made using or providing birth control to married people a crime, was ruled unconstitutional. This is certainly within living memory, 1962, Connecticut with a statute making it illegal to use or to provide birth control to a married couple. That is how far the moralists who will impose their own personal religious convictions are certainly willing to use the law to force married people not to use birth control, since it was regarded as immoral. It took an act of the Supreme Court to find that this infringed upon individual rights.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Time. Senator McFarland, please.

SENATOR McFARLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think this vote should be reconsidered. I think the vote was correct. The Speaker should have been overruled and has been. With regard to statutory construction or rule interpretation, entire law books have been written over how to interpret language. Volumes, 300, 400 pages, have been written about various court rules on how to interpret statutes, laws, rules, regulations, what have you,