

May 4, 1973

which is directed at urging the Congress to take actions to reverse the action of the Supreme Court in their decision striking down the majority of the abortion laws in the United States. I oppose that decision, I oppose the results of that decision and the logic and the reasoning employed to arrive at the results in that decision and I would have no great assurance if the word same were stricken to insert the word appropriate. The word appropriate has no meaning as far as I know in law. I think the word same has clear meaning with reference to constitutional rights. It is my feeling that the unborn human life is entitled under the Constitution to be considered a person. Under the Supreme Court's decision that was basically the issue before the court, whether or not unborn human life was to be considered a person as that word is used in the Constitution. The Supreme Court found that unborn human life was not a person and as a result of that finding that the right of privacy, a right not articulated in the Constitution of the United States, the right of privacy of an individual woman to choose what to do with her body superceded the right of an unborn human life to protection from, under the law. And as a result, criminal laws relating to abortion were struck down on that basis. It is my feeling that unborn human life is human life and is a person, it would be my concept that it is a person under the Constitution of the United States. However, the Supreme Court did not concur in my interpretation of what a person is and as a result we are faced with a situation of expressing the will of this country which is how we determine these matters as to whether or not this form of life is to be considered a person and insured the same constitutional protections as any other person. In this regard I might say that Senator Chambers' position here confuses me a great deal and Senator Chambers has made some statements this morning that, with reference to what I have understood to be his philosophy, are extremely unusual. Senator Chambers says that we are confronted with a legal matter which is different than a moral matter. My approach and as I have considered up to this time Senator Chambers' approach to legal matters and to political matters is that the foundation of both is moral judgment and that to me is the foundation of every law that we make here and the foundation of every decision that we approach here. This is a moral matter, the results and the operative effect of it is a legal consequence, so we determine our laws and make our laws to adjust the conduct of the society in which we live and those laws are always based on moral premises on what we believe to be the correct way to operate in the social context and the correct dignity to lend to each other in the human context. So to separate the legal from the moral would leave us in a total vacuum and I believe that that was the intent and the affect of the Supreme Court's decision. They attempted to dissect the moral from the legal and to avoid the moral and to base things on supposed legality and logic and they totally failed in that attempt and they admit their failure because they admitted in the decision that they could not determine what human life was and yet they were willing to affectuate a decision which would possibly, even under their reasoning, destroy human life without a basis in logic or morality. So the word appropriate, to give them appropriate rights, I feel would have the same affect in my philosophy of what human life as to say that we would give appropriate rights to Negroes, to blacks, to women, or any other category. I think we should give the same rights to all human beings and if we leave it to the word appropriate I think you all know what we would be left with.

PRESIDENT: Now, Senator Savage, we're still debating your motion to reject the Lewis amendments, did you wish to be recognized again?

SENATOR SAVAGE: I wanted to extend my apology to the body, I didn't mean to be discourteous to Senator Lewis. He'll have an