

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Governor. Every time I hear you speak, I am reminded why you were the Governor and why I wish you still were Governor or Senator. I keep trying to convince Leahy of that, but I have not worked it out yet. But, seriously, I am always impressed when I hear you speak.

Senator Kennedy.

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to join in welcoming an extraordinary, distinguished panel of witnesses and to commend them for brief, but very moving and compelling testimony. It really says something, I think, when we have distinguished individuals who have lives of accomplishment and achievement have to come before the committee and talk about very personal aspects of their lives. People do not do that very willingly, because privacy is something which is highly regarded and protected. In order to make a point to have to describe that, I think all of us are very moved by that presentation.

Now, Judge Thomas had indicated that he had no agenda, that he was going to be openminded, that he had a regard for precedent. I think when he was being pressed on, I think it was probably on the *Griggs* case, indicated that something that was in law for 17 or 18 years had a very important precedent in his own mind, that he was reluctant to see unsettled law.

I would think that perhaps people that were not looking for the overruling of *Roe* could find different wisps during the course of the period of his testimony to get some degree of belief that maybe he would not, and yet there are a series of both the Lehrman speech that he made in reference to Lehrman's presentation and other comments that he made prior to these hearings on privacy and other issues that would lead people to believe that he would. So, as was pointed out by virtually all the panelists, it really is very much an open question.

Tell me, just to the extent that you can—I think probably a few people could do a better job—if that decision is overturned, what really does that mean in terms of the lives of women and families in this country?

Ms. WEDDINGTON. There is an article by one of my colleagues at the University of Texas, Mark Graver, called "The Ghost of Abortion Past," and what he really tries to do is point out what it was like before *Roe v. Wade* was decided, in terms of its impact, particularly on the poor and women of color.

I think if *Roe v. Wade* was overturned or seriously damaged, that what you end up with is a situation much like those days of old, where women of means will be able to travel to States or countries where it is legal, but those who are younger, those who are poor, those who are less sophisticated are going to return to some of the illegal and very unsafe methods of abortion. It does not solve the abortion issue.

The second thing is I think it does away with the right of privacy. I think that is important to many Americans, because of the developing nature of intrusion, not just by government, but by other methods, as well, through computers and a lot of other things. We want a sense that we are safe in making those decisions most fundamental to us.