Rich in symbolism and substance, the Senate Judiciary Committee’s Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Property Rights held a hearing June 23 on the impact of Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton that deserved far wider attention than it garnered. In a room filled to capacity, the testimony was so dramatic it drew tears from the audience.

Chaired by Sen. Sam Brownback (R-Ks.), the committee heard witnesses expound on “The Consequences of Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton,” the dual 1973 Supreme Court decisions that simultaneously gutted the abortion laws of all 50 states and spurred the creation of the Pro-Life Movement.

“The contentious debate since 1973 over the culture of life has proven that the American people, the democratic process, and ultimately even the federal judiciary have been ill-served by the Supreme Court’s breathtaking intervention into, and circumvention of, the public debate about abortion,” Brownback said. He added, “To put it simply, Roe was a mistake. A very, very costly one.”

From the pro-life perspective, the most telling testimony was provided by Norma McCorvey, the “Jane Roe” of Roe v. Wade, and Sandra Cano, the “Jane Doe” of Doe v. Bolton (the companion case to Roe). Both testified they were exploited by lawyers whose first and foremost objective was to legalize abortion.

Neither, fortunately, had an abortion. Both now are strong advocates of the right to life cause.

McCorvey told the subcommittee that she was unmarried in the early 1970s when she found out that she was pregnant with her third child. She testified that while she wanted an abortion, “my lawyers did not tell me that I would be killing a human being.”

“Instead of getting me financial or vocational help, instead of helping me to get off of drugs and alcohol, instead of working for open adoption or giving me other help, my lawyers wanted to eliminate the right of society to protect women and children from abortionists,” she said.

Ms. Cano’s role was (in her words) “still pretty much a mystery to me.” At no time had she wanted an abortion.

“I have tried to understand how it all happened,” Cano told the subcommittee. “How did my divorce and my divorce?”

O’Conner, a lawyer and professor of government at American University; and R. Alta Charo, a professor of law and bioethics at the University of Wisconsin Law School.

Opposition to Roe was also furnished by two distinguished scholars.

Teresa Collett is professor of law at the University of St. Thomas Law School. She explained that she has a great deal of experience in “assisting legislators and groups across the country evaluate proposed abortion laws during the legislative process and defending such laws in the courts.”

Amusingly, the听取了众多证人的作证，这些证人对堕胎的后果进行了生动的描述。

考特·科勒特是明尼苏达大学法学院的教授。他表示，堕胎权的法律已经证明了对生命的侵犯。

他继续：“像少数其它国际社会案件一样，Roe和Doe的决定对我们的历史和公民身份起着至关重要的作用。”

Roe在结语中说，“促使美国人共同努力，通过一个持续的过程实现和平与有力的说服，来建立和完善我们的政策在各自国家的堕胎权。”

The hearing represented the first of three or four the subcommittee is planning on prominent federal court decisions. According to press reports, the topics for future hearings are still under discussion.