

SENATOR LINDSAY: I think what it is referring to is certifying the medical record itself, that the medical record shows that that abortion is necessary to prevent the woman's death, because I think it is talking about the record itself, it should show her health or her condition, and the physician would merely do the certification of that record, that is the way I interpret it I guess.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: All right, do you see the difference now in your having read it and it made it clear to me between my amendment and yours? Yours relates only to death, the possibility of death. Are you with me?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Yeah, but the problem I've got is I haven't been able to find my copy so go ahead and keep talking while I grab the statute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. The section that I want to save from being repealed by you, and the only way I can do it is by writing it out and making it an amendment to yours says, "This section shall not apply when an emergency situation exists such that continuation of the pregnancy provides an immediate threat and grave risk to the life or health..." Your amendment in 769 deals only with a life threatening situation. The current law in 347 says a threat to life or health, and you don't want this provision to apply to where the health is threatened by the continuation of the pregnancy? In other words, you want the doctor to have to certify that it is a situation that would result in death if the abortion is not performed, rather than as the current law says, there is an immediate threat to life or health, that is the difference.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Is that something, I guess, in question form? I guess the response would be that I guess you run into a question of health and what constitutes a risk to the health of the minor, as far as...we know that if it is a risk of death, clearly that includes any major problems relating to her health.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But you are aware that this language that I am talking about is in the present law?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Yeah, no question about that. It is...no question that it is subsection (3) of the statute intended to be repealed.