

have left it like that. But there is something in me that...that won't allow that in this particular instance. I don't know what it is. But, at any rate, I am opposed to the amendment that we have labored over because what it does is impinge on a doctor's judgment. Here is what we have done with the law as it would stand if it's enacted in its present form. A young lady comes in for an abortion, she doesn't know the law. She doesn't know to say that she has been the victim of abuse of the kinds that would allow a physician to forego giving notification. She doesn't even know that notification must be given to her parents or whoever that person would be. So she enters the office and the physician says, I cannot perform this abortion without your parents or your guardian being notified. And she begins to talk about her condition. She has pains. She is hemorrhaging and the doctor says, well, let me examine you. So the doctor performs the examination and says, we have a very serious medical problem here but I still have to notify your parents because this problem, as serious as it is, does not allow me to say, as a physician, that it will actually result in your death prior to my giving notification, so I cannot use my judgment as a physician. Were I unencumbered by this law that the Legislature put on the books, I would perform the abortion because it is an immediate and grave risk to your health. Perhaps your pelvis will be thrown out of whack. Perhaps some organ will be damaged. Perhaps your ability to have children in the future will be destroyed. But that is not a threat to your life and under this bill that is the only circumstance under which I can perform this abortion without giving that notification, and I have to do it in person or by certified mail. And with the amount of time that's taking, I can't...I can't treat you. You have to go someplace else to see if you can find somebody. But then something may rise up in the doctor and the doctor will say, first do no harm. The doctor's obligation is to treat. Failure to treat does harm. The jurisprudence in this country makes people liable for that which they omit to do that they ought to do in the same way they are liable for doing that which they should not do and in this case it is an "ought to do" rather than a mandated "shall do" because the "ought" is based on a moral and ethical and professional obligation to treat those who need immediate treatment. If somebody came into a physician's office with a severe laceration, it's not life threatening but it's considered an emergency, it could result in an infection if it's not treated, and although the person may not die a limb could be lost so the performance of whatever services are necessary will be