

major questions unresolved with regards to constitutionality of our abortion decision and I think that those, you know, I would like to explain later. I guess it is important to note that the only reason that we are here and I think, the only reason that Senator DeCamp or Senator Labeledz or Senator Dworak are even sponsoring the bill is because of Judge Urbom's decision, and Senator Hoagland had this inserted in the Journal on page 547 to 553. I don't think Senator DeCamp would even have made as many changes as he did if he had not read that decision and saw that Urbom very explicitly and clearly sets out numerous sections of the state statute that place our law in constitutional jeopardy, and if you have not read that decision, I think you may want to because really in terms of the abortion law, that is where we should begin, with what Urbom is saying, it is the law according to the court rather than back with the statutes that we passed. I think some of the things that are worthwhile in these amendments are that it creates with regards to a forty-eight hour waiting period and parental consultation an exception, and Urbom questioned those statutes because there was not an exception and that is that the exception would be in the case of emergency, and then to clear up any questions of ambiguity about the term, emergency, we provide a definition of that term. Now the parental consent was changed as Senator DeCamp indicated to parental consultation. However, a minor may have an abortion without that consultation if an emergency exists. There is a limit inserted as to how long a doctor must hold the consent and consultation forms. As Senator DeCamp indicated there is a criminal and more importantly a civil remedy for unauthorized disclosure of information on the consent, consultation or reporting forms. Also Urbom questioned some of the things that were in our state statute with regards to the reporting form as to their relevance to the state's interest and also as to whether or not, in fact, they would be clues to the identity of the woman. He also indicated that although our statute does not require the identity of the woman to be on the reporting form, the language is ambiguous. It allows the Health Department to add additional things, and therefore he felt that it might allow the opportunity for the woman's identity to be on there. So we have limited the form to several specific things. We have tried to strike those things that we felt might provide clues to the identity of the person. We did add in response to requests from Jim Cunningham that a record be kept of how many abortions are conducted under the emergency section. So we have added one thing to the reporting form and taken some other things out. These are all issues that are contained in Urbom's decision and they are all things that it