

March 8, 1979

LB 316

hot line matchbooks at ball parks and flea markets. One agency even pays a doctor cadillacs to promote abortion hot line from his sound truck. Working undercover as counsellors for the agencies our investigators documented how with bait and switch and sleight of hand, the flamboyant agencies swindle women who come to them for help. They pay commissions for every abortion their counsellors sell. They charge women \$45 to \$150 for as little as five minutes of information that is available elsewhere. They give misleading information including telling women more than twelve weeks pregnant that they must go out of state for abortions. It could be any one of the many phone calls from women seeking information about abortions or one of their free pregnancy tests offered in hot line. There is another section here where they said when those who call the hot line don't know who is behind that soft voice, they are counsellors hired off the street, women schooled more in sales than in abortion counselling, women who must sell to be paid. In other words, they are paid a certain amount of salary each week and then they are paid as high as \$10 and \$12 bonus for every abortion that they sell over the telephone. I think that section, the name of the referring physician, agency or service, if any, should be reinstated.

SPEAKER MARVEL PRESIDING

SPEAKER MARVEL: The Chair recognizes Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President and colleagues, I rise in opposition to Senator Venditte's amendment. I think Senator Venditte makes a good point in that the abortion procedure is treated differently than other medical procedures. I think that is a valid and good point, but the point of the matter is that the Supreme Court has specifically and clearly stated that in the area of abortion, the woman, you shall protect the confidentiality of the woman. Now the difficulty is in separating the confidentiality of the woman from the confidentiality of the physician. Now Senator Venditte's point is valid but I am afraid that if we look past the Supreme Court decision then we are going to jeopardize the whole recordkeeping section within this particular statute. I don't think Senator Venditte wants that. I don't want that. I want records, at least minimum records, records that are now provided by the statute and I am afraid that if we take Senator Venditte's amendment with the Danforth case, the decision that came down from the court, we are going to jeopardize this whole section and I think that would be a bad mistake and I think that would be a result that