

March 8, 1979

LB 316

found death certificates but I have never found a report of a surgical procedure so that also leads me to conclude that our state does not have any kind of reporting requirements and therefore, when we single out the abortion area for the kind of reporting requirements that Senator Venditte is talking about, we really are making an exception to standard medical practice and to standard reporting practice. Furthermore, when we indicate that these records ought to be public records as opposed to being confidential records, we clearly are making an exception to standard medical practice and certainly to our own standards, at least visavis the venereal disease area. Now in the right to privacy issue the basic right to privacy that has been developed by the United States Supreme Court started in the late 1950's with cases involving contraception. The two leading cases were *Poe v. Ullman* and *Griswold v. Connecticut*. In both of those cases the Supreme Court recognized both the individual and the married couple's right to privacy in receiving from their physician, contraception information. Very clear from those cases that any kind of prohibition, which is what existed in Connecticut, on a physician's ability to provide that information to his patient, infringe the patient's right to privacy. Thus, it seems to me that any kind of activities that we take in this area to make the physician's relationship with the patient non-private, that is open to the public which is what Senator Venditte's amendments would do, has the effect of infringing upon the right to privacy of the individual and may not withstand constitutional tests. I would, therefore, urge a vote against the Venditte amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: I have two more speakers, Senator Labeledz and then Senator Dworak. Senator Labeledz.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senator Hoagland, would you yield to a question, please? On request 2661, on page 8, it states, "No person shall disclose any information contained on the written consent or the statement of consultation including the identity of the woman seeking the abortion." Now doesn't that protect the woman from disclosing or any information disclosing the patient's name?

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Here is the reason it does not, Senator Labeledz. Judge Urbom said, again on page 551 of the Journal, that I am aware the statute does not require the listing of the names of the women but he goes on to say that it requires a listing of many other things which may, at least in many counties in Nebraska, identify the person very nicely. Now