

March 15, 1976

and I think it has worked rather well. At a time of a death in a family, people sometimes are very upset and then, if they should find out that the body is being given away for various reasons, it puts other people connected with the services in a real bind and I think that this is a better bill if we would just reinsert the stricken material.

PRESIDENT: Senator Bereuter. Senator Bereuter.

SENATOR BEREUTER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I rise in opposition to the Stull amendment which would strike the language on page 2. This argument entailed by the amendments is predictable. We knew it was coming for a period of time. I would like to point out to the members of the Legislature that the language which is being stricken is not a part of the anatomical gift act, the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act. It is not a part of the model law which was enacted some years ago by the Nebraska Legislature. It was added specifically by Senator Stull for reasons which he outlined for you just briefly. I feel very strongly that this language should be stricken so that we do go back to the provisions of the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act and the reasons for that are twofold. The first reason is I think rather obvious. If a person in his or her wisdom chooses to give some or a portion of their body for medical science or for some donor purpose, that should be his or her will and that will should be carried forth. It should not be thwarted by some relative who comes in at the point of death, after death, and revokes the donation given by the deceased. This simply should not happen. Someone's will regarding their own body should not be thwarted after that person's death. Now the second reason for my opposition to striking...to reinserting this language, in other words, my opposition to the Stull amendment is a very practical one. If a physician who is designated to receive a part of the body of the donor for medical science, for some donation purpose, for some transplant purpose is under any kind of question whether or not someone may step in to revoke the donation, that person responsible for accepting the donation, or perhaps for enucleating an eye, will be very reluctant to act, understandably so. That physician or that licensed mortician, in the case of eyes, would be quite concerned that he not proceed immediately lest someone else step in and revoke the donation. Now time is of the essence in this particular activity. The cornea, for instance, maximum, six hours is all the time that may elapse before irreparable damage is done to the cornea for cornea transplant. Therefore, the people who are designated to receive the donated organ, the people who will enucleate in the case of eyes, must know immediately upon the death of the deceased that there is nothing standing in their way to carry out the will of the person making the donation after that person's death. Therefore, I think there is very good reason indeed for these two reasons to strike the language, to take the act back to its original form, that is, the form of the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act that has