

not the replowing of this ground. I know that the priority motion is used to give somebody a ten minutes speech, and I can see why Jim McFarland wanted to make that speech. The points remain unchanged. Basically, those of us who support this bill believe that the individual is the source of authority for the determination of what kind of medical treatment they are going to have. Secondly, although Jim tells a poignant and, I find, very personally touching story about his own grandfather, the information that we circulated, from the Mayo Clinic, indicates that as many as 50 percent of people who are elderly and are facing terminal conditions do not have family or spouse around them to help them in this situation. Third, we've pointed out today that the medical standards are no different under this bill than exists under present law. There is no greater risk or lack of definition, or anything else, than what we currently have. All the changes are the creation of a sense of personal responsibility which will be carried out in the medical treatment of one's own future. Lastly, Senator McFarland closed his speech with the point of saying this was the better way, this was the better way for our family, I think it's the better way. And I admire Senator McFarland's convictions on his point. I defy him, however, to say that it's the law, or should be the law that he wishes to impose that perception and impose that kind of mechanism on everybody else. I resent it utterly that we shift responsibility away from the individual to others, nameless, faceless, whom we do not know, whose working principle for decisions we do not know, whose standards we do not know and take away from the individual what is innately theirs--the right to decide their own future and their own medical treatment. This motion is unworthy of our time, let's get to whether or not this bill has the votes to advance.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Labedz, on the McFarland motion.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise again to support the indefinite postponement of LB 88. I believe in Section 2, where we talk about the attending physician, that is really frightening. Attending physician does not mean the family physician. It could possibly mean the physician in the emergency room. Can you imagine taking a relative or a loved one into the emergency room with a living will in your hands and the attending physician, not the family physician, makes the decision as to whether or not the patient is terminally ill and could possibly have serious complications and possibly imminent