

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 10, 2001 LB 462

wouldn't we also say, number one, that if there was a death penalty, that the next of kin, according to Senator Maxwell, should not be allowed to have that organ transplant to somebody else and save another life? And I think, by extension, a murder victim should not have their family able to give an organ donation to somebody else to save their life because it bears a relationship, ultimately, to an immoral act. Frankly, it seems to me in both of those cases, it wouldn't bother me one whit that with consent the organ donation was allowed to save another life, I think that would be the appropriate thing to do. I think that would be a good thing to do, and I don't see that as moral complicity with evil; I think that of bringing...I think that as supporting the value of life. But I would be intrigued by Senator Maxwell's response to the extension of his analogy, something that I am sure he is used in the law school setting. Senator Erdman made a different argument. He said, look, I've got faith in science; you don't understand, I'm a supporter of LB 462, I'm...I'm...I'm a...I have faith in science; I'm going to do this bill so I can force the university into new sources of tissue, different sources of tissue, sources of tissue that aren't tainted; I'm going to force them into more profitable avenues of research. This is not a profitable avenue of research as indicated by all...

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...the money that's going elsewhere. Senator Erdman, the bill does much more than that. The bill stops the use of cures if you find them from the wrong sources. That is not faith in science to say we will eschew the use of a cure to Parkinson, we will eschew the use to a cure of Alzheimer's. If it came from the wrong source you can't use a public hospital, you can't use public funds, you can't use public health to administer such a cure; we will not taint our hands with such a treatment. That's not faith in science, that is a rejection of science. And there is no way that you can...you can square the opposition with the notion that you're simply and only forcing the university into new sources of tissue. This bill says much more than that, and it says if we had an Alzheimer's cure in our hands it would depend on...