

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

May 5, 2003

LB 602

of 2000. They said that CRNT, or somatic cell nuclear transfer, or therapeutic cloning, requires a deliberate creation and disaggregation of a human embryo. They went on to say, it is true that the techniques developed in this transfer, therapeutic cloning research, can prepare the way scientifically and technically for efforts at reproductive cloning. Now, would it be nice to ban reproductive cloning? Absolutely. I think that it takes away from the respect and dignity for human life. And...but all cloning, whether it's therapeutic or genetic, is the duplication of a genetic code. Now, we talk about the advances made in science, whether it's DNA, whatever the case may be, when we look at law enforcement and fingerprints and all of these things. But the genetic code belongs to us as individuals. And to attempt to reproduce that, I believe, brings problems to civilization, to a civilized society that would get ahead of itself in terms of research. The University of Nebraska position on this entire bill, both kinds of cloning, is neutral. They're very progressive on the research end of the spectrum. And I'll be very candid with you and say that they're a little more progressive than I'm comfortable with in some situations. But the fact of the matter is, they're neutral on this issue, and they have looked at this very...in a very thorough manner. I do rise to offer my support for the committee amendments. But again, I'm emphasizing my opposition to the Schimek amendment that would basically still pave the way for therapeutic cloning. And as many researchers indicated in the Journal of the American Medical Association, indicate that therapeutic cloning certainly paves the way...or, prepares the way scientifically and technically for efforts at reproductive cloning. I go back to the committee hearing, which was very enlightening. And I appreciated, and still do appreciate, the dialogue. But there was a testifier that basically says, you know, government should stay out, there shouldn't be any policy on this. And one of the committee members basically said, because science as a community cannot agree on an issue, does that mean we should let science establish the policy, establish the framework, establish what is ethical and what is not ethical. A group of individuals who can't even agree among themselves would therefore try to establish the parameters or the boundaries within their community. So I believe that it is a very logical, a very...