

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

January 13, 2006 LB 57

discussion. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, if people who are not trying to twist and distort science would read and allow what they read to speak for itself that would be fine. But when they cunningly, disingenuinely...disingenuously attempt to put a Catholic twist on it, they run into trouble. Senator Foley didn't pay attention to what he read. If I had the passage, I could be more specific in all of them, but he talks about the fertilized egg being the beginning of the development. Nowhere did he read that a fertilized egg is a human being. Senator Foley, cunningly, like a card shark or somebody using the shell game, did not say human being exists at that time; it's the beginning of human life. I have always said that at any stage of development there's a potential human being, but it is not a human being. That which is developing and that zygote is not a human being any more than an acorn is an oak tree. An acorn is as much the beginning of an oak tree as a zygote is the beginning of a human being. But an acorn is not an oak tree, a zygote is not a human being, a chicken's egg is not a chicken. When you go into the restaurant, you don't...they don't ask you, you want bacon and scrambled chicken? You want bacon and scrambled eggs. Aristotle knew that a developing embryo was not a human being, and he never called it that. Aristotle did the first systematic study of the development of creatures from the time of conception to the time of birth. Now, Senator Foley talked about the development process by which a baby develops from whatever term he was using from his textbook at that time. That's not denied. I tried to get something through his skull yesterday about the difference between the fertilized egg and what preceded that fertilized egg. Since he maintained that the fertilized egg is the full human being, then there is no developmental process after that. The job has been completed. Now he reads from a textbook, which would correct his ignorance if he would allow it to. We are talking about a process of development, but being a fuzzy thinker he brings that same fuzziness to precise language. This is the same process by which religious zealots attempt to say that so-called intelligent design is science. Call it what it is, teach it for what it is, but don't corrupt and taint science with this nonsense. So Senator Foley cannot show you a