

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

January 17, 2006 LB 57

Senator Chambers. Senator Foley. Is Senator Foley on the floor? Senator Foley, you're recognized to speak, if you care to. Yes.

SENATOR FOLEY: Thank you, Mr. President. Well, here we go again, Senator Chambers. He continues to offer the view that the definition of when a human being comes into existence is somehow a Catholic theology that was invented somewhere along the way and that I'm asking all of you to swallow a Catholic dogma. Well, to the extent that the Catholic Church teaches that a human being came to existence at the moment of fertilization is simply good science. That's what the scientists will tell you if you ask them, when did the human being begin? And I read extensive excerpts from the textbook used at the University of Nebraska, and I know Senator Chambers goes up the wall every time I mention that textbook. He wishes that textbook were burned, I suppose. But it's there and it's used, not only at our university, but at medical schools across the country. If he doesn't like that textbook, let's try another one. And again, this is another textbook not produced by the Catholic Church. This is one of the premier textbooks on medical embryology--that's the title of the book, Medical Embryology, Third Edition, published by Williams and Wilkins, author Jan Langman, L-a-n-g-m-a-n. And I quote: The development of a human being begins with fertilization, a process by which two highly specialized cells--the spermatozoon from the male and the oocyte from the female--unite to give rise to a new organism, the zygote. That's what you're going to find in any medical embryology textbook. Show me the book that doesn't have that definition. You can't dismiss that as just some Catholic dogma that somebody invented in the Dark Ages. That's science. As to FA200 that Senator Chambers has offered, there's no need for FA200. The definition of serious bodily injury is in state statute. It's been there for decades. Senator Chambers knows that. It's been there for decades. There's absolutely no reason to repeat a definition of serious bodily injury in this new criminal provision. I think he's doing it with malicious intent to the bill. (Laugh) That's a pretty good guess. I figured it out. (Laugh) And I think he's just acknowledged that is his intent, and I'll ask you to vote no on FA200. Thank you.