

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

January 20, 2006 LB 72

in the details. So I...if Senator Chambers wishes to speak about angels, then he can now move on to a different quotation. (Laugh) Thank you.

PRESIDENT SHEEHY: Thank you, Senator Brown. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Brown did mention angels, and that perhaps if I wanted to talk about angels. Well, I don't want to be talking more about myself than I do already. But I don't know why the word "angel" is generally applied to females, when there is no female angel acknowledged in the "Bible." No angel is female, not one. So why do they get around to referring to women as angels? Could they be Freudian slips, Senator Michael Foley, hmm? Just remember this, every time you refer to a woman as an angel, you are applying a masculine term to her. I'd like to ask Senator Brown a question, since she opened this can of fish.

PRESIDENT SHEEHY: Senator Brown, would you yield?

SENATOR BROWN: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Brown, have you heard women referred to on a regular basis as angels?

SENATOR BROWN: Oh, absolutely.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: There is no female angel in the "Bible," so why apply a masculine term to females?

SENATOR BROWN: I don't know.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Brown. I know, but I ain't telling. Senator Brown did us a service by mentioning what she said was the origin of the idea contained in the statement that I made about people saying the devil is in the details. But what she did was emphasize to a greater extent than I did that the devil doesn't bother with details. Show how silly angels are, if you go to a philosophy course, they talk about them dancing on the head of a pin. That's what angels spend their time doing. Now, there are some of my colleagues