

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

January 17, 2006 LB 57

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Foley. On with discussion. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Foley is so funny. How can I be acting with malicious intent when I want to define a word that he has in his bill, and I'm using the definition in the statute? Would it be a malicious act against his bill to put the definition of serious bodily injury into the bill? That definition is not created by me. I'd like to ask Senator Foley a question before I deal with what he said earlier.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Foley, would you yield?

SENATOR FOLEY: Yes, I'd be delighted.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Foley, if I understood you correctly, and I stand to be corrected here and now if I didn't, I thought you said that the definition of "unborn child" in this bill is the same definition found in another statute. Did you say that?

SENATOR FOLEY: The definition in this bill is identical to the definition in statute, per passage of the Homicide of the Unborn Child Act four years ago.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, let me ask you this. If you say there's no need in repeating a definition that's already somewhere else in the statute, why are you repeating this definition, when it's somewhere else in the statute?

SENATOR FOLEY: Very good question, Senator Chambers, very good question. And just...it's there to ensure clarity of the law. This is a criminal statute, and absolutely essential...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, it's on my time. What is the difference between your repeating a definition which is somewhere else, and my repeating a definition somewhere else?

SENATOR FOLEY: Senator Chambers, you represent to this body that FA200 is word-for-word identical with the definition of