

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

April 8, 2004 LB 958

punishment, I'm all for that, but to try to separate the fetus from the woman and say two people are here, when in fact...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...there's only one, I disagree with that. Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Beutler, on the Chambers amendment.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, I'd yield my time to Senator Foley to complete...or to begin his answer.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Foley.

SENATOR FOLEY: Thank you again, Senator Beutler. I appreciate your question. It's a very good question. It deserves an answer. You're absolutely correct that this bill completely excludes the mother from any prosecution whatsoever, and in some sense one might argue that's an inconsistency with the premise of the bill, which is that a person, meaning any person, who commits this act of violence against the child can be prosecuted, but we're saying "except for." And why do we say "except for"? You and I both know that there are cases where women are chemically dependent or dependent on alcohol and that, the use of those substances, may result, and does result in some cases, in serious damage, lifelong damage in some cases, to the child. And those are very tragic cases. But I cannot imagine any set of circumstances where I would want to incarcerate a woman because she has a chemical dependency. I just don't want to go there. That's not the purpose of this bill. The purpose of this bill is to allow for prosecution of third parties who commit acts of violence against pregnant women and their unborn children. That's what I'm seeking here. And I think that's where Roe v. Wade has taken us. If I were to remove the language excluding the mother, I'm not sure what that would do with the legal status of this bill, whether or not that bill might be challenged on constitutional grounds and whether or not that might in some way be seen as an assault on Roe v. Wade. Now, in all honesty, do I want Roe v. Wade to fall? You bet I