

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

January 17, 2006 LB 57

Senator Brown's concerns first, before moving back to the argument that Senator Chambers offered. Senator Brown, I think you're voicing thoughts that other senators may have, so it's important that you raise them and that I address them. I think some senators may be under the impression that one must prove serious bodily injury to the unborn child instantly at the time the child may still be in utero, or instantly at the time of birth. That's not the case. A period of time could lapse before all the elements of proof are assembled by a prosecutor. And yes, of course it's true, some children are born with serious birth defects. Of course that's true. It's unfortunate. And those birth defects may have absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with any kind of an attack on the child or the mother. Those birth defects may have been there anyway. And that's why prosecutors have the ability to exercise discretion as to which cases to take to trial. Same is true with fetal homicide. Miscarriage is a naturally occurring event. And we had people arguing four years ago that women were going to be hauled off into court proceedings because they had miscarriages. That hasn't happened, because the prosecutors have used the law properly, and they used the law the way that we said they would use the law, when they had evidence in a case beyond a reasonable doubt that they could bring to a jury and prove. And that's happened four times now since passage of the fetal homicide statute four years ago. Senator Chambers...obviously, Senator Chambers despises the bill. He's going to do everything he can to damage or kill the bill. He's been pretty up-front about that. And the FA200 that he offers does damage to the bill. When you write a criminal statute, every word counts, and if you're going to use a definition and rely on it in the construction of your criminal statute, you ought to rely on language that's been in statute before, has been tested in the courts before, and that it works. We have a definition of serious bodily injury. It's in the criminal code. We're using that same definition in the bill. Senator Chambers wants to change it, insert some new words, delete other words, saying, you don't really need those words; let's get rid of them. No, the words have been there for decades, the courts understand those words, we're going to use those words. That's the proper way to construct a criminal statute. That's the language that went through the Judiciary Committee, in more than