

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

January 18, 2006    LB 57

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

SENATOR CHAMBERS:    Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Foley is adopting the approach of his leader in the White House. President Bush and Vice President Cheney, no matter what the evidence presented to them as far as an allegation, will say, that's simply untrue, and it's supposed to be dismissed. Well, I will let the record speak for itself. I will let my amendment speak for itself in terms of what it says. But, Senator Foley, I would like to ask you a question.

SENATOR CUDABACK:    Senator Foley.

SENATOR CHAMBERS:    Suppose, instead of using the plural form of these words, I said, hand...arm or arms, leg or legs, hand or hands, foot or feet. Would that satisfy you?

SENATOR FOLEY:    No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS:    Thank you. You see, Senator Foley is being frivolous. He knows what this amendment is designed to do. He has put into his bill the term "serious bodily injury," without a definition of "body." I have stated over and over, and any doctor or scientist or even person on the street that he would talk to would let him know that if there is no body present, there cannot be serious bodily injury. You cannot injure that which is not in existence. What I'm offering here is a definition for the term "body," so we know at what stage of development a criminal statute such as that he is proposing would be applicable. This has nothing to do with the value of a zygote, an embryo, or a fetus. It has everything to do with the criminal law and what kind of law is enforceable, what kind of law is rational, what kind of law makes sense. Now, a person such as myself, trained in the law, trained in Catholic philosophy, encounters tremendous difficulty on a floor where you're dealing with people not trained in either discipline. Oh, there are people on the floor with law degrees, but that doesn't mean that they're trained in the law. They were trained in law school, but they don't understand the law, they don't