

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

January 23, 2004 LB 304

SENATOR LANDIS: Right. There isn't something that gives a special purpose. But remember, for example, that the word "offensive" appears in many of our pornography statutes and the fact that it's offensive to the community.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR LANDIS: Oftentimes that's...that phrase is used, but it's without definition.

SENATOR CUDABACK: You may consider...I mean, you may continue, Senator Landis. Your light is next.

SENATOR LANDIS: Why don't I give the first minute back to Senator Chambers, so he can continue with his line of cross-examination. But I would like some of the time myself.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right. The only thing I will say is that this is entirely different from pornography because, as one of the Supreme Court judges said, I can't define it, but I know it when I see it. If we're talking about offensive language within the narrow context of an interrogation, I think there should be some definition of it. If he said you...you're like a blockhead, or I meant if there is no profanity, no racial slur, but it's something that a person just doesn't like, does that qualify? That's what I'm getting at and I'm not looking for a total definitive answer.

SENATOR LANDIS: Right. Gotcha. To me, you are looking at a standard that would come about, and we use it a lot in civil law, where a reasonable third party, looking at the circumstances, would be offended. For example, we do it with emotional distress. It's not that the individual felt emotional distress, but would a reasonable third party looking at that be...see that there was emotional distress? In this situation, I think you'd be...it's the same idea. Would a reasonable third party, looking at the totality of the circumstances, say that is offensive language? Is that...could you have a greater