

SENATOR ABOUD: I guess we can talk about ill-advised and ill-prepared amendments at this time. This particular amendment, I believe, is just a measure to harass the bill. It really doesn't...I think it was just an amendment to place up there to slow down the bill now that it is on Select File. There is eight more working days left, yet the bill as amended it really could possibly ensure the death of the bill and that's my belief on why the amendment, or maybe not in this instance, but I have a feeling it's probably going to be brought back and harassed as a result of a continued effort by Senator Chambers. Well let's focus more on the actual amendment itself. If you'll note on page 3, it states it shall be unlawful for a person to knowingly possess with intent to rent, sell, deliver, distribute, trade. Now, when an individual sells a photograph, I would assume it normally means that an individual takes a photograph, hands it to another individual and another individual gives money back to that individual so a sale actually does take place. If they traded, I assume that possibly wouldn't be of value, but as far as the sale for money would, in fact, be already included in the amendment, or already included in the bill. The bill itself provides, in a brief explanation of it, provides that if an individual distributes or sells or trades the photograph then that individual will be convicted of a Class IV felony. Now this bill was brought to me by the Omaha Police Department, the Douglas County Attorney's Office and the Omaha City Prosecutor's Office in response to the child pornography ring that took place in Douglas County. Now, at that time there were 13 individuals that were arrested in their investigation of child pornography. They were basically luring young boys, because that's all the photographs really dealt with, young boys, into pornographic photographs. Now the Judiciary Committee was privy to photographs that were brought in by the Omaha Police Department.

SENATOR LANDIS: One minute.

SENATOR ABOUD: I believe they brought in a dozen photographs, and I was disgusted by the photographs as were other members of the committee at that time and there was a strong desire at that time to do what we could to get these individuals out of the business of selling or out of the business of trading these particular photographs and that's why we advanced the bill. If the bill...I just don't feel at this time that this bill needs any changing. It's a pretty straightforward bill. It has been worked out in committee. We've discussed this issue, I know in the Judiciary Committee, for over four years when it was