radar evidence but it contains a statement by a judge that I think would apply here. The judge in that case was saying that the safeguards of the rules of evidence must be thrown around the introduction of scientific evidence because although the advancement of science can bring pushbutton warfare to civilization it ought not be allowed to bring push-button justice. So despite the pressure of various special interest groups, to have the law modified in its general approach for their convenience I think it is necessary to maintain the integrity of evidentiary proceedings and I don't think it will place an undue burden on anybody and it certainly would accord with the rights that an accused person has in this society if we would require that the evidence on which a conviction is sought has to be produced in court. If I am accused of possessing narcotics for the purpose of sale or distribution, they have to at least produce a sample of the narcotics themselves. They can't come in with a photograph. So I think in this particular situation since the purpose is to give a definition of shoplifting, let us let the bill give that definition and don't try under the pretense of merely defining shoplifting to bring about what I view as a drastic and radical change in the handling of evidence and the means required by the state to obtain a conviction. So I am asking that you adopt my amendment which would only strike subsection (2), the portion that I read for you and so that it is crystal clear, it is about two-thirds of the way down the page and it would be lines 24 through 27, then it resumes the count from 1 through 11 and I think that will make it clear exactly what I am talking about.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator DeCamp, your light was on. Do you wish to speak?

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would respectfully oppose the amendment but let me say I do understand Senator Chambers' concerns so I would like to try to give you a little background as to the issue and the reasons for the photographic evidence or the arguments. You be your own judge as to what you do, of course, but I think there are some sound arguments for this method. I passed out a sheet and you can see shoplifting in the State of Nebraska has never been defined as a crime incredible as that sounds. We don't have a crime of shoplifting as such. It is a very specific thing, it's a very ... a thing we're all familiar with but incredible as it sounds, as I say, we've never actually said these things constitute shoplifting, blah, blah. So the first half of the bill, particularly as we've worked with the committee and they have gone along with doing it, is to really clearly define what constitutes shoplifting and Senator Chambers, of course has left that intact. Now the second part has