

example, Wisconsin pays...charges \$4.25 for their fees. Iowa pays \$3.00. What we are asking for here is \$2.85 to do that. Senator Beutler, and I don't see you at the moment, but I will speak, and I am sure that you will either read the transcript or hear this. Maybe the appropriate way is to work through a Supreme Court rule and to try and devise a system that is flexible enough to meet the needs of the courts out there but still protect the taxpayer, if you believe that there is people who are getting paid for not having a full day's work for a full day's pay. I would urge you that that is not necessarily the case. The court reporters I know work very long hours, travel, and then come home to do the appeal work, and that is also what slows up appeals is trying to get this done. And if they have better equipment, it speeds up the system of justice and, thus, they can pay for new word processors that may make them more efficient. I would be happy to answer any other questions at this time.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Madam President, and members of the body, I think this debate has focused not on what the real issue is and that is the cost of the...the increased cost sought for the bills of transcript, or bills of exception and transcripts. The issue, rather, is focused on a completely separate issue and that is the issue of free lance court reporting. I would suggest to you that I think that is a red herring that is being drawn to take the focus away from that, that the free lancing bill has come up before the Legislature. We heard it in Judiciary Committee I think both of the last two years, and it is a separate issue, and it is an issue that should be heard on its own merits. Frankly, I am not sure that even if it did get to the floor here whether we could do anything about it. We have a separation of powers problem. Those court reporters are employees of the courts. The courts are entitled to say what they can and can't do. If we step in there and say, you can't do this, the Supreme Court, I believe, could still come in and say, you are not going to tell us what the courts have to do. I think the courts could still say, we will allow free lancing, regardless of what we say, or we can say we will allow free lancing, and the courts say, uh-uh, they are our employees, they are going to do what we want them to do. So I think when you get into the free lance question, I am not sure it is something that we ought to be deciding in the first place. Number two, I