

reducing the number of errors made on appeal which ultimately keeps the cost down, but it also has to deal with adding that quality of defense for an individual. I would also be very willing to examine the issue and I think Senator Beutler and I began to have this discussion that what...

SENATOR CROSBY: Time. I'm sorry, you really only had a minute and a half. Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Senator Abboud, on the Beutler amendment.

SENATOR ABOUD: Madam President, colleagues, I'm going to talk about the amendment. The discussion is about which counties will probably be opting out and which ones will probably move into the system. And I think my county, from what I understand at this time, will probably be not a part of this particular system. They will be choosing to maintain their own system of public defense which I might add is very good. And they would not be a part of this particular proposal so it would be, I guess, and, apparently, from my understanding, this has been made clear for quite some time, not that it probably makes any difference to the sponsor of the bill but it is a concern, that when you have a county that adequately funds and maintains their system of public defense that...over the years and they've done an outstanding job as it consistently has gotten better and better, keeping...maintaining quality attorneys and their staffing, providing good care, good representation to indigent criminal defendants, that they will not be a part of this system. Now, in my own mind, I'm trying to figure out exactly how this is going to work because I don't see how...this just looks similar to a lot of state bureaucracies that are created and continue to grow and grow and grow. And I can't see anything but growth on this particular proposal. We had a similar measure...we had a study on this particular proposal in the Judiciary Committee, interim study. We took a great deal of testimony on it and I...the committee assumed, at least I did, and I believe the Chairman did as well, that we would be hearing the bill in committee. And I suppose Revenue is probably a better place for it, at least that was the decision of the...somebody, I guess, on the Reference Committee. I don't see how it qualifies for it. It's just like we probably should have dealt with expansion of the tax base in Judiciary Committee. I'm sure it would have got a fair and adequate hearing, at least on my belief on expanding the base on taxes. But if...I think if it had gone through the proper process, we probably would have had a bill here that might have had...been a