

and, in effect, you'll get money that nobody else would ever get, because it's going to take away from hiring staff people, and that's my frustration. And, Senator Lindsay, you're too good a friend, you know that I'm not doing this as an individual but what I want to do is try to stop the wagon here, before it goes too much further, and set the record straight. I know that you may have a fear that this commission may come in and tell poor Tom Riley how to run his business and that's just not true. Tom Riley is a good lawyer and you're not going to be able to go in and tell him how to run his business. If he wants assistance or his county has some need in a conflict, this is a gift horse, he can come down here and not cost his county any money and maybe, if they qualify, they will get some assistance to handle that conflict (interruption)...

SENATOR CROSBY: One minute.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: ...that they're paying \$800,000 for right now. That's a great benefit to Omaha. If I was from Omaha, I wouldn't want to opt out of this thing, this helps my county out. And if I was a smaller county, I wouldn't want to opt out. What a great opportunity for an insurance policy. It's not a panacea, it doesn't solve it all. Now Senator Chambers has got another issue here and I'm glad that people are starting to listen to it a little bit because you're talking about the politics of the death penalty, to a certain extent, and how this plays. What this is, though, is a mechanism for the state to give some assistance in the form of staff attorneys to assist them in the defense of indigent people. This is not a fund of money that's going to be distributed to the counties in the form of cash and those things. We took that out. That went out in my amendment and to that extent it isn't prudent to put it back in. And so...

SENATOR CROSBY: Time. Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Senator Chambers, on the Beutler amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President and members of the Legislature, once again, I support Senator Beutler's amendment. And I'm not just supporting his amendment so that I can quickly launch into what I feel the necessity to talk about, but his amendments have validity and, at this point, the bill already is much better than it was when it was first brought before us, because I think, practically speaking, it was unworkable then and impractical. It might have been a symbolic move but it