

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Kristensen, you would have the opportunity to either take up the bill or lay it over.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Let's take it up.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Lindsay, on your motion.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. This, I had no idea and still don't, I guess, how many amendments would be filed afterwards on this. But again, unfortunately, all the debate took place at committee amendment level rather than at the general debate level, because I was hoping to get some kind of idea where the body stands on the bill. As it is, the bill, I think, is in the shape that Senator Kristensen wants it. And so now I think we can get a test of, before further amending or whatever, that we can get a test of where we stand on the bill. The way the bill stands now, and my primary concern on this is not, I guess, which committee it went to because I don't care about that. My concern is simply the fact that we are creating a commission that is going to hire some lawyers. And those lawyers are going to, between the commission and those lawyers, are going to utilize, this year, \$500,000, and what will they accomplish? How much, in a system that is generally accepted that it spends between 9 and 11 million dollars on indigent defense, how much is really going to make it back to your counties in the form of property tax relief? It isn't going to happen. My fear, and as I've mentioned on the debate on the committee amendments, my fear is just the opposite, that it's going to, especially with the defeat of the amendment which said the committee is not empowered, the commission is not empowered to set standards, I may be dead wrong, and Senator Kristensen has told me I am dead wrong, and maybe I am wrong. But, in the future, you will see if, with or without legislative approval, I think, a start down the road towards setting those standards. If we look at the task force on indigent defense, the report on that, everything that is in this bill has come out of that report, that is the direction we're going. And if we're comfortable doing that, if we're comfortable at least using Douglas County's example, doubling the money we're spending on indigent defense, that's fine. My concern is I very strongly support indigent defense, but I support a strong, effective indigent defense system. I don't see a reason to bring down some systems that are working in order to create a system that doesn't work. And that is, I think, what we are creating is another system. You've heard in the debate as we've gone