

AFIS was \$65,000 in planning money only for one year, and the worker's comp is actually a catching up of some equipments made in past years. And so obviously I think, to date at least, the body has treated the state auditor fairly. And so my first true argument is strictly on a financial side. One, is that the committee has, dollarwise, treated the state auditor better than the Governor. Secondly is the precedent concern that if you fund this particular request, there are others that will be in line to also have their computer requests funded. Now moving off the financial aspect, and moving onto the policy question, one of the larger concerns of the Appropriations Committee, at least, was when..and I have shared this with State Auditor Breslow, even though I certainly like the way he has come into the office with, shall we say, a zest for doing his job, and I appreciate that. And in many ways the computer issue is something that I'm not going to argue does not make some sense. But probably my bigger concern over the financial, me personally now, was that when the state auditor came into our Appropriations Committee his request was for these computers, not for better efficiency for his office, not to try and create a better bid for his county audits, which there is some concern whether or not he is going to keep them, but the reason the state auditor came in and requested these computers was...I'll read the quote, "I wish to maximize the efficiency that automation provides and convert freed staff into performance auditors and fraud investigators. In addition, automation will reduce the cost to counties and state agencies for audit performance." But we probably spent two hours in that hearing, and the total thrust of the hearing was, give me the money for computers so I can do performance audits. And I think the whole body will know that Senator Schimek had introduced a bill...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR MOORE: ...that dealt with performance audits, that was on consent calendar, but did not advance to date. I guess my concern is that I think we have the cart before the horse. I guess...I'm not going to argue that...some of the necessity for Mr. Breslow's computers, but I would argue that by giving this money, you're de facto giving him some encouragement to do performance audits, which he does not, at least in my opinion, have the statutory authority to do. And maybe the most prudent thing, if you really want to put this money in for computerization, you ought to come in, in the out year, and back down his staffing so he does not use that for his intended