

of those people to serve. Obviously, the way I've presented it is that there shall be six members appointed by the Legislature, only three of those could be current members. By constitution you can't pay them any more than what they're already receiving. If they were getting their usual senatorial compensation, the other members of the commission, I'd just put them on a level playing field so they'd get paid roughly the same. The committee saw fit to strike that, thinking that that's public service, or at least that's my assumption. I have no problem with that. I still think you can probably attract quality people, the Legislature is a good example of that, that even for small amounts of pay they're still able to attract people that are willing to serve and donate their time and participate in the process. So, with that, I would support the committee amendments with the understandings that I've reached with Senator Bernard-Stevens and Senator Robinson.

**SPEAKER WITHEM:** Thank you, Senator Kristensen. On the committee amendments, Senator Hall.

**SENATOR HALL:** Thank you, Mr. President and members. I rise to ask a couple questions, if I could, of Senator Robinson. And, Senator Robinson, it deals with the issue that Senator Kristensen just raised regarding the committee amendment where you strike...portion of the committee amendments where you strike the authorization for employing the necessary personnel. Now I understand the issue of wanting to do it through the A bill process, that's okay. That's a clean, appropriate way to handle that. But if we don't allow for the authorization to employ those individuals, is it your intent that we basically use folks who currently are on staff, or is...I mean, because my thought is if we don't have the authorization spelled out in the bill, it probably will not be reflected in an A bill. And I mean correct me if I'm wrong, but unless you tell us, I mean unless the bill says this is what we're going to do, we're going to...granted, you know, the other expenses would probably be fairly nebulous in terms of the amount that they're going to run. But it says, you know, items as necessary to carry out their function. That's fine, and that could probably be showing up in the A bill. But unless there is specific authorization to employ the people that are going to do this work, I don't know of anybody who's understaffed enough or underworked enough, rather, that could just take on the magnitude of this kind of workload. And my thought is that at a minimum you've got to retain the authorization language in the bill to allow for the