

least. It is incapable of doing the job that needs to be done in reviewing the constitution in all of its aspects and applications. If they're doing the best that they can, but they have 20-60 vision, and what needs to be seen requires somebody with 20-20 vision, they're not going to see it. If there is a tone that has to be detected by the ear, and they are deaf to that tone, they can put their hands behind their ear all they want to, and they still will not hear it. They just don't have the means to pick up on all of these signals that have to be received in order to do the job that should be done if the job intended to be done is a review of the constitution. But if only certain aspects are to be viewed, and only certain points of view are to be presented, then I can understand the makeup of it. Didn't occur to anybody to sit down and compare notes and see what the makeup of this commission is. I'm sure that if a baseball had its choice, Senator Hillman, it would not choose to be pitched and struck with a bat. I'm sure that if the nail had a choice, it would have chosen to be a hammer. And as Rommel said, I'd rather be the hammer than the anvil, that's why he was a man of quick action. But we don't often have the opportunity to make a choice that would change our destiny. As a Legislature we are always free and always have an obligation to do that which is right. Judging by the attitude of the members of this Legislature when we're trying to appropriate money for other things, it would be wrong to appropriate this money.

SENATOR CROSBY: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And when we won't even consider raising the minimum wage, it's wrong to appropriate this money. How are they going to justify it? Everybody nods and winks at everybody else, except me, and agree that we'll go ahead and do this, and maybe it will go away. But if you appropriate this money, it's not going to go away, as far as I'm concerned.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yes, Madam President, I'll be very brief. I just want to rise briefly and defend the 14,500 in there, it's mostly because it's an issue that's been approved by the Legislature. The funds are legitimately to be spent, that's my perspective on this. If we're going to have this, then it ought to be funded, 14,500 represents a reasonable cost expenditure for this particular body. And I think it ought to be retained.