

time, and a lot of energy into this, so at least we should pay their gas. Thank you.

SENATOR COORDSEN PRESIDING

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Witek.

SENATOR WITEK: Thank you very much. I would also.... Senator Chambers has his point of view on the Constitutional Revision Committee, and I understand that. And I even understand when people say how they understand how insulting that is, because I've gone through this whole process on this Constitutional Revision Committee suggestion. And in committee, and Senator Bernard-Stevens would remember, we discussed this in committee as to whether this group should get any money at all because they had originally asked for quite a bit of money, and they had originally wanted staff support and all this other stuff that they had included in the original bill that Senator Kristensen had included in the original bill. And we cut and took away a lot of that in the committee and said, you know, half of us didn't think that it really needed to be done, and the ones that did think it needed to be done said that they'd like to do it...not spend a lot of money to do it. There was some talk of how much money they would need and how long they would be operating. The \$12,000 that was appropriated at that time was supposed to be, from what I remember, like the entire appropriation for the whole process of the time that they were going to be working. And there was no mention, that I can remember, at that time of additional monies needed, until this showed up on the appropriations bill, that they were going to have any need for any additional money. This was the first chance that I've seen that anybody has mentioned that they wanted more money than the original 12,000 appropriated. So it's been a process all along that they have changed and said, we want so many members on the committee, and then changed and said, well, maybe we should have a couple more members on the committee, and we want so much money, and now they come back and say, well, we need 14,000 now. First it was 12,000 the first year, now we need 14,500. It's money that is not...and I have never voted for it, but I have never felt that it's, first of all, even an appropriate expense of tax dollars. Second of all, I think if you went to every taxpayer in this state and you got any kind of an opinion from them on whether they thought should we go out and spend \$14,500 on a Constitutional Revision