

days to his office at the university to try to catch him, just to ask some questions. I had no...no axe to grind, and I couldn't get ahold of him so I had Laurie, God bless her, who never caused anybody any harm at all, try to make a call and she called. Finally got ahold of him at his office and he told her it was none of her damn business what they do over there. How about that? Isn't that interesting? They don't have to be accountable. To a Legislature? Oh, my gracious. Well, to be completely frank, they discovered, they researched and they patented that product on our time. They don't have...the state has no...no rights to any, apparently, none of the money that could be developed as a result of that product being developed with us. They say they have a policy, but I don't know what it is for sure. I've gotten a large document about what they are and I see all the names of the professors who have rights to all of these patents, but I don't know where the taxpayers come in and how much money they receive. I think we ought to know those things. I think we ought to have a right to know those things. How do we do that? And when we brought this up where we're going to be worried about rather than spending \$50 on a Senator some day to do whatever they do and we're going to lower that to 25 because that's going to make that person, obviously, ethical then shouldn't we be worrying about somebody that's making three figures after founding a company that got a patent done on state taxpayers' time and making a fortune on it? I think we ought to know. Do you think we ought to know, for example, who and what staff we have in the state who maybe have spouses who work with software companies that have contracts with the state, put it...put together those software programs? You know how many millions of dollars we spend with consultants on software every year? Don't you think we should know what the association is with those companies and staff that we might have in the state, in the agencies of the state? These are all public bucks. Why put it off? I wanted to quickly explain to answer a staff question in particular that we used the word "staff". We probably could have done it better.

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR LYNCH: But "staff" only applies to that staff that fall under the category of officials and officials is clearly defined in the amendment so that would, in fact, automatically preclude all of those staff people we are concerned with having to be accountable. But it would include all the administrators and staff who have a stake in the possibility of conflicts of