

January 9, 1989

just a few of them with you. Other states have centralized this work, they have found that it works very well. Similar information could be gathered on all appointees, for example, their financial reports, their background information, their qualifications, plus any other information requested by the individual committee chairs. It could be all done in one fell swoop. This could reduce a duplication of work which is now, we found, to be the case in some committees. There are currently three to four different offices collecting the same information, Political Accountability Disclosure, the Governor's Office, committees staff persons, state agencies. This change will also simplify the process for offices that provide the Legislature with information, for example, the Governor's Office, Political Accountability. They would now be able to funnel all information to one office instead of searching out which committee that information should go to, where it should be referenced to, and so forth. There is no question it would help reduce committee staff work as well. That is the first change. The next one, small Roman numeral (iv), is a requirement for a hearing in each case and required appearances by appointees, unless, and I underline the word "unless", it is waived for a good cause by a committee vote. It also requires a committee report. This simply puts in the rules what most often occurs now in this body, that an appointee appear, but it is up to the individual committee as to what course it takes. By putting this rule into operation, I think it will add some structure and, certainly, some certainty to the process. This change also emphasizes the Legislature's role I believe in the confirmation process by requiring hearings, by requiring appearances, but it does retain that committee flexibility. The committee has the last word. The next one, small Roman numeral (v), says that the Clerk shall defer acknowledgement of receipt of appointment letters received during the last eight days of a regular session, that is to defer them until the next regular session or until a special session, should one be called. Committees are often too busy in the last few days of a session to pay much attention to the appointments which are being made. This will avoid a rush and a lack of thoroughness, I believe, or it will avoid the Legislature not acting on the appointments at all, which has been the case as I mentioned earlier. Then we add some new language to proposed Rule 3, Section 13 to require seven calendar days notice of the committee hearing on the appointment, and that is the same, as you know, as is required for a bill. I think this will enhance the perception of the seriousness of our role in the confirmation process. I think it