

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

January 10, 2000

Agriculture and Natural Resources Committees to the Agriculture, Environment and Natural Resources Committee, and the number of members. (Legislative Journal page 190.) Is there discussion? Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: May I have a word with the Clerk first, because there may be a procedural matter here? Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I will state what this amendment does and at some point it will be printed, but let me talk about the process here. The way this proposed rule change dealing with Rule 3, Section 3 operates is that we divided it into two parts. One dealt with changing the name of the Transportation Committee. The second division dealt with everything else. So that means any amendment to any committee or anything herein, numbers of members, whatever, can be made at this time. So here is the amendment that I'm proposing now. We will strike "Appropriations" and "nine members". We strike that. We strike "Revenue" and "nine members". Those two committees will be stricken, and we will insert "Appropriations and Revenue 15 members". We create one committee out of two, and we keep that sacred divisible by three number, which in this case is 15. Why would I want to combine these two committees when one raises revenue and the other appropriates, or spends it, to use the vernacular? What better way is there to create responsibility than to have those who want to spend money have to make the decisions necessary to raise money? That might put a brake on some of this spending that everybody says is running away. But if you separate those two functions--one raises, the other spends--there is a disjoining that occurs. I believe that it makes more sense, maybe dollars and cents, if you allow me, to have the Revenue Committee and the Appropriations Committee joined into one than to attempt to join the Agriculture Committee and the Natural Resources Committee. There is not really a dichotomy between raising revenue and spending it. It's like a continuum. You must have one before you can have the other. The money must be there before you spend it. So, when the Appropriations Committee has all of these various boards, commissions and agencies come before them begging money, they do not have as strong an argument for denying that money as they will have if this act of matrimony, legislative matrimony that I'm attempting to effectuate, were to succeed. The Appropriations Committee could then ask, well, what suggestion