

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

January 9, 2004

committee to hold hearings or to process bills. Because of the nature of the Performance Audit Committee, we deal in all subject matter areas, and what happens, and it's entirely appropriate and I don't think we'd ever want to change this, when we file a bill, it goes to the appropriate subject matter committee for hearing and for review and, if appropriate, for advancement to the floor of the Legislature. That is not changing at all by virtue of giving us the ability to identify two bills as priority bills. I would also indicate to you that this is not a new idea for special committees. This Performance Audit Committee is a special committee. There are only about four of them in the Legislature. The only other one that deals with substantive matters is the Executive Board of the Legislature itself, and that special committee has the ability to introduce priority bills. That special committee also has the ability, as you know, to process certain types of narrowly defined legislation. But again, we're not asking for that. I just wanted to point that out so that you knew that this wasn't an absolutely new precedent for special committees. And I might also point out to you that, like the Executive Board, and I think this is a somewhat important analogy, there are certain people who are on the committee by virtue of their positions in the Legislature. You know that's true of the Executive Board. What is also true of the Performance Audit Committee is that the Chair of the Appropriations Committee, the Chair of the Executive Board, and the Speaker of the Legislature are on the Performance Review Committee and will always be on the Performance Review Committee, so that any decision to move forward with a performance audit or to prioritize a performance audit includes those individuals in the decision making. So I think that is an important thing. And I would also point out a language difference to you. Whereas under most...under the rule that pertains to the standing committees, it's the right of the Chair of the committee to identify priority bills. And some committee Chairs share that right with the committee and others do not, and from time to time that changes, even on the same committee, as the Chairs change. But in this instance, what we're asking from you is not to give the Chair the power, but to give the committee the power by majority vote to identify two priority bills, thus making it an even more controlled right than pertains to the standing committee or to the other special