

January 15, 1974

about a week ago about this very matter and he was discussing the possibility and it's someone who hasn't talked yet on the floor, but we were discussing the possibility whether this function of auditing should be a part of our fiscal staff's responsibility. Certainly no reflection on our fiscal staff, I think they're doing a tremendous job. But, I said in my estimation, it should not be a part of the fiscal staff because they come to the Budget Committee in the Legislature and ask them to make recommendations for programs and amounts of money. I think when you start doing your auditing of performance, if, in fact, some of the staff might have had some misjudgment, there is always the possibility that they would try to vindicate themselves. Where if it were completely separate, I would buy the Legislature perhaps having it. If it were completely separate and a different group who have more or less tunnel vision and didn't do anything more than say this money was spent exactly or it was not spent exactly the way the intent of your budget called for. I feel if you give it to the fiscal staff, it would be a mistake. I see nothing wrong with giving it to the Legislature if it's a separate function from the fiscal staff.

SENATOR MAHONEY: Well, there's money in this particular bill, Senator Stahmer, that if this is the way the Legislature so deems it and so desires it, if the fiscal staff as you say has all of this work and all the troubles and you need someone to give it that tunnel vision, it can have the tunnel vision and we can set it up because the funds are in that bill to do so. All you're doing here is giving a Republican auditor some additional tools to use in a political warfare.

PRESIDENT: The chair recognizes Senator Stull. Then Anderson.

SENATOR STULL: Mr. President and members of the Legislature. Senator Marvel mentioned that this suggestion came about in a sub-committee of appropriations committee a couple of years back. I happened to serve on that sub-committee and I have just a little bit of pride in what we recommended. I think we should not bring this bill back. What does it do? It creates an audit review board made up of the chairmen of the standing committees. When they decide that they want to have a performance audit, why, they tell the auditor where to make the performance audit. I think we passed this bill, I think most of us knew what was in it and this bill should not be returned. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Anderson.

SENATOR ANDERSON: Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I think all of us who are asking questions about this bill should recognize that we share some of the responsibility of not asking these questions prior to now. But, the chance still exists so making a change if it's determined that the Legislature is giving up a responsibility that rightfully should be its. When this discussion first came up, I asked for a copy of the Legislative Resolution '74 report in attempting to answer some questions in my own mind about whether this study that Senator Stull has referred to, I think Senator Luedtke referred to it, whether this study was actually attempting to make a determination as to which alternative was proper. Whether utilization of the auditor, public accounts office was proper, or whether leaving this function in the Legislature was proper. In looking through the report, I have some difficulty satisfying myself that the alternative of placing that responsibility in the Legislature's hands was completely asked. In the report, for example, it says the basic concerns outlined in the resolution were the following and question number one. How could the efforts of the office of the State Auditor of Public Accounts better be used by the Legislature. I'm wondering if that wasn't a starting point that may have locked in the output of that committee. I feel in my own mind that we should continue to ask these questions and at least take this opportunity to see whether this is the right way to go or not.