

January 18, 1979

people for the most part that are knowledgeable in the area in which they function, and I believe that it is appropriate that that committee look at that director, or whatever he may be, of an agency or department to answer those questions that they are going to have to be answered during the process of their committee operation. I support this, and if there are other areas that we can add to to make it a better workable solution, I'm willing to sit and listen. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I agree with the proposed change also. In a lot of instances people do wind up on individual standing committees who don't have any particular knowledge or ability related to the subjects which come before that committee, but after being on it for a period of time things begin to filter into your mind even if by process of osmosis. I think that there will be people on every committee who have an understanding of the subjects that come before that committee and could better interrogate and that's what I think should happen...interrogate people who are to be appointed to high positions in state government. Having been on the Committee on Committees myself I was often considered by some, I think, a disruptive influence because I asked so many questions, and I would interrogate. I would grill. I would challenge. These were people being placed in positions a lot of times to control the destiny of large numbers of others. They would be given power in some instances to promulgate rules and regulations, or at least to initiate them. So when the Committee on Committees is merely a friendly little club where these appointees come in and everybody greets them and say hi, how are you doing, it sure is nice to see you, and I want to let you know that I'm for you, well there is no point in even having a Committee on Committees at all. These people should come before the standing committees and Senator Kelly that responsibility should be parceled out, and each committee can more carefully and thoroughly examine the attributes of each individual appointee. I don't see any reason that a Governor would be afraid to have appointees come before standing committees who deal with the subject matter to be presided over by his or her appointee. I understand Congress does this. If somebody is going to be recommended for a Supreme Court Judgeship, he or she would go before the Judiciary Committee. That's as it should be here also. The mere fact that something has persisted for a long time is not in and of itself an argument for its continued existence in that form. A lot of times that's a tribute to inertia and mindless acceptance of things the way they are.