

they shall do, and what their qualifications shall be.

As you know, under the present law, we have an executive audit which is under the executive department but under the supervision and direction of the state comptroller. This is the current type of audit that you know of, similar to what takes place when the C.P.A. or the accountants come in and check the records and cast accounts and try to make sure everything is running in proper order.

What we are talking about in this proposal is an audit which would occur after the project or the item in question is concluded. What we are speaking of in this audit is this. It ought not to be under the executive department because one does not audit oneself. This is a type of audit by the other branch of government which might exercise this function, namely, the legislative branch.

This is done in many other states. Its purpose, however, we believe, in our Committee, should be much more than merely casting accounts after the project item or event has been concluded. We believe it should go in depth into a determination of performance as well as financial review. Performance would mean whether the money was spent for what it was appropriated? Was the amount spent on what they say they paid for? Or on items perhaps that are totally different. Was a swimming pool built instead of an addition to a school? This is something like or akin to what takes place when the General Accounting Office in Washington moves into a department and begins its examination to find out whether or not the expenditures have really been what the records say they are. This is a proper function of the legislative department.

The first question that arises is this. If it is a proper function of the General Assembly, why do we have to put this into the constitution? The constitution, of course, is not only a matter of restrictions, it is a document dealing with mandates, that which you must do. We believe that this is an item which should be mandated in the constitution to require the General Assembly to act. True, they could act without any prodding from the Constitutional Convention. The sole purpose of this short, succinct article is to make it clear that they are required to act.

It just so happens that the present General Assembly has been making a study of this very same subject, and has been mak-

ing it since before this Convention convened. It is a study in depth dealing not only with the subject of state audit but dealing also with the manner and method by which the General Assembly shall examine state budgets and state finances, and whether or not the State Fiscal Research Bureau should be changed, not only as to title, but as to what it in turn should do.

The Legislative Council has met. It has come up with a proposed act which it has already approved favorably.

But we believed in our Committee that we still should have this in the constitution because those of you who are of a practical nature, as I am sure all of you are, know that sometimes some things that the Legislative Council recommends do not always go through the General Assembly. We believe that while we applaud the fact that the Legislative Council is moving forward, nevertheless without regard to that situation, we should include in the constitution this requirement.

The problem then arose as to what detail should be involved. We felt that all that we need to say is that the General Assembly shall provide by law for post-audit of state finances by persons under its control.

At that point I am very pleased to say that others in the Convention, having examined this language, felt that while they did not differ with the object, they thought that there could be some changes which might be useful and practical and avoid an attempt to rewrite portions of the proposal here on the floor.

We received a call from Delegate Gallagher, Chairman of the Committee on the Legislative Branch, who pointed this out. Without going into the details of the differences, he appointed a subcommittee of five under Delegate Hanson, and I appointed a subcommittee of five under Delegate Case. The group met and all of the word surgery was performed across the table without taking up the time of this assemblage. It is for this reason that you will have before you in a moment or two, not SF-1 on the blue paper, but the amendment which is on the white paper, and the last four lines are what will be before you. They read, "The General Assembly shall provide by law for post-audit of state finances by an agency of the General Assembly directed by a person appointed by it and under its control."

You may feel that there is not any great difference in the language. As to the sub-