

April 4, 1975

PRESIDENT: The chair recognizes Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, Vince, have you given the page?

CLERK: 1120.

SENATOR WARNER: What this amendment does, it would make it possible that the Legislature in odd-numbered years would adopt a bi-annual budget, a two year budget. Then in the even-numbered years, the short session, the 60 day session, the appropriation, of course, could be reviewed. The amendment would also permit looking ahead two years in the even-numbered sessions and at least on a limited basis, it was permissive, if the body so chose to do. I offer the amendment for two or three reasons. One, one of the ways the Legislature adopts or implements policy is through appropriation. Essentially when you have a 12 month budget, essentially you have a 12 month policy which seems to me is too short. It would be desirable to have it longer. Secondly, of course, in the 60 day session there is hardly adequate time to thoroughly review the entire budget compared at least to the time permitted in a 90 day session. It seems to me that this could relieve much of the work load in that short period of time and making it more productive. The legislature still could review. Then the final thing that the amendment does, which I think is also important, it eliminates the argument about what is an express obligation when the Board of Equalization meets and the appropriation that would be set for the second year would be firm and would be identified as express obligations so that the Board of Equalization could take that into account when setting the rates for sales and income tax. Briefly, this is what the amendment does. It, obviously, would not be implemented until the 1977 session. It would not be implemented this session. It could, on a limited basis, be implemented in 1976. It seems to me, many agencies now are almost in a continuous budget making process. They are defending one budget request, trying to carry out the current appropriation and then developing a future budget and it seems to me a great deal of time is used in this continuous budget process which an every two year major review would eliminate much of that time that is now spent.

PRESIDENT: Senator Syas.

SENATOR SYAS: I think...I don't know if I got him right or not, Senator Warner, but he is trying to change this bill back to making bi-annual budgets, is that what he is trying to do?

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I assume that was a question, Senator Syas. It would permit bi-annual budget but annual review.

SENATOR SYAS: Well, I would like to put this two-bits worth in. I don't know. Maybe that is all it is but anyhow, I wonder if we can actually do this since we are now on annual session without a constitutional amendment. I was just wondering. You see here we are in a position of