

CLERK: Mr. President, Senators Haberman and Warner would move to amend the bill. (Amendment found on page 367 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Warner, please.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, the amendment has been passed out. As the bill was reported yesterday, didn't really have...which is no problem, but was not a lot of lead time. The amendment does two things. First, as has been pointed out, it changes the method of selection of a committee and its chairman which, you know, whatever the Legislature wishes to do is fine, but it seems to me traditionally when these kind of changes have been made, the effective late for that change has been at the completion of the term for which the individual or individuals serving that committee have been selected. And, obviously, since the existing Retirement Committee has been selected as provided by law, it seems to me it is appropriate that any change, rather than being made during the interim, that is, the current chairman, by law, would be wiped out 90 days after the session. It seems to me it would make sense that that change should occur at the beginning of a session and in this case it would need to be the 1991 session of the Legislature. A precedent for that, I can only think of two, where it was not done and I can recall two committees that legislation was introduced after an individual was selected, but in both cases, to serve as chairman, but in both cases it was done with the people knowing that that committee was to be abolished and was in concurrence with it and, in essence, they served in that position only to fill it, knowing it was going soon to be abolished. So I think that part of the amendment is an appropriate change to take place. The second one is probably more difficult to...for me to argue since the position I currently have the privilege of holding is involved, but I do believe in the retirement system that it is desirable irregardless of who the individual might be, that the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee is there, and the reason is twofold. One, you could argue the same for any committee and that is that if there is an impact on financing, why, somehow or other, it affects appropriations somewhere in the future, and that would not be a very strong argument as I indicated, you could make that of every committee. Wouldn't be an argument at all, as a matter of fact. But this one is different in two respects. Almost inevitably, the real impact from retirement programs are somewhere down the line and