

suggest this. Also the amendment to the amendment goes on to say also to strike "committee" and insert "committees" to make it perfectly clear. Believe me, when we recommended this in the Rules Committee it was not intended to interfere with any kind of a process that was indeed important to this body. Hopefully, those of you who are on committees that spend money, can you show me, can I see the hands of any people who serve on committees that don't spend money, recommend the spending of money? You know, based on that argument, some are more important than others because some may spend more money. In this particular committee, on Retirement, for example, as I understand the committee, the retirement fund now is almost a billion dollars. That is a lot of money, but necessarily the money spent or recommended to be spent by every other committee is also important even though it may be a smaller amount. So I guess you could assume that, based on that, the more input, someone who deals with the budget in total in this body should be involved as an ex officio member of every committee. I only say that because I also understand that, for example, the ex officio membership provides generally that they are there to listen and recommend. Generally, ex officio members never vote. I'm not sure how traditionally it got started or if it even happens, to be completely frank, and some of the ex officio memberships on committees that may exist on the floor, but technically, ex officio members is an honorary thing provided for people who in a very important way should be in on and understand what happens on a day-to-day basis, on a regular basis within those committees. But, generally, they don't vote, and when they do vote it is specified why and when they should be voting. So in this case I don't oppose the recommendation and the amendment as originally proposed that has to do with the effective date, and, if, in fact, you would agree with me that it's important to have oversight and chairman of committees that not only wind up recommending what we spend, but also we're involved with the spending process and I would hope you would agree with me also, then in that case, we should have not only the chairman of the Appropriations Committee as ex officio on this committee, but also the chairman of the Revenue Committee as well. That seems to make sense to me. It is very even-handed. If, in fact, you think you got to have ex officio members some place, okay, but put the people on as ex officio members that really should be on then, too, and include everybody that is involved with not only raising money, but spending it as well. So I would respectfully suggest that you support my amendment to the amendment. I think it is good