

have two kinds of choices that probably can be made as I have been listening to the discussion and one is that each of us...and, collectively, I suspect there is no aspect of higher education that we would not like to see some specifics about changing it in some fashion or at least be considered. And I also suspect that the broader you make the study, as desirable as that would be, then the likelihood of implementation probably is directly proportioned to...less likely to succeed the broader it gets. I think you need some specifics in a study which gives some direction. I would quite agree that the issue of a community college is on tax bases and there is no question but what that is a creeping problem that is going to have to be addressed in the next year or two. The thing that really concerns me about delaying that portion that might be affected by the constitutional amendment, that based upon the amendment as it is proposed now, the study is not completed till '91, that means that, in fact, if there is a constitutional amendment that would be proposed, it would not be till 1992 election and, obviously, there would not be a special election. An implementation would be sometime after 1992 and, in all likelihood, much of it would not be until 1994 for the simple reason that some changes are not convenient or even feasible to do in the middle of a budget cycle. So many of the problems that people are looking at and what immediate solutions, in fact, we're not going to have six years to wait on the financing of community colleges, or at least in some areas, that's going to have to be addressed in at least the next two years if not...almost if not sooner because of some of the inability for them to fund their own programs with their tax bases that they have. I think it is much more desirable to do the study in two phases as it is proposed and, incidentally, Senator Scofield made the comment that we have a fairly decent role and mission statute now which I wholeheartedly agree but I frequently hear it as described elsewhere but, nevertheless, I think that was fairly decent. But when that was done 10 years ago it also recognized that change had to be considered and that statute required the same thing to be done every five years and, in fact, it hasn't really been done in 10 years so that a change even as sound as it might be at the time it was done I think is appropriate to consider and appropriately to address. But I would strongly feel that we should not delay the constitutional proposals, if any, until 1992 to be addressed because some of these problems, I'm afraid, just are not going to likely want to wait that long. The Legislature is not going to want to wait that long. While I'm speaking, I should indicate, as you know,