

one of sort of the frustrating things that occur for me, this whole discussion that we've had over the last few months on higher ed, at least since the consultants made their recommendations is that very frequently there is criticism made of the proposal as to some aspect of it, and then a few days later the same individual or same group will come down with another objection, which is, for all practical purposes, contradictory to the first objection that they had. And I can appreciate if you're opposed to doing anything, if you're opposed to any change whatsoever to a more effective, efficient system of higher education, that then one would obviously be opposed to whatever is being suggested as an alternative. But when we get down to the issue of elected versus appointed, which is obviously one which everyone understands, it seems to me that the suggestion that is recommended here, as the bill was proposed, is really the best of all worlds, the best of either argument being included into the one area. The number...you know we have 11 regents now. We talk about 8 but there is actually 11, 3 nonvoting. So, numberwise, that's...if that's an issue, it is not particularly different. It's true that the polls show a high percentage, as we would expect to be the case, a high percentage of citizens who said that they would prefer to vote. I do wish that those polls would have asked that same individual who their current regent was from their district. It would have been interesting to see if there would have been the same high level of correlation with their desire to vote and their knowledge immediately as to who their regent was, and perhaps there would have been, I do not know, but it would have been interesting to have seen. What we have here, as has been pointed out time and time again, is combining two boards, in a sense, one elected and one appointed. But what is more important is that we are establishing two different boards or group of boards, in one case, each with a different purpose. Coordination, as will be the responsibility of the Board of Regents, is one that supersedes over all seven institutions, as it should and must if you're going to have effective coordination. The combination of those being elected, I would have preferred, personally, that they would not be separate districts. The committee amendment, however, makes separate districts. But a portion of those, a majority of those being elected and five appointed to me has several advantages. One, of course, the obvious is that the majority still is in the hands of the citizens through the election process. But then those appointed benefits, which have already been mentioned, and a great many people who have no likelihood of ever being able to