

McFarland's amendment to make them all appointed, but never did get right down on a justification for why the regents are to be selected as they are in this bill and I think Senator Schimek's amendment gives us an opportunity to give that full consideration. I am not going to support Senator Schimek's amendment despite the fact that I am pleased that it is here so we can center in on this. She'd probably rather I'd vote for it and be mad at her for bringing it, but the other way around, I'm going to thank her for bringing it but not going to support it. The rationale for the Board of Regents in the bill, as it is written, is as follows. We currently have two separate boards providing governance and coordination, such as it is, one for the university system, one for the state college system. The university governing board is elected, eight members currently elected from eight separate districts throughout the state. State College Board of Trustees on the other hand is an appointive board, I believe six trustees appointed by the Governor. The functions of coordination then will be merged with one board coordinating all seven campuses. The rationale is we have a history of elective trustees...of elective regents, and we ought to continue that. So we are going to continue to elect six regents under this new proposal. We also have a history of appointive governors over the higher education system. So what the consultants have recommended to us and what we are supporting in LR 239 is a mixed situation where part of them are elected and part of them are appointed, maintaining the majority of them on an elective basis, but having the Governor be able to offer some as appointments to provide a balance for the board and I think that's an adequate compromise. I know people who are criticizing 239 because of this, frankly. They are looking for things to criticize and that's fine, that's part of the process, but changing this is not going to, I think, bring a resounding note of support for the current, from the current Board of Regents for this proposal because their concerns are something other than what the specifics are in the bill. Let me defend, just for a second, a little bit, the theory of appointed regents, appointments of a lot of these people. I know Senator Schimek has put forth the purest democratic ideal of electing officeholders, that there is more...the theory is that there is more accountability if they are elected. I'd argue just the opposite. When a group of people cannot be held accountable for their decisions by virtue of the fact that they have been elected on a basis of name identification, who spent the most money on a campaign, not on a basis of what they are planning to do for a given set of