

state consistent with the institution's primary service responsibilities. First of all, what are service responsibilities? And if the service responsibility relates to the types of courses or curriculum offerings that are made, these are offered to everybody throughout the state. But if you're going to take it to mean something different, in other words, a geographical area that's served, regardless of the subject matter being offered or the service, then there ought to be something that defines the geographical district that is to be considered. But language like this breeds confusion, contention, and would be very difficult, if there should be a challenge to this provision of law, it would be difficult to state what it does mean. So let's say the Legislature decides to do something with reference to one board of trustees. It doesn't say here that we've got to treat every board of trustees the same way. We can deal with one board of trustees if we choose and we can say that for that board of trustees so many will come from a certain area that we will define however we want to, based on what we say that a service area is. None of the other boards of trustees will be affected by that. The purpose in doing such a thing by the Legislature could be designed to punish a particular institution or a particular board because if certain people are appointed to a board and we don't like it and maybe a way to get rid of them would be to define these areas of the state consistent with the institution's primary service responsibilities, we set up an area that has more than one board member on it and say only one member of the board can come from that area. Then we have eliminated one of the board members. So if this language is not designed to serve some political purpose then I see no validity to it. It generates so much confusion, it is so indefinite that it's difficult to even discuss it in a way that makes clear what is being said. You have to break it up into individual little parts and discuss each part and do it in a hypothetical manner. I don't believe there is any bill that has come before us this session that has so much ambiguity, provides so much room for maneuvering and political manipulation as these few lines. I'm not saying that the drafters of this language had in mind to achieve the results that I'm talking about, but when we consider amending the Constitution we must look at what the Legislature is prohibited from doing and what the Legislature is allowed to do. Whatever the Constitution does not prohibit the Legislature from doing, the Legislature has the power to do. So under the language, as it's drafted, all of the things that I've mentioned can be done. The Legislature, which might be the best move for