

statewide perspective, you would not be able to do that if this language were taken out of the Constitution. If you think it is a good idea to give the Legislature the authority to make some sorts of restrictions that the trustees in some way be consistent with the service responsibilities of the institutions, then you ought to leave this language in this...in the constitutional amendment and vote against the Chambers amendment. If you think, on the other hand, that there's no purpose being served by making such types of...giving the Legislature the authority at some day to make some sort of restrictions, then taking it out doesn't weaken the bill. It's not the major portion of the bill, but I think it...I think it's something that is good to allow the Legislature to have this authority. I think that it is good, for instance, as a graduate of Wayne State College and, pardon me, Senator Morrissey, I'll maybe throw Peru in as an example here every now and then, too, to have people from northeast Nebraska serve on Wayne State College Board of Trustees; to have people from southeast Nebraska serve on Peru State College Board of Trustees; to have somebody on the Med Center Board of Trustees be a practicing physician, to be conversant in how people in medical school are trained. I think it's a good idea. I think it is not the major portion of the bill. I think it's good that Senator Chambers is asking these questions because I think it clarifies what the intent of the language is. Frankly, I understand it better, having to stand here and defend it, than maybe I did earlier, and I think his bringing the amendment is helpful to us, as a body, of understanding it, but I think it is language that is valuable in the Constitution. The...you know, one of the ways to argue in favor of a measure or against a measure is always to set up a worse case scenario and what would happen if a group of senators, 25 or 30 senators, were mad at a given board of trustees and would pass specific language. My guess is, if they get that mad at any given board of trustees, they're going to find a way, through budget, through some other type of enabling legislation on role and mission or some other thing that they can do, to find a way to punish those people. So I don't think they'll have to dig to the depths of the Constitution here to find this particular language to provide that punishment that they may be seeking to warrant. In practice, we don't do that. We don't. As mad as members of the Legislature were last summer over what was transpiring with the current Board of Regents, there has been no punitive types of legislation passed. Although Senator Moore tried maybe in the budget, the budget that we passed for the Board of Regents was roughly consistent