April 4, 1990

LR 239

reported correctly engrossed. (See pages 1879-80 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, in addition to that, I have received a communication from the university regarding a bond proposal. That will be referred to Reference Committee for their action.

Mr. President, the next item on LR 239, there have been amendments adopted to the resolution by Senator Warner. Senator Chambers had a proposal that was adopted. Mr. President, the next amendment I have to the resolution is by Senator Chambers. Senator, this is your proposal that reads on page 3, line 3, beginning with the word "No" strike all language through the word "party" in line 5.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Legislature, this is the amendment that I told you Senator Warner and I had talked about and he has no objection, but I want to make it clear to you what it is. And the reason I hope you will listen, based on the discussion we had and the vote that was given, I think people are taking this bill seriously. I believe we have a chance to move it, and there may be a chance to get enough votes to actually put it on the ballot. Now I want to tell you about this amendment and I hope you will follow me if you can. What the bill would say right now is that when the initial appointments are made, no more than three members of the Governor's party can be on the board, whether it is the regents or the trustees, but after that initial appointment, there no longer is that requirement. Senator Warner and I had a discussion about that and my position was that if we are going to require the balance at the initial appointment, we should require that same party balance throughout. But his position and that of others was that it is not going to make that much difference, and he can state it differently than I am saying it, but I want to get to the crux of what my amendment tries to do, that the worry is not that the Governor will appoint all members the Governor's party because if there was a requirement that of members of the opposite party be appointed, and the Governor wanted somebody of the Governor's own party, that person could simply shift parties and nothing would have been prevented. So the reason I am offering this amendment is to strike all reference to this party balance. It is not necessar/ in my opinion. If we are not going to carry it all the way through