

word "responsibilities."

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Chairman, and members of the Legislature, I am going to read the language that will be stricken. "The Legislature may provide that some or all of the appointed members of each board of trustees shall be appointed from areas of the state which are consistent with the institution's primary service responsibilities." The discussion the other day centered on the vagueness and lack of clarity about this language. If it is put into the constitutional provision, it would limit the Legislature should it decide to have some kind of geographical representation to these requirements. One is that it would be an area of the state which is consistent with the institution's primary service responsibilities. There is no definition in the statutes right now of that terminology and a statute would have to create a definition for that, set up a philosophical position justifying it in order to even get it enacted, and I think it would pose more problems. So, by striking this language, we don't diminish the power of the Legislature. The Legislature can do exactly whatever is contemplated by this language without the language. So rather than freeze something into the Constitution, which could turn out to be a stumbling block for the Legislature, I am asking that this language simply be removed and let the Legislature keep what it has now, which is plenary or total power to do what this language is talking about. If you have any questions, I am prepared to answer them but the language does not need to be in the Constitution. The Legislature has all the power necessary. The Constitution imposes limits on the Legislature, not grants of power because the Legislature has that power. The purpose of this language is not to limit the Legislature, so I hope that you will adopt the amendment which would strike this language.

PRESIDENT: Senator Warner, please.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I, briefly, would be in support. I opposed this the other day. I had a concern at that time that the ability to have an area of consideration that was consistent with an institution's role and mission might be necessary to have in the Constitution. Since that time, I am convinced that the striking of this language does not interfere with that in any fashion. I am perfectly