

under the Legislature's direction and control. If we remove the Regents, reference to the Regents from the constitution, reference to the Attorney General, reference to the State Auditor and the Treasurer, we would then be in a position to enact legislation of the kind that would better adjust what these individuals do. In some states the auditor is appointed. Some states do not have an auditor as such. There might be an entity or an individual working under the Legislature who does or performs the auditing function. Some states may decide to hire out that kind of work. But in any case, however the auditing function is to be done, the Legislature could make a determination about it. When it comes to the position of Attorney General there is no reason for that position to be named in the constitution as an executive office. In other states the Attorney General is appointed. Certainly no good argument can be given, in my opinion, which would indicate that an Attorney General who is elected, especially on a partisan basis, has that detachment, that impartiality, that competency which we would like to see in the chief legal officer of the state. So by striking reference to the Attorney General from the state, no harm would be done in terms of what that office would do and the function it would serve. The Treasurer is basically...well, actually is a ministerial position. There certainly is no need to have that position listed in the constitution. There is no need to elect a person who will be called the State Treasurer. If not one entity were to carry out the functions of what the Treasurer does, those responsibilities could be dispersed or distributed out. But it would not create any problem to no longer have the Treasurer mentioned in the constitution. If you're going to take away reference to an entity, such as the Public Service Commission, which in fact does do something of value, which does stand as a bulwark of protection between the public and these large entities that would gouge and misuse the public for profit, if you're going to remove reference to that entity from the constitution, removal of these that I'm mentioning would certainly not be considered unreasonable. LR 41CA, a constitutional amendment proposal to be submitted to the public, should not emerge from this Legislature. Although, and it's a question somebody may raise in the future, the statutes refer to sending these constitutional proposals to the Governor, we simply don't do it. The Legislature enacted a law that indicates that these proposals should go to the Governor. As a matter of fact, that statute talks about the order in which these types of things are