of cor are at that

4

6

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

of contingent guarantees, first to find out what they are and, second, to find out what likelihood there is that the State may be called upon to pay and how wisely the Legislature has estimated in each instance whether or not it is safe to take this risk.

I think that the Committee has come full circle apparently, or since the original Constitutional language was adopted. I think that they had a reasonable fear and that to ignore the policy behind this fear today is not only to change the language, but to ignore the important and relative teachings of the past.

Now, I do not foresee any problems in connection with State financing because I think that the decision of the Court of Appeals which has been commented on goes beyond semantics and reaches sound, good sense and follows the practical sense in the distinction that I am trying to make, and that is the distinction the Court of Appeals made between cash and credit.

It would be open in every case in which the State wanted to lend its credit to the aid of a private institution, for the State to borrow the money and either