which we presented you with, our feeling was that the, that a mere exhortation or direction to the Legislature to let the University alone was of no consequence, and really did not aspire to constitutional significance. We had understood that the Commission generally was opposed to fancy language, fancy empty language in the Constitution, and while we had no objection to naming the University annex, claiming that we desire that it have as much freedom as possible, we did not feel that this was of constitutional significance. It took away completely, it pulled the teeth of what we were trying to do, which was to grant constitutional security to the degree of autonomy that the University has enjoyed under statute. There was no other or better way to draft that language than as we did it. I would point out that the third suggestion, the one appearing on Page 2 of our proposals is one which has been copied from the Hawaiian and Alaskan Constitutions which are not among those filed as granting autonomy to their State University. We don't really know what it means, and I don't believe we were able to discover exactly how far that language was intended to go by the Constitution makers in those