

over the selection, promotion and retention of its faculty; and generally, over all concerns that have any bearing whatsoever upon the preservation of independence of thought and inquiry. Even further, I assert that great care should be taken to prevent abuses that might lead to indirect interference with true freedom of teaching and scholarship.

On the other hand, this does not mean that a university should be freed from certain minimal procedural requirements which are needed to assure proper business administration, the principles of which are applied to other State agencies of no less importance, such as hospitals, courts, and other essential activities which are likewise acknowledged to be entitled to protection against external influences.

Encroachments by other arms of the State Government upon the legitimate prerogatives of the University should not be tolerated. Neither should the University be made a law unto itself, displacing agencies whose function it is to shield the taxpayer against those abuses which inevitably are associated with the exercise of absolute power. Neither Governors, nor judges, nor university administrators are fit to be entrusted with unlimited power. This defect is not personal to the present management of the University; it is inherent in human nature.

No legitimate interest of the University needs the sweeping grant of authority given by House Bill No. 26. The University has not been unduly restricted in its operations or inhibited in its growth. On the contrary, it has flourished and prospered. My predecessors and I have not been niggardly in dealing with the University through the years. In this year's budget I included a large grant for increased pay to its faculty. The University's budget is now over \$18,000,000 in State funds alone—an increase of nearly two and three quarter millions of dollars over last year's budget.

My fundamental objection to the bill is that it does not attempt to deal with any special needs of the University, but boldly sweeps away all limitations upon every phase of the University's operations. Under the guise of defending an academic institution against undue interference, it would enthrone another evil which is no less to be feared.

In providing the necessary protection to the University against outside pressure, we need not embrace the equally indefensible alternative of complete exemption from established procedures of a business character which long experience has shown to be necessary to avoid favoritism, waste, and lack of coordination with other State agencies and development plans. We have here no genuine issue of