

carding it here. If these procedures are bad, they should be changed or abolished. If experience has shown that in the case of the University certain special arrangements are needed, they should be provided. The remedy would not seem to be to retain the law as to purchasing for the Health Department, the Department of Education, the State Roads Commission and other branches of the State government while wholly exempting the University of Maryland alone. The argument that what may be done at the University in the course of certain revenue yielding activities is not costing the State any money, is more plausible than true. As long as the State is in the position of having to provide funds to meet any unmet need or to make good any deficit, it is absurd to speak of any expenditure by the University as "not costing the taxpayers money". When the legislature is confronted by a *fait accompli*, it has no real choice as to what should be done; its action is forced. That has been the experience in the past; the proposed change would only make repetitions easier.

The bill would also free the University of all regulation in the selection of employees—not only academic persons as to whom a broad latitude may well be granted—but all other employees, too. It is difficult to see why stenographers, clerks, bookkeepers, maintenance people, watchmen, messengers, etc.,—in fact all outside the teaching staff—should not be selected under merit system rules as are such employees in other departments. If civil service procedure has merit in the selection of all other public employees why, it may be asked, should people performing similar employment of a non-academic character at the University not be chosen the same way?

The advantages and disadvantages of the civil service system (for non-academic personnel) may be debated endlessly, but it is firmly established practice in federal, state and local government throughout the nation. The appointing power may chafe under its restraints, but public opinion in favor of civil service rests upon experience under civil service contrasted with experience under the spoils system. The elimination of civil service would open the door to patronage abuses for political or other purposes unrelated to the public good. There is no reason to believe that Marylanders are prepared to sanction a general retreat from the merit system or that, if they knew of the proposal, they would favor the grant of a broad license to abandon this system at the University.

In support of the bill, it has been pointed out that it specifies that employees, though not required to be under civil service, shall, nevertheless, have protection against injustice by resort to an appeal. This protection they will have anyway if they remain in the civil service system, and there is no reason for exempting the University from the requirement binding on all