

NEW SERIES : Price 1 dollar : VOL. XXVI No. 2

VERMONT *History*

Formerly the Vermont Quarterly



April 1958

The PROCEEDINGS *of the*
VERMONT HISTORICAL SOCIETY

This Winslow Compromise, so-called, proposed that 8 of the 9 elected Trustees should thereafter be chosen by the Governor from a list of nominees (six each) drawn up by the State Agricultural Society, the State Grange, the Vermont Dairymen's Association, and the Board of Agriculture, with the proviso that the Governor must select two from each list of six presented.⁹² This compromise was acceptable to the University Trustees who were panicky over the obvious strength of the movement to divorce the State Agricultural College.⁹³ Two days later, the House Committee on Education reported a substitute bill which was nothing more than the Winslow plan.⁹⁴

But the advocates of separation, confident of victory, were in no mood to compromise. The plan of the representative of the uninfluential State Agricultural Society was characterized as an attempt to "befog the minds of the supporters of the separate college bill."⁹⁵ The House rejected this substitute, 164 to 56, and passed the original separation bill, slightly amended.⁹⁶ The battle then shifted to the Senate where a spectacular debate took place before crowded galleries. Petitions in favor of separation bearing 5,000 signatures poured in upon the Senators. The friends of the University in that body fought hard to defeat the bill. Senator Robert Roberts, University of Vermont graduate and an able lawyer, worked so indefatigably that towards the last of the session he "did not have his boots off for some days and nights." Senator Cleveland, big, bluff and honest, like the President of the United States of the same name, was another valiant defender of the University. It was Cleveland, who charged that the printed petitions which were flooding the Senate "did not originate in Vermont, but in the office of the *New England Homestead* of Springfield, Massachusetts."⁹⁷ Senator Roberts, challenged the guaranty of \$50,000 by leading citizens of Rutland as "null and void" on the clever grounds that "it depended on the permanent location of the new college at Rutland" and what promise of permanence could any agricultural and mechanical college have if the legislature broke faith with the original grantee of the land grant fund, the University of Vermont?⁹⁸ During the debate in the Senate, fifteen students from the State Agricultural College went to Montpelier to present their petitions against any new agricultural college and told the Senators that there were great advantages to being connected to a University.⁹⁹ When the final vote was taken, the separation bill was defeated 18 nays to 12 ayes, just before adjournment.¹⁰⁰

The newspapers which had supported the separation bill condemned

the Senate's action in the angriest terms. The *New England Homestead* declared that the fight would go on, saying, "This dastardly obedience by the Senate to the behests of the 'cultured' university lobby, which has so openly advertised its contempt for the common people of Vermont is the final result required to stir into action the great body of Vermont farmers."¹⁰¹ The *Rutland Herald* reported the story under the heading, "Lobby Won" and in its leading editorial excoriated the Senators for defying the petitions of more than 5,000 farmers.¹⁰² The *Rutland Herald* also referred recklessly to talk at Montpelier that some Senators were bribed, even though the editorialist of the *Herald* professed to disbelieve such charges.¹⁰³ Dr. Thomas H. Hoskins, in the *Vermont Watchman*, also tried to keep the fight alive by stating, "The people have the facts before them. If they take hold in earnest, hold their grip for the interval, and see that no senator gets elected who is not pledged to an independent college, they may win in the next legislature." . . .¹⁰⁴

These passions cooled somewhat in the year following the great legislative battle of 1890. The University administration made strenuous efforts to "mend its fences" with respect to agricultural education. The winter course of free lectures for farmers was begun with conspicuous publicity in the *Burlington Free Press*. President Buckham, himself, opened the course with an address, in his usual classical style, to the assembled farmers followed (somewhat incongruously) by a lecture on "The Horse's Foot and Its Care."¹⁰⁵ More important was the purchase of a new farm of 110 acres and the erection of farm buildings thereon, including barns, a creamery, and greenhouse. The new farm and buildings were dedicated, early in December, 1891, with great ceremony. All of this was done by the University without Federal or State financial aid. As a matter of fact, the University had to borrow from its general funds and "for the time being to pledge its credit." It would have been perfectly legitimate for the University to use 10 per cent of the land grant fund of 1862 for the purchase of land. But such use would have required legislative approval and the Trustees did not dare go to the next legislature in view of the bitter feelings stirred up by the "battle of 1890" and, besides, "the new farm had to be in operation before 1892's General Assembly met." All together, the University spent \$29,863.12 on farm and buildings and agricultural equipment, plus an additional \$12,488.77 on engineering buildings and equipment also erected and procured in 1891.¹⁰⁶

These timely reforms undoubtedly saved the University of Ver-

mont and the State Agricultural College from a new assault in the General Assembly of 1892. Governor Fuller reported to the legislature that he had visited the University and State Agricultural College and had been impressed with the signs that the University had an "Agricultural Department established on a modern basis having the latest facilities." The Governor added, with surprising frankness, "I think it can be said that the agitation that has taken place has been of great benefit to the school."¹⁰⁷ The legislature decided to see for itself and appointed a joint committee to visit the Agricultural College and "examine its methods of government and practical workings." This Committee made a favorable report and was especially impressed with the new dairy school.¹⁰⁸ Even the State Grange was less intransigent, adopting a resolution, in 1892, which recommended "that . . . whereas it is not advisable to separate the agricultural college from the classical institution with which it is connected, that Trustees having sole control of the agricultural and mechanical fund be elected from the ranks of the farmer and mechanic."¹⁰⁹

Thus the vengeance which had been vowed by the advocates of separation after their defeat in the Senate in 1890 had not come to pass. Never again was there any real danger of separation of the State Agricultural College from the University. This is not to say, however, that animosity towards the University evaporated completely. Echoes of the bitter argument were heard for several years afterwards.¹¹⁰

Nevertheless, with the advantage of perspective which the passage of time has given, one must conclude that the defeat of the "divorce bill" in 1890 was fortunate for the future development of agricultural education in Vermont. No one with any knowledge of the history of the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College can deny that the farmers of Vermont had real grievances against the University for its management of the land grant fund.¹¹¹ But separation was an extremely dubious solution. It is difficult not to agree with the fifteen agricultural students who told the Senators in 1890 that there were advantages to being connected with a University. Yet, even disregarding the obvious advantages of a connection with the richer resources of a University, it is hard to see how a separate institution would have produced much satisfaction. In view of the record of legislative parsimony in Vermont, so far as agricultural education is concerned, before and since 1890, one can only wonder what the fate of such a separate institution would have been. The inescapable conclusion for the historian is that separation would have jeopardized

seriously the further progress of agricultural education in Vermont.¹¹²

On the other hand, the bitter battle of 1890 had tragic and far reaching consequences for the State Agricultural College and, it must be said, for the people of Vermont. The persistence of suspicion and distrust among the farmers of Vermont and their representatives in the legislature made it impossible for the University authorities to approach the legislature. Dean Hills depicted this situation with evident regret when he wrote, in 1932,

Thus it was that during the years when the other 47 land grant colleges were forming contacts with their respective legislative bodies and the latter were becoming accustomed to such contacts and making appropriations, Vermont legislatures were not approached. And thus a tradition was formed . . . All of which amounts to just this: that in so far as approach to the legislature is concerned, this institution was set back for a full generation as an aftermath of the great fight of 1890.¹¹³

It is a pity, indeed, that the Winslow compromise could not have been accepted by the House of Representatives in 1890. The uncompromising temper of the proponents of separation made it impossible for them to see that the shortcomings of the State Agricultural College in Vermont were to be found, to a greater or lesser degree, in all of the land grant colleges.¹¹⁴ To be sure, the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College was not conspicuous among those institutions which were blazing new trails in agricultural education. The reorganization of the Board of Trustees so as to include more farmer representatives, suggested in the Winslow compromise, might have provided the basis of accord between the farmers and the Agricultural College, and between the legislature and the State Agricultural College. With the right men on such a Board and with a spirit of cooperation, Vermont might have been able to keep on a par with the leading agricultural colleges in the United States even with her more limited financial resources.

Of course, the lack of state support, such as other agricultural colleges were receiving by the twentieth century, kept the Vermont State Agricultural College in a troublous state. The University farm which had been purchased for experimental work proved to be too expensive to maintain. As a matter of fact, in many years, the farm was forced to be self-supporting and got into the "red" and ran down badly.¹¹⁵ In 1904, the Dairy School which had been established with so much fanfare thirteen years earlier was forced to close for lack of funds. Even the *New England Homestead*, no friend of the University, exhibited impatience with the parsimony of the Vermont legislature

and pointed out bluntly that "out of 45 states in the Union, 44 have appropriated money for buildings at their state colleges. Vermont is the only one which has not."¹¹⁶ Joseph L. Hills, the Director of the Experiment Station and Professor of Agricultural Chemistry at the State Agricultural College, lamented this fact in an address to the Vermont Dairymen's Association in 1904, and urged the dairymen to bring pressure upon the legislature to appropriate enough money for the erection and equipping of a suitable agricultural building.¹¹⁷ A resolution to this effect was endorsed by the Dairymen's Association¹¹⁸ and the State Grange also worked hard to secure an appropriation.¹¹⁹ Such cooperation between the University and the two leading farm organizations was most unusual and it is scarcely surprising that the legislature responded with an appropriation of \$60,000 to erect a building for the use of the agricultural department, to be named, quite fittingly, Morrill Hall.¹²⁰

At about the same time, the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College began to receive increased appropriations from the State legislature. Since 1888, the University of Vermont had been receiving \$6,000 annually—\$2,400 of which was for paying the tuition and incidental college charges of thirty students and \$3,600 for providing competent instruction in the branches of learning related to the industrial arts.¹²¹ In 1908, the appropriation for the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College was increased to \$16,000, although only \$3,600 was earmarked "for instruction in the branches of learning related to the industrial arts."¹²² Two years later, the state subsidy was increased to \$26,000 of which \$10,000 was for the "exclusive use" of the medical college, \$2,400 for tuition aid to students, and \$13,600 "for instruction in the principles and methods of teaching, in branches relating to English language and literature, ancient and modern languages and history, mathematics, political, social, moral and industrial sciences."¹²³ In 1912, the subsidy was virtually doubled with \$4,800 earmarked for the exclusive use of the College of Agriculture for tuition aid to students and \$8,000 for the use of the College of Agriculture in developing agricultural extension work.¹²⁴ All of this shows that, even when the legislature of Vermont began to grant increased subsidies to higher education in Vermont in the opening years of the twentieth century (Norwich University and Middlebury as well as the University), the amounts available for the Agricultural College were the smallest portions.

It is not strange, then, that the State Agricultural College became the target of sharp criticism again. This time, however, the slings and

arrows must have been more painful to the friends of the University because the censure came from a group of professional educators rather than uninformed and politically ambitious farmers. In 1912, the legislature of Vermont, in a joint resolution, set up a commission to investigate and report upon the "educational responsibilities" of the State. This Commission was composed of distinguished men including John H. Watson, Judge of the Supreme Court of Vermont, who was appointed chairman of the Commission; Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University; Theodore N. Vail, President of the American Telegraph and Telephone Company; Percival Clement, former President of the Rutland Railroad; Horace F. Graham, State Auditor of Accounts; Frank H. Brooks, President of E. and T. Fairbanks and Company, St. Johnsbury; Eli H. Porter, former member of the State Railroad Commission; James B. Esty, Mayor of Montpelier; Allison E. Tuttle, President of the State Teachers Association; and George L. Hunt, Montpelier lawyer, who served as Clerk of the Commission. This Commission decided to have an expert study made of education in Vermont in addition to making visitations and conducting public hearings of its own. Consequently, the Commission invited the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to undertake such a study. The scope of the Commission's work was defined broadly to include all levels of education in Vermont, elementary, secondary and the three institutions of higher learning which were receiving state subsidies. This was not an investigation which was designed by the enemies of the University of Vermont to make trouble for it again. It was born out of the concern over the adequacy and efficiency of the educational system at all levels in Vermont. The State Agricultural College merely took its turn in the clinical process.¹²⁵

The report of the experts concerning the State Agricultural College was ruthlessly thorough. No aspect of the organization or work of the Agricultural College escaped the critical examination of the Carnegie group. Consequently, the report of the Commission in 1914 represents an important landmark in the history of agricultural education in Vermont.

The professional investigators deplored the inadequacy of equipment at the State Agricultural College. The condition of the College farm, always a problem to the University, was relentlessly exposed. The report summarized the situation tersely: "Professors cannot use the farm as an aid in teaching, students are never seen upon its premises, and the college farm barns, instead of being a model for a well-

kept establishment, would probably be condemned as unsanitary by any modern Board of Health." The condition of the College farm was representative of the total situation at the State Agricultural College. The report continued,

The entire agricultural equipment at Vermont is meagre. Thus the equipment for teaching scientific dairying is not adequate, the department is not adequately housed, and there are no animals available for teaching purposes. It is true that there are animals upon the farm attached to the Experiment Station, but they have been selected for commercial reasons and are not necessarily adapted to the needs of teaching. In addition, students have no access to this farm and professors very limited access. For this reason, live-stock judging cannot be properly carried on. . . . For such work, the professor in charge is compelled to take his students to commercial establishments in the vicinity of Burlington. There is no piggery. A few pigs live in the manure cellar under the barn. The barn for dairy cattle, erected twenty-two years ago, is not of modern construction. This lack of equipment seriously affects the work of animal husbandry—particularly in dairying, which is the principal industry in Vermont . . .¹²⁶

Instruction in the Agricultural College also came in for its share of animadversions from the professional investigators. The Carnegie group reported "a striking absence of the more familiar agricultural courses." In particular, the report emphasized the inadequacy of work in entomology, agricultural chemistry and "the absence of effective work in poultry raising." In addition, "the absence of a separate technical library . . . for the students" was noted as another "marked lack" of the Agricultural College.¹²⁷

The investigators, however, did not blame the professors at the Agricultural College for these failings. The report characterized them as "excellent men" who had "done admirably with the means they have had at their command." The sorry condition of the College of Agriculture was "the result of a policy of administration for which the Trustees are responsible." This policy, which received so much condemnation in the report concerned primarily "the expenditure that the Trustees make of the generous annual gift that the State receives from the United States government." Of the \$58,130 received from the federal government "chiefly for agricultural education," the investigators found that only \$5,481 was spent "on the agricultural schools as such." The rest went to Engineering, Natural and Physical Science, Botany and Zoology, Mathematics, Economic Science and English. "In a word," the report concluded this policy, "the appropriation of the general government for agricultural education has been used . . . for the benefit of the general educational development of the

University, and in the process the Agricultural College has been milked dry."¹²⁸

The Commission's report noted, with commendable fairness, that "what has gone on in Vermont has in large measure gone on in all other states of the Union." On the other hand, it was pointed out that in most states this condition had undergone a transformation since the opening of the twentieth century and, in many of these states, "the agricultural college has developed a close connection with the industries of agriculture, and, thereby, has brought to its support the farmers of the state, so that it wields not only a large political influence, but obtains thereby a generous state support." It was obvious to the investigators that this had "not yet happened in Vermont."¹²⁹

The recommendations of the educational commission were most interesting. It is clear from their report that the function of the Agricultural College should not be primarily to train farm boys in the technique of their vocation. Such a limited "trade school" function, which the advocates of a separate college in 1890 seemed to desire, was not, in the opinion of the Commission, the "real function" of an Agricultural College. The real function of a college of agriculture, the report asserted, was "the promotion of scientific agriculture and the maintenance at the same time of right relations to elementary agricultural training schools." In addition, an agricultural college should develop a "close touch with the agricultural problems of the State, to deal with these problems by the best means that science affords, and to put the fruits of these investigations by simple, direct and feasible methods into the hands of the farmers themselves". . . . To play such a role, the Vermont State Agricultural College would need to have adequate support. Such support could best be obtained if "the Commonwealth should insist that a fair proportion of the United States annual grant shall go into agricultural instruction, and it should supplement this income by such means as are necessary to effect the contact between the agricultural school and the agricultural industries."¹³⁰

The Carnegie Report presents a very revealing picture of the condition of the Vermont State Agricultural College at the end of the first decade of the twentieth century. Yet there are important considerations which should not be overlooked in evaluating the report. In the first place, it must be recognized that the authors of the report were definitely of the opinion that the Morrill Acts were intended to benefit agriculture primarily and, therefore, that the bulk of federal funds should have been spent upon "distinctively agricultural subjects,

such as agronomy, soils, horticulture, farm machinery, farm management, dairying, animal husbandry, and the like."¹³¹ That notion is debatable, to say the least, in view of the later researches of Dr. Alfred C. True of the United States Department of Agriculture concerning the intent of the college land grant act.¹³² In the second place, the report seems somewhat inconsistent in the matter of state support. One of the recommendations of the report was that the State should supplement the income from the federal government. Yet, in the summary recommendations made elsewhere in the report, the Commission urged that, in the interests of improving elementary and secondary education in Vermont, "subsidies to higher education should cease."¹³³ Presumably, the concern of the Commission for the larger problem of elementary and secondary education was responsible for the failure to analyze more carefully the problem of the relationship of the State of Vermont to its land grant college. Surely it is difficult to deny President Buckham's claim that the State of Vermont had a "special obligation" towards the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College, particularly since the State had "persuaded the University to assume the heavy burden of maintaining the . . . wandering and homeless institution (which) was at the point of dissolution."¹³⁴ As early as 1888, Justin Morrill had made a similar claim, pointing out Vermont's unique failure to make a liberal appropriation for its land grant college. The Educational Commission of 1912-1914 was certainly aware of the generous appropriations made by other states to their State Universities.¹³⁵ Yet, strangely enough, no careful thought was given to the connection between the Vermont State Agricultural College's weakness in comparison with other agricultural colleges, and the parsimony of the Vermont legislature. Is it not sound to conclude that the Agricultural College would have been able to make a better claim upon the University Trustees for a larger share of the land grant fund if the legislature had made it a stronger arm of the University from the very beginning?

The Report of the Educational Commission of 1914 had almost no legislative repercussions so far as the State Agricultural College was concerned. As a matter of fact, the report was so severely critical of the entire educational system of Vermont that it created a defensive attitude on the part of many Vermonters.¹³⁶ In the opinion of one contemporary observer, this report got almost nowhere "because Vermont does not care as a rule to follow in the train of other states; because Vermonters do not take kindly to the advice of outsiders;

because as has been aptly said, 'Vermonters would rather go to hell in their own way than to heaven in your way'.¹³⁷

Nevertheless, educational changes were under way in Vermont which were to ameliorate many of the conditions which had received the critical notice of the Educational Commission. One of the recommendations of the Carnegie Report had emphasized the importance of modifying the curricula of elementary and secondary schools with a view towards securing "a sympathetic attitude towards vocational training" particularly in relation to agriculture, the principal industry in the state.¹³⁸ The recommendation, of course, was admirably consistent with the Commission's conception of the primary function of the agricultural college.

Such developments in vocational education had made their beginnings in Vermont before the great educational study of 1912-1914. In 1908, the influential Vermont Dairymen's Association had adopted a resolution calling upon the legislature to establish a (secondary) school of agriculture.¹³⁹ Although the legislature of 1908 did not heed this request, there was increasing support for the proposal. In 1910, Theodore N. Vail, President of American Telegraph and Telephone Company, endowed a school of agriculture in connection with the Lyndon Institute at Lyndonville, Vermont, with the object of giving "practical and theoretical instruction to Vermont boys who have neither the money nor the inclination to pursue an extensive college course."¹⁴⁰ This noteworthy act seemed to awaken more interest in the subject of secondary agricultural education. In the same year, with the urging of Governor John A. Mead,¹⁴¹ the General Assembly of Vermont appropriated \$20,000 to purchase land, erect buildings and provide equipment for a school of agriculture to be located in Randolph. Also an annual appropriation of \$10,000 was made for the maintenance of the school.¹⁴² In 1915, Theodore Vail turned over to the State of Vermont the agricultural school at Lyndonville together with his famous "Speedwell Farms." In a mood of gratitude, the General Assembly fulfilled its obligation to maintain the Lyndonville School by providing an annual appropriation of \$20,000 for the maintenance of this second state school of agriculture.¹⁴³

Thus, at long last, Vermont had two agricultural schools of the type that the advocates of a separate agricultural college had demanded as early as the seventies and eighties. Strangely enough, the millennium in agricultural education did not arrive with the creation of these schools. On the contrary, doubts were expressed within a few years

concerning the value of two such schools for the State.¹⁴⁴ In 1921, these doubts were dignified by the recommendation of the retiring Governor, Percival W. Clement, that the operation of the Vail School be discontinued "unless the legislature is prepared to spend money beyond the value of the institution to the State."¹⁴⁵ In a strong retrenchment mood, comparable to that which prevailed everywhere in the nation in those post-war years, the legislature of 1921 abandoned the Vail School¹⁴⁶ —and no protesting outburst of any significance came from the farmers' organizations. A few years later, suggestions were heard in the legislature to discontinue the school at Randolph as well because of the small attendance. Governor Billings personally investigated the condition of the Randolph School and the State Board of Education assumed the task of making improvements.¹⁴⁷ A new and, as it proved to be, able principal, Stanley G. Judd, directed the rehabilitation process and, since that time, the school has functioned successfully though with small enrollments.¹⁴⁸

It should not be forgotten, however, that, in these years, agricultural courses were being introduced in many high schools of Vermont. The first high school agricultural course was established at Morrisville in 1911 and, soon afterwards, in the high schools at Stowe, Bristol and Vergennes.¹⁴⁹ In 1912, the legislature provided state aid to the amount of \$200 to any town which provided for and maintained courses in manual training, domestic economy or agriculture "with special instructors therefore."¹⁵⁰ Federal support for these efforts came with the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917. In Vermont, as elsewhere, notable advances in secondary agricultural education were made after 1917. By 1940, there were 36 vocational agricultural departments in Vermont high schools, with an enrollment of 801 students. In addition, 179 young men were obtaining part-time instruction through the same schools and about 100 farmers were receiving evening school training.¹⁵¹

Important as these developments were, they were overshadowed by the growth of the State Agricultural College and associated agencies in number of students, equipment, and in prestige and influence among the farmers of the State. In the quarter of a century after the study made by the Vermont Educational Commission, the State Agricultural College began to enjoy a considerable increase of funds from federal sources. In 1914, federal money was made available, on matching basis, to carry on cooperative agricultural extension work. In 1917, the Smith-Hughes Act provided funds for training teachers

in Home Economics and Agriculture. The Purnell Act of 1925 granted additional funds for research by the Agricultural Experiment Station. The Capper-Ketcham Act of 1928 made available additional funds for extension work. In the lush days of federal giving under the New Deal, the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 provided in a comprehensive fashion for generous grants to support resident instruction in the land grant colleges, extension work in agriculture and home economics, and research in the state experiment stations. In 1937, additional money was made available in the George-Dean Act to train agriculture and home economics teachers in the high schools. By 1941-42, the Vermont State Agricultural College and associated agencies was receiving a total of \$299,043.28 in addition to the income of the original land grant fund. Of this large total, \$85,824.05 was being used for the support of resident teaching in agriculture or the mechanic arts at the University, \$100,471.60 for the work of the Agricultural Experiment Station and \$112,747.63 for extension work in agriculture and home economics.¹⁵²

In this same period, the legislature of Vermont began slowly to make a greater contribution to the various educational activities associated with the agricultural college. The largest amounts of financial aid were given to the extension work in agriculture and home economics under the supervision of the Extension Service of the State Agricultural College. Such aid, of course, was required by the Smith-Lever Act as a condition for receiving federal funds. By 1941-42, \$64,777.54 in state funds was available for extension work in agriculture and home economics in Vermont. Substantial aid was given also to the Vermont Agricultural Experiment Station in this period. In 1923, all license fees paid by commercial feed manufacturers were granted to the Experiment Station, to be used in conducting feeding stuff inspections and other purposes specified by law. In 1925, a similar provision was made in the case of all license fees paid by agricultural seed purveyors. In 1927, the General Assembly appropriated, at the instance of prominent dairymen, \$20,000 and \$15,000 for the next two years to improve the University farm buildings, equipment and livestock, and to expand instructional and extension activities connected with the Experiment Station. Properly speaking, this was a subsidy for resident instruction and extension work rather than for research by the Experiment Station and marked a notable case of something like direct aid to the Agricultural College itself. In 1935, the legislature provided for annual grants to match the federal grant

of \$10,471.60 a year provided by the Bankhead-Jones Act. Additional matching grants were appropriated by the legislature after the enactment of the George-Dean Act of 1937.¹⁵³

Needless to say the increased federal and state subsidies which came after the first World War made it possible for the State Agricultural College and associated agencies to perform much greater services for the farmers of Vermont. It was in this period that the old attitudes of hostility and suspicion came to be replaced by an attitude of good will on the part of the farmer toward the State Agricultural College. The major part of the credit for this change of attitude belongs to the work of the Extension Service. In Vermont, as elsewhere, the extension work of the Agricultural Colleges proved to be the vital link between the college and the farmers. The regular contacts with the farmers through meetings, demonstrations, club work, etc., have helped the agricultural college to understand the needs of the farmers and the farmers to appreciate the value of the scientific work of the colleges.

This reservoir of good will was tremendously important for the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College when disaster struck the institution in 1940. Following the sudden death of President Guy W. Bailey in the fall of that year, startling facts concerning the financial condition of the institution were brought to light. Apparently, President Bailey had had a free and uncontrolled hand in managing the finances of the institution so that no one knew the real condition of the University until his death. The Trustees reported to the legislature which convened shortly after the beginning of the new year that the University would have an estimated deficit of \$526,000 by June 30, 1941 and that pledged funds of the University had been used to meet operating losses during the Bailey regime.¹⁵⁴ The General Assembly responded to the shocking news of this crisis by passing unanimously a bill to aid the University by appropriating \$150,000 for the medical and agricultural colleges and authorizing the University to issue bonds to the amount of \$675,000.¹⁵⁵ Unfortunately, the story did not end happily with this generous gesture on the part of the legislature. The legislature had instructed Governor Wills to make a full and complete investigation. Governor Wills promptly secured the services of Dean Paul C. Packer of the College of Education in the University of Iowa, and Dr. Walter A. Jessop, President of the Carnegie Foundation, and Haskins and Sells prominent auditing firm. The complete and full investigation revealed that the University had "let seep away over one million dollars of its endowment in

operating losses.”¹⁵⁶ So serious was the situation that Governor Wills called the legislature into special session on September 10 to deal with the problem of rehabilitating the University. The legislature came to the aid of the distressed institution by appropriating, unconditionally, \$260,000 for 1942 and a like amount for 1943 on condition that the University raise \$150,000 from the contributions of alumni and friends.¹⁵⁷ Under its new President—John S. Millis—the University reduced operating costs and raised the required amount from the alumni. Despite these valiant efforts, the University faced the prospect of further deficits of \$150,000 a year. The legislature, therefore, appropriated \$50,000 for 1943 and \$150,000 for 1944.¹⁵⁸

It was becoming apparent by this time that the legislature would need to grant large amounts of money to the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College as a permanent policy. The financial crisis of the University had brought to many Vermonters the sobering realization that the University of Vermont was, in a peculiar sense, a state university which the State had a special obligation to support. At the same time, however, the new relationship of the State to the University reopened the old question of the status of the State Agricultural College. The Agricultural College, alone of the divisions of the University, had not run a deficit. To the contrary, the report of Dean Packer in 1941 had revealed a surplus of \$9,000 in the State Agricultural College which had been used to help other departments.¹⁵⁹ Leading farm organizations began to demand a new deal for agricultural education in Vermont. As early as April, 1941, the Farm Bureau was deploring the high tuition charges at the State Agricultural College—the highest in the United States—and complained that the “State has never seen fit to give financial assistance.”¹⁶⁰ The Farm Bureau, therefore, began to campaign for a large scale program of financial assistance to the State Agricultural College, not only to lower tuition costs, but also for new buildings and equipment.¹⁶¹

The Vermont State Grange revived its old cry for separation of the State Agricultural College, albeit in a different form. In October of 1944, the Grange resolved to “oppose further appropriations to the State College of Agriculture as the institution is now set up.” This was followed by the appointment of a Committee on the Agricultural College, whose chairman was Guy A. Horton, lawyer and author of a history of the Vermont State Grange. Horton's book on the Grange was published in 1926 and had revived memories of the great battle of 1890 and had made Horton an interested and suspicious observer of the affairs of the University of Vermont and State Agricultural

College. The Grange Committee prepared a report in time for the legislative session of 1945. This report, entitled *What the Grange Wants For the College of Agriculture—and Why?* presented the demands of the Grange in the perspective of “seventy years of thinking, discussion and controversy.” The Committee charged that the Agricultural College was being milked of its funds by the College of Arts and Sciences; that, considering the predominating importance of agriculture in Vermont that an unfair proportion of federal funds under the Morrill Acts, the Nelson Act, and the Bankhead-Jones Act were allotted to the College of Engineering. Having made these charges, the Grange Committee presented six proposals as the solution of the Grange. These were: that the State College of Agriculture should be a separate entity, having its own campus and farms; that the State College of Agriculture should handle its own funds and personal property; that accounting of funds should be on a separate college basis “such as will show the receipts and expenditures of the College of Agriculture including its Research and Extension Departments”; that the State College of Agriculture should buy its University service on a business basis, including such things as instruction, library, gymnasium and charge, likewise, for any service it may render to their departments; that the School of Engineering be absorbed into the College of Agriculture, as a Department or School of Mechanic Arts, in order to insure the right of the Agricultural College to a larger portion of the federal grants for agriculture and the mechanic arts; that the Trustees “on the agricultural side” be appointed by the Governor instead of the legislature, in order to maintain “agricultural-mindedness in the Trustees”; and that the State Commissioner of Agriculture, and not the Governor, should be *ex-officio* member of the Board.¹⁶²

This, and other plans for the expansion and improvement of the Agricultural College were discussed widely in meetings of agricultural groups before the legislative session. With the full support of the Farm Bureau and the Grange, and in line with recommendations made by the popular Dean of the State Agricultural College, Joseph E. Carrigan, bills were introduced in the House to appropriate \$700,000 for the purchase of land and the erection of buildings, and \$170,500 to make it possible to lower tuition for agricultural students from \$385 to \$185.¹⁶³ At the same time, legislation was introduced to reorganize the State Agricultural College. The final result of all of this legislative activity was the enactment of three significant laws by the legislature of 1945. One of these declared that the “Vermont Agricultural

College, created by No. 96 of the Acts of 1864, and continued in life by Sec. 11 of No. 83, of the Acts of 1865, is hereby recognized as being in existence as a body corporate owned by the State of Vermont." Upon this resurrected Vermont Agricultural College, the legislature bestowed the right to acquire property and to exercise such powers as are or may be granted to it by the legislature.¹⁶⁴ A second law appropriated \$467,500 for the purchase or leasing of land, the building of buildings—specifying the University land on which Morrill Hall was located, the University farm, the erection of a modern poultry plant, and the construction of a building or buildings for the Vermont Agricultural College.¹⁶⁵ The third act organized the Vermont Agricultural College into four divisions: (1) a resident teaching division, for instruction in agriculture and home economics; (2) a division of research to consist of the Vermont Agricultural Experiment Station; (3) a division of extension; (4) a related services division to carry on inspection of feed and fertilizer, maintain the college farms, poultry plant, to test soils and milk, etc. on request, and to conduct short courses. Each of these divisions was given substantial state subsidy: \$40,000 for the resident teaching division to provide \$200 scholarships for each student; \$15,500 for the research division; \$75,000 for the extension division, and \$40,000 for related services. The control of these funds was placed in the hands of the Trustees of the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College with the proviso that "all funds appropriated to the Vermont Agricultural College shall be kept in a separate account and shall be audited annually by the auditor of accounts."¹⁶⁶

Thus, after eighty years, the General Assembly of Vermont accepted its special obligation to the Agricultural College. The reorganization of the Agricultural College in 1945 displayed caution and practical wisdom. The Agricultural College was dignified with the recognition of its corporate existence as the Vermont Agricultural College. Generous appropriations were made for its expansion and support. Moreover, care was taken to safeguard the management of the state funds appropriated so that they would be used exclusively for the four divisions of the Vermont Agricultural College. At the same time, no violence was done to the corporate union of the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College. The institution remains in the control of the legal descendants of the Board of Trustees of the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College which had accepted the trust of the Morrill land grant fund in 1865.

Many problems remain to be worked out regarding the relations

of the Vermont Agricultural College to the other schools in the University such as the division of the federal funds for agriculture and the mechanic arts and the exchange of services. Yet satisfactory arrangements of these matters should not be too difficult if a proper spirit of cooperation is maintained within the University and an avoidance of recrimination is observed by persons or groups outside of the University. It seems safe to conclude that the Vermont Agricultural College is on the threshold of a happier era now that the State has assumed the responsibility which Justin Morrill had failed to persuade it to accept during his lifetime.

NOTES

¹ The history of these educational developments has been summarized from Alfred Charles True, *A History of Agricultural Education in the United States*, 23-82.

² Hills, *Five and Fifty Years*, 5.

³ *Laws of Vermont*, 1854, No. 43.

⁴ Grenville M. Dodge and William Arba Ellis, *Norwich University, 1819-1911*, (Montpelier, Vt., 1911) I, 13-18.

⁵ A. C. True, *Agricultural Education*, 82-83.

⁶ See A. C. True, *Agricultural Education*, 88-90; also I. L. Kandel, *Federal Aid For Vocational Education* (Carnegie Foundation For the Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin No. 10, New York, 1918), 74-76.

⁷ A. C. True, *Agricultural Education*, 78-79.

⁸ True, *Agricultural Education*, 87, 91-92.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 95-97.

¹⁰ William Belmont Parker, *The Life and Public Services of Justin Smith Morrill* (Boston and New York, 1924), 48-50.

¹¹ A. C. True, *Agricultural Education*, 97-99. Dr. True and Morrill's biographer, William B. Parker, have established effectively the weakness of President Edmund J. James' thesis in *The Origin of the Land Grant Act of 1862 (The So-Called Morrill Act) and Some Account of its Author Jonathan B. Turner*, (University of Illinois Studies, IV, Urbana, 1910). Dr. True is critical of Morrill's failure to acknowledge the influence of others, but does not believe that Morrill's bill was a copy of a bill given to him by Turner or Turner's friends. Parker raises important questions about the reliability and adequacy of James' evidence. Although Parker insists upon Morrill's complete authorship of The Land Grant College Act, he makes no claims of invention or originality for Morrill, (276-284). Kandel, in *Federal Aid to Vocational Education*, also rejects James' thesis, (79).

¹² A. C. True, *Agricultural Education*, 99-106.

¹³ George A. Works and Barton Morgan, *The Land Grant College*, (Advisory Committee on Education, Staff Study No. 10, Washington, 1939), 109-112 for a copy of first Morrill Act and later amendments.

¹⁴ *Laws of Vermont*, 1862, 38-39. Vermont was the second state to accept provisions of the Morrill Act.

¹⁵ *Hills Ms.*, "Legislative History."

¹⁶ *Hills Ms.*, "Legislative History."

¹⁷ *Burlington Free Press*, November 10, 1863.

¹⁸ *Laws of Vermont*, 1863, No. 60.

- 19 Hills Ms., "Legislative History."
- 20 Dodge and Ellis, *History of Norwich University*, 141.
- 21 Hills Ms., "Legislative History."
- 22 *Ibid.*, See also *Burlington Free Press*, October 17, 22, 25, 1864.
- 23 *Laws of Vermont*, 1864, No. 96.
- 24 June 12, 1865.
- 25 *Burlington Free Press*, June 12, 1865.
- 26 *Ibid.*, May 3, 1865.
- 27 Benjamin F. Andrews, *The Land Grant of 1862 and the Land Grant Colleges* (Bureau of Education, Bulletin No. 13, Washington, 1918), 50.
- 28 *Burlington Free Press*, October 25, 1865, contains a copy of this report in full.
- 29 Hills Ms., "Legislative History."
- 30 See *Laws of Vermont*, 1865, No. 83.
- 31 *Burlington Free Press*, November 22, 1865.
- 32 *Ibid.*, November 23, 1865.
- 33 Vermont was not alone in making such a disposition of its land grant fund. In the first decade after the passage of the Morrill Act, 18 out of the 36 states accepting the provisions of the act sought to establish separate agricultural colleges. In the other 18 states, the land grant fund was granted to the State University or to some college or university of prominence within the state. In the New England States, Massachusetts established a separate agricultural college but also devoted one-third of the income from the land grant fund to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Maine established a State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts which became, later, the University of Maine; the New Hampshire College of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts was part of Dartmouth College until 1903; Connecticut granted income from the land grant fund to the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale until 1893; Rhode Island granted the income to Brown University until 1893 when the Rhode Island College of Agricultural and the Mechanic Arts was established. See F. B. Andrews, *Land Grant Colleges*, 11-15.
- 34 Hills Ms., "Legislative History." A Committee on Education and Labor in the National House of Representatives reported in 1872-3, that no students were enrolled in agriculture in Vermont. Vermont, however, shared this distinction with 19 other states at the time. I. J. Kandel, *Federal Aid for Vocational Education*, 39.
- 35 See A. C. True, *History of Agricultural Education*, 112-119.
- 36 As late as 1921, a Senator, during a debate on a Teachers' College bill, opposed the location of such a college in Burlington, warning of the "dangers which lurk in that city for young girls." *Burlington Free Press*, March 4th.
- 37 *Burlington Free Press*, February 18, 1870; Hills Ms., "Legislative History."
- 38 *Rutland Herald*, November 2, 1870.
- 39 *Report*, 1873-4, Vt. Board of Agriculture, 609-621; Hills Ms., "Legislative History."
- 40 *Report*, 1873-4, Vt. Board of Agriculture, 785-790. The Committee confessed that some of its members had entered upon their duties in "a critical, even an antagonistic spirit." The Chairman of the Committee, James K. Tobey, was secretary of the Vermont State Grange (*Burlington Free Press*, November 17, 1886).
- 41 May 26, 1875.
- 42 Hills Ms., "Legislative History."
- 43 *Burlington Free Press*, October 14, 1876.
- 44 *Vermont House Journal*, 1876, 531-2.
- 45 W. B. Parker, *Justin S. Morrill*, 171-175.
- 46 *Vermont House Journal*, 1878, 35-6.

- 47 *Ibid.*, 67; See also *Hills Ms.*, "Legislative History" for the content of this measure.
- 48 Parker, *Justin S. Morrill*, 294.
- 49 See *Burlington Free Press*, October 10, 11, 15, 16, 25, 1878; *Vermont Watchman*, October 9; *Rutland Weekly Herald*, October 17, 1878.
- 50 Parker, *Morrill*, 294.
- 51 *Vermont House Journal*, 1878, 50.
- 52 *Vermont Senate Journal*, 233, 267; also *Hills Ms.*, "Legislative History."
- 53 Parker, *Morrill*, 295. The legislature awarded Poland a consolation prize by electing him to the Board of Trustees of the State Agricultural College.
- 54 Hills, *Five and Fifty Years*, 21-22; also *Hills Ms.*, "Legislative History."
- 55 A. C. True, *Agricultural Education*, 192-194.
- 56 *Ibid.*, 194-5.
- 57 *Ibid.*, 128-29.
- 58 *Ibid.*, 202-205.
- 59 Hills, *Five and Fifty Years*, 7.
- 60 *Ibid.*, 8.
- 61 *Journal*, 1885, Vermont State Grange, 19-20.
- 62 Message of Governor Ebenezer J. Ormsbee to the General Assembly, 1886, 17.
- 63 *Vermont House Journal*, H. 211; Hills, *Five and Fifty Years*, 9-10, 13.
- 64 See Guy B. Horton, *The Grange in Vermont*, 36; also *Vermont Watchman*, August 15, 1888.
- 65 See report of the Joint Committee in *Vermont Senate Journal*, 1888, 379. The Committee was very critical of the Experiment Station farm.
- 66 *Ibid.*, 261-262.
- 67 *Message of Governor William P. Dillingham, to the General Assembly*, 1888, 7-8.
- 68 *Burlington Free Press*, October 12, 1888.
- 69 Kandel, *Federal Aid to Vocational Education*, 33.
- 70 Joseph L. Hills, *The Attempted Disruption of the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College in 1890*. This history of the great battle of 1890 was written in 1936 and is in typescript in the possession of Dean Hills who generously allowed the author to make unrestricted use of it.
- 71 Dean Hills was at Massachusetts Agricultural College a class or two behind Myrick and remembers him as an ambitious youth who had always resented the slurs and innuendoes of Amherst College men and was convinced that agricultural education could not thrive in a "classical atmosphere." See *Attempted Disruption*, 116-118.
- 72 *New England Homestead*, XXIV (January 4, 1890), 4.
- 73 *Ibid.*, XXIV (Sept. 6, 1890), 301.
- 74 *Ibid.*
- 75 *Ibid.*, 1889-90—*Passim*.
- 76 *Ibid.*, XXIV. (March 1, 1890), 71.
- 77 *Ibid.*, XXIV. (June 21, 1890) 216.
- 78 *Burlington Free Press*, October 25, 1890.
- 79 *New England Homestead*, XXIV (Nov. 8, 1890), 376; Hills, *Attempted Disruption*, 50.
- 80 President Buckham to Professor W. W. Cooke, September 8, 1890. (Original in Hills, *Attempted Disruption*, 78-79.
- 81 *Burlington Free Press*, October 1, 1890. Hills says, "This formal opening never occurred at any other time, neither previous to 1890 nor subsequent to 1890. . . . The President addressed the agricultural students. He never did before, nor did he again. There was no reason for this show except an institutional political one . . ." *Attempted Disruption*, Appendix, 28.

82 Dean Hills has written, "That the House Committee on Education was packed is perfectly clear to one who studies its make-up. Three of the nine members were graduates of the University—the only graduates . . . among the 240 House members. . . . Four of the nine were physicians, three farmers and one an editor. . . ." *Attempted Disruption*, 90.

83 *Burlington Free Press*, October 25, 1890. Guy B. Horton is both inaccurate and unfair when he says that "The Senator was in a difficult position. His continuance in office lay in the hands of the men he was addressing." (*The Grange in Vermont*, 41-42). In the first place, Morrill had already been reelected ten days before he addressed the Committee. (See *Burlington Free Press*, October 15, 1890) and was therefore not in a "difficult position" on that account. Secondly, Morrill was expressing an opinion which he had maintained consistently since the land grant colleges went into operation. (See A. C. True, *Agricultural Education*, 106-111.) In 1867, for example, Morrill had told Professor Brewer of Yale that "he did not intend them to be agricultural schools. The title of the bill was not his, and was not a happy one. The clerk was responsible for the title. He expected the schools to be schools of science rather than classical colleges." . . .

84 "Hearings on the Agricultural College Bill," *Printed Bills of Vermont*, 1890, appendix 1-11. President Buckham was wrong when he said that agricultural students were not looked down upon. They were called "aggies" and "dungies" by other students and not admitted to fraternities at this time. Hills, *Attempted Disruption*, 293a.

85 *Burlington Free Press*, November 18, 1890.

86 "Hearings on the Agricultural College Bill," 1890, appendix, 4.

87 *Ibid.*, 11.

88 *Burlington Free Press*, October 31, 1890.

89 "Hearings," 1890, appendix, 2-3.

90 XXIV (October 4, 1890) 336.

91 *Burlington Free Press*, November 26, 1890.

92 *Ibid.*, November 17, 1890.

93 Hills, *Attempted Disruption*, 92-93. This was a real concession on their part inasmuch as only two farmers had ever been elected to the Board in twenty-five years, 1865-1890. Hills records (*Attempted Disruption*, 261), "It may be claimed that the legislature and not the University authorities elected. This is true. But almost always in later years, to the writer's personal knowledge, the University administration pulled the strings and really suggested the choices. He himself was sent to Montpelier several times to see that chosen people were chosen."

94 *Vermont House Journal*, 1890, 281-2.

95 *Vermont Watchman*, November 12, 1890.

96 *Vermont House Journal*, 296-297.

97 *Burlington Free Press*, November 26, 1890.

98 *Ibid.*

99 *Ibid.*, November 25, 1890.

100 *Vermont Senate Journal*, 1890, 264-265.

101 XXIV (November 29, 1890) 404.

102 *Rutland Weekly Herald*, November 27, 1890.

103 *Ibid.*, December 4, 1890.

104 *Vermont Watchman*, January 7, 1891.

105 *Burlington Free Press*, January 31, 1891.

106 Hills, *Five and Fifty Years*, 24. The total of \$42,351.89 spent was not far from the \$50,000 estimated by the proponents of the separation bill in 1890 for the purchase of a site and the erection of buildings for a separate agricultural college.

107 *Message of Levi K. Fuller, Governor of the State of Vermont to the General Assembly*, 1892, 9-10.

108 *Vermont House Journal*, 1892, 281. (Committee report.)

109 *Proceedings*, 1892, Vermont State Grange, 36. Worthy Master Alpha Messer was still unreconciled, 15-16.

110 See address of President C. F. Smith to the Vermont Dairymen's Association, in 1898, in which he said . . . "We do not expect to see the millennium in our Agricultural College until it is severed from all connection with any other institution." *Report*, 1898, Vermont Board of Agriculture, 11.

111 Even Dean Hills, who condemns absolutely the "attempted disruption" of 1890 admits readily that the advocates of separation had "a great deal of right on their side." *Attempted Disruption*, 311-12.

112 It is not unlikely that the advocates of separation themselves would have fallen out with one another over the question of educational policy. See the quarrel over the meaning of "practical education" between Alpha Messer and A. W. Cheever (presumably), the editor of the *New England Farmer, New England Farmer*, September 23, 1893. Both had worked for separation in 1890.

113 Hills, *Attempted Disruption*, 309-310.

114 I. J. Kandel reached the following conclusion in his *Federal Aid For Vocational Education*, 107: "The progress of agricultural colleges was delayed until the time when the colleges could persuade the farmers and others that their curricula possessed genuine value for practical purposes. But the colleges did not begin to demonstrate this fact adequately before the beginning of the twentieth century. A number of causes tended to retard the development of adequate and suitable curricula. The most important was that few knew what subjects really constituted a training preparatory to agricultural operations. Imitation of current, rule-of-thumb practices could more easily be obtained on a farm under practical conditions. The applied sciences underlying scientific farming had not yet been adequately developed to afford a satisfactory course of study, while the establishment of experiment stations . . . only begun to receive national support in 1887."

115 Hills, *Five and Fifty Years*, 25.

116 XLVIII (January 6, 1904) 62.

117 *Annual Report*, 1904, Vermont Dairymen's Association, 44-48.

118 *Ibid.*, 131.

119 Horton, *The Grange in Vermont*, 50-51.

120 *Laws of Vermont*, 1904.

121 *A Study of Education in Vermont* (Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin No. 7.) This study was prepared in 1914-15 at the request of the Vermont Educational Commission. The annual appropriations after 1888 were not a mark of any special favor to the University. Norwich had been the first to receive a tuition subsidy in 1884, and in 1888 Middlebury and the University of Vermont sought and obtained similar grants.

122 *Laws of Vermont*, 1908, No. 50.

123 *Laws of Vermont*, 1910, No. 75.

124 *Ibid.*, 1912, No. 83.

125 Carnegie Report, *Education in Vermont*, 3-4. The experts included such persons as Professor Milo B. Hillegas of Teachers College, Columbia University; Dr. William S. Learned of the Harvard School of Education; Professor Edward H. Farrington of the College of Agriculture of the University of Wisconsin.

126 *Ibid.*, 165-167.

127 *Ibid.*, 166-167.

128 *Ibid.*, 168.

129 *Ibid.*, 170.

130 *Ibid.*, 171.

- 131 *Ibid.*, 169.
- 132 A. C. True, *Agricultural Education*, 106-111.
- 133 *Carnegie Report*, 15.
- 134 President Buckham's statement in the legislative report of the Board of Trustees, 1909/1910, as quoted in *Hills Ms.*, "State Parsimony."
- 135 *Carnegie Report*, 14.
- 136 e.g. editorials in the *Burlington Free Press*, March 16, July 8, 13, 30, 31, 1914.
- 137 *Hills Ms.*, "Legislative History."
- 138 *Carnegie Report*, 213.
- 139 *Report*, 1908, Vermont Dairymen's Association, 133.
- 140 *Carnegie Report*, 128.
- 141 *Inaugural Message of John A. Mead, Governor of the State of Vermont to the General Assembly*, 1910, 6.
- 142 *Laws of Vermont*, 1910, No. 62.
- 143 *Ibid.*, 1915, 538, and No. 76.
- 144 *Burlington Free Press*, June 12, 1917.
- 145 *Retiring Message of Percival W. Clement, Governor of the State of Vermont to the General Assembly*, 1921, 16.
- 146 *Laws of Vermont*, 1921, 353.
- 147 *Retiring Message of Franklin S. Billings, Governor of the State of Vermont to the General Assembly*, 1927, 9.
- 148 Stanley Judd became Vermont's fourth Commissioner of Agriculture in 1945.
- 149 Rufus W. Stimson and Frank W. Lathrop, *History of Agricultural Education of Less Than College Grade in the United States* (Washington, U. S. Office of Education, 1942) 447.
- 150 *Laws of Vermont*, 1912, 84.
- 151 Stimson and Lathrop, *Agricultural Education of Less Than College Grades*, 450.
- 152 Hins, *Five and Fifty Years*, 28.
- 153 *Ibid.*, 28-29.
- 154 *Burlington Free Press*, February 24, 1941.
- 155 *Rutland Herald*, April 10, 1941; *Laws of Vermont*, 1941, No. 75.
- 156 *Message of Governor William H. Wills*, 1941.
- 157 *Laws of Vermont*, Special Session 1941, No. 3.
- 158 *Laws of Vermont*, No. 64. See also *Inaugural Address and Legislative Messages of Governor William H. Wills*, 1943.
- 159 *Farm Bureau News*, August, 1941.
- 160 *Ibid.*, April, 1941.
- 161 *Ibid.*, June, 1941.
- 162 Grange Committee on the Agricultural College, "What the Grange Wants For the College of Agriculture—and Why," 1945.
- 163 *Burlington Free Press*, January 1, 20, 1945.
- 164 *Laws of Vermont*, 1945, No. 71.
- 165 *Laws of Vermont*, 1945, No. 72.
- 166 *Ibid.*, No. 73.