

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

Sixty-Eighth Legislature.

SENATE.

No. 6.

STATE OF MAINE.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives:

By the concurrent action of both branches of the last legislature it was

*“Ordered—*That the Governor and Council appoint a committee, to consist of three members of the Executive Council, to examine into the affairs of the Maine State College, and the doings of the Trustees of said College, and to inspect the records and accounts, and the buildings and premises occupied by said College for the years 1895 and 1896, and to report to the next legislature the reasonable wants of said College, and make such other recommendations as the committee may deem advisable.”

The committee of the Executive Council on Public Instruction having been named by His Excellency, Governor Cleaves, as the special committee provided for in the foregoing order, and having given the subject due consideration, beg leave to make the following report:

In pursuance of our duties, we have visited the Maine State College at Orono, and have inspected the buildings and premises, the apparatus and appliances, and general equipment of the College. We have visited, also, for information and comparison, the Massachusetts Agricultural College, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the University of Vermont.

So far as was possible, we have acquainted ourselves with the history of the College, the doings of the Trustees, the courses of study, and with such other matters as seemed pertinent to our inquiry. While we have not knowingly overstepped our authority, we have felt compelled, in our wish to treat the subject comprehensively, to take a broad view of the duties under this commission. It early became clear to us that a simple statement of matters of fact would not be a compliance with the terms of the order, and that a report, to be of any value to the legislature must deal with the principles underlying the relations of the State to the College, since we are asked not only to report upon the condition of the College, but upon the "reasonableness" of its wants, the latter being clearly dependent upon the point of view and affected by any special claims which the College may have upon the State. It is well known, also, (and this was doubtless in the mind of the honorable Senator who framed the order,) that the few weeks of a legislative session, crowded with many and diverse duties, afford scant opportunity for the careful study of any one question except to the neglect or exclusion of others, and that much information already in print, (in various public documents,) is practically lost to many members from uncertainty where it may be found. We have, therefore, included much that has been already published, but which we have thought best to bring anew to the attention of the legislature, both in order that our report may aid somewhat in simplifying the discussion which invariably attends the introduction of a resolve to appropriate money for the College, and also, that the facts upon which we base our conclusions may be fully set forth.

And first of all we desire to put on record our belief in the unselfish devotion of the Trustees, the President and the Board of Instruction, to the welfare of the College.

We believe that they have administered its affairs with integrity, and fidelity to what seemed to them the best interests of the institution. We believe the quality of instruction at the present time to be of high order, while the positions of honor and responsibility to which many graduates have attained attest the character of that instruction in the past. We find that while the buildings are for the most part well planned and constructed, they are insufficient for the 300 and more students now in attendance, and hopelessly inadequate to the accommodation of the number, which, with a continuance of present conditions, may reasonably be expected during the next two years.

The same is true of the appliances and apparatus in every department, excepting the agricultural.

In view of the fact that the attendance has more than doubled within three years, and that all the wants of the College must be calculated with reference to the number of students, we can safely say that if the State accepts as its definite aim the realization of the hopes and plans of the President and Trustees for the future of the College, it must sooner or later provide for everything that is contained in the President's estimate of the needs of the institution, presented to this legislature.

We take pleasure, also, in saying that at no institution have we seen in attendance a body of young men of more manly bearing or more creditable appearance. While other and older colleges have more complete facilities and larger endowments, we believe that in excellence of instruction, in the orderly behavior of its students, and in all the influences which make for the upbuilding of character, the College will take high rank with other schools of learning within and without the State.

If no other consideration were involved save the merits of the College as an institution of learning, and were your committee expected merely to state what additional buildings, appliances and income might be necessary or desirable to a college with a certain number of students in actual or prospective attendance,

its duty would be easily and quickly performed; but we are required to report its *reasonable* wants,—reasonable, also, we apprehend, as regards the taxpayer, or, in other words, what can the State be *reasonably* asked to do for the College?

The difficulty in answering this question in exact terms is obvious. We are met at the outset with a disagreement of public sentiment as to the existence of any obligation on the part of the State to supply what may be, on the part of the College, an entirely reasonable “want.”

Here is something to be determined in justice alike to the College and the people. If there is an obligation on the part of the State to the College, as has been frequently urged upon the legislature, then it is time that it be clearly defined and cheerfully acknowledged. If, on the other hand, the support of the College is purely a question of educational policy, it is equally important that the people so understand it.

In the absence of a well defined attitude of the State towards the College, and with a view to open up the entire question, if possible, to final settlement, we have undertaken to give somewhat of the history of the College, and of legislation prior to its establishment, in order that by a consideration of what the College was designed to do and what the College is now doing, the legislature may determine to what extent hereafter the people should be charged with its support. To this we have added our own views and certain recommendations in accordance with the requirements of the legislative order, but we fully understand that they carry no weight of authority. Being charged with this duty, we have performed it to the best of our ability, and we believe the conclusions forced upon us by the facts of the case to be entirely just, both to the College and the State.

Many of the early Massachusetts colonists were college-bred men. They were keenly alive to the value of learning, and in their poverty laid the foundation of a college which should be to the New World what Oxford and Cambridge were to the old. Education with them meant strictly classical training. Latin and Greek, with Theology and the study of the Scriptures, was

in their view a sufficient curriculum for men whose chief end was "to glorify God and enjoy Him forever."

This distinctly individual and self-centered aim was dominant until the awakened political consciousness of the Revolutionary era brought to light the value of educated citizenship to the new Republic. From this time forward, many new colleges were founded and the cause of education in all the states was aided and recognized both by constitutional provisions and legislative enactments.

It is noticeable that public sentiment in New England early defined the relation of the state to education, and while in the beginning all schools, academies and colleges received continuous support by taxation, legislative grant, and private benevolence, the state soon withdrew from the support of colleges and academies, leaving them to the care of the religious denominations most active in their establishment, and retaining under its especial care and control only the common schools, maintained at public expense, as being essential to the "common welfare" and the "mutual defence."

Of a complete "state system" from the primary school to and including a professional course, all at State expense and under State management, we find no trace, but free public schools, and a degree of compulsory attendance, with higher education and professional training at the cost of the individual, may properly enough be termed the "New England idea" in education.

While the traditional idea of a liberal education held its own in the older institutions during the earlier decades of the present century, and gave place but grudgingly to the pressing claims of a growing scientific knowledge to a share in their courses of study, the newer Western States were impatient of what was deemed a narrow curriculum, and began to claim recognition for a so-called broader course of advanced study, more in keeping with the spirit of a thriving and inventive people engaged in subduing the wilderness and harnessing the powers of nature.

The University of Michigan, which stands to-day as the leading exponent of the idea of collegiate and professional training

at public expense, was one product of this movement for a so-called "practical" education, and largely from this same source came the influences which culminated in the act of Congress commonly known as the "Agricultural College" bill, which became a law July 2, 1862.

This act, entitled, "To establish colleges for the benefit of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts," endowed each state, under conditions, with as many times 30,000 acres of public land as it had representatives in both houses of Congress in 1860. We quote briefly from the text:

"The interest of the entire remaining gross proceeds of the grant shall be used for the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life."

"The State legislature must formally accept the grant within three years, establish at least one school of the character set forth above within five years, must replace all losses to the fund, must invest the entire gross proceeds, after a permitted expenditure of not more than 10 per cent thereof for sites or experimental farms, in safe stocks yielding not less than five per cent on their par value, and must use the interest wholly—excluding the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings—in support of the school or schools established by this Act."

The plain object and intent of this act is clearly stated in the remarks of Mr. Morrill of Vermont, (who had charge of the bill and who made the only speech in its behalf,) as follows:

"This bill proposes to establish at least one college in every state upon a sure and perpetual foundation, accessible to all, but especially to the sons of toil, where all the needful science for the practical avocations of life shall be taught, where neither the higher graces of classical studies nor that military drill our country now so greatly appreciates will be entirely ignored, and where agriculture, the foundation of all present and future prosperity, may look for troops of earnest friends studying its familiar and recondite economies, at last elevating it to that higher level where it may fearlessly invoke comparison with the most advanced standards of the world.

* * * * * The bill fixes the leading objects, but properly, as I think, leaves to the states considerable latitude in carrying out practical details. Each state will be the judge of its own requirements, and I have no doubt each will feel sufficient interest in the subject to make a judicious disposition of the grant. The entire fund is to be held good and wholly devoted to the object, as the states are to pay all incidental expenses, even the first cost of the buildings and their subsequent repairs. But it cannot be doubted that in every state this charge will be mainly a nominal one, as many towns will be likely to strive to secure the location of these institutions within their limits, and an active competition will arise from the tender of lands and buildings in order to obtain an end so desirable. If these colleges should be established, it is to be hoped the donation of lands, with some little outside aid, will be sufficient at no remote period to offer instruction free of charge for tuition, and that through connection with farms which may be attached indigent young men, by voluntary labor of a few hours each day, may, where desirable, give an equivalent, wholly or in part, for their board. Certainly the opportunity of obtaining a sound education adapted to the wants of the individual will be offered at reduced rates, a love of useful labor will be promoted, and thus health and usefulness can not but be advanced among those who otherwise might waste a life in uncultivated ignorance or cultivated imbecility. * * * * *

There is and can be no mode by which the resources of a country can be so fully developed as by educating the vast numbers who are to devote their lives to agricultural employments as tillers or owners of the soil. By this means each man is trained to bring into action his whole mental and physical force. A dull, uncultured man, though physically a giant, does little work for which brute power might not often be easily substituted. He may move mountains, but the inevitable mouse only appears. The skilled and thoroughly trained farmer is sure to harvest larger crops and with less labor than his unskilled and untrained neighbor. Science, working unobtrusely, produces larger annual returns and constantly increases fixed capital, while ignorant routine produces exactly the reverse. The prejudice against educated farmers arises from the fact that, while those usually styled such may be truly educated in some sense, they have no real agricultural education, and are no more fitted for their duties in that sphere than the aeronaut is fitted for a railroad engineer. * * * * *

When we have a race of educated farmers—men who have parted with their conceit for absolute knowledge—practically illustrating their education by their works, they will not turn out sailors on horseback, as it may be admitted some of the so-called farmers have done. * * * * *

These colleges, founded in every state, will elevate the character of farmers and mechanics, increase the prosperity of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, and may to some extent guard against the sheer ignorance of all military art which shrouded the country, and especially the North, at the time when the tocsin of war sounded at Fort Sumter."

Public sentiment, in this State and in the Eastern States generally, was divided upon the question of accepting the Federal grant under the imposed conditions. It was felt that Maine was already supplied with colleges beyond the demands of higher education, and doubt was freely expressed as to the wisdom of establishing another, with only a moderate endowment, which might entail continuous State assistance.

The prevailing belief, however, seems to have been that it would be unwise to neglect an opportunity which promised so much for the agricultural interest of the State, and the grant was seasonably accepted. The Public Documents for the years 1863-68 contain voluminous reports of Commissioners, Secretaries of the Board of Agriculture, the President and Trustees of the College, and the messages of the Governors for those years, reflecting various phases of public feeling on the proposed establishment, but showing the popular conception of the College to be conformed to the ideas of Mr. Morrill, before quoted. In other words, that the College was to give to the "industrial classes" a scientific knowledge which should make farming both attractive and profitable, and which should elevate both "agriculture and the mechanic arts" to the plane of other pursuits and professions by filling their ranks with educated men.

The message of Governor Coburn to the legislature of 1863, (Pub. Doc., 1863, p. 146) alludes to the subject in the following words:

"It is earnestly hoped that the legislature of Maine will not prove backward in accepting the offer which Congress, with far-reaching sagacity, has tendered to us, and will establish a school where the sons of farmers may freely obtain all the necessary facilities to fit them to become ornaments to their profession, and, when themselves established on their farms, to become so many centres of light, radiating knowledge to all within the scope of their influence, both by precept and example.

By so doing, permanent and effectual aid will be given to that interest which is the substratum of all wealth, the foundation upon which all other interests build, etc.”

The foregoing quotations, one from the author of the original act of Congress, and the other from the earnest friend and liberal benefactor of the College, are given simply to show what results were expected from its establishment, and that it owes its existence to a belief that scientific farming would be promoted by the education of farmers’ sons.

That this expectation has not been realized is a matter of common knowledge, but it is not a part of our argument to show what influences are responsible for the growth of the College wholly along the line of instruction in the “mechanic arts,” and in those branches of study *not* “especially related to agriculture.”

We know that the friends of the Institution have for years rebutted the popular notion that it should be considered mainly an agricultural College, and the occupations of its graduates fully sustain their contention. In 1892 the 348 graduates then living were employed as follows:

AGRICULTURE AND ALLIED INDUSTRIES.

Farmers.....	17
Professors of Agriculture.....	2
Directors of Agricultural Experiment Stations.....	2
Chemists to Agricultural Experiment Stations.....	5
Veterinary Surgeons.....	3
Nurserymen.....	2
Florist.....	1
Assistant U. S. Bureau of Animal Industry.....	1
Editor of Agricultural paper.....	1
	<hr/>
Total.....	34

CIVIL ENGINEERING AND ALLIED INDUSTRIES.

Civil Engineers.....	72
Professor Civil Engineering.....	1
Instructor Civil Engineering.....	1
	<hr/>
Total.....	74

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING AND ALLIED INDUSTRIES.

Mechanical Engineers.....	26	
Draughtsmen.....	18	
Manufacturers.....	16	
Architects.....	3	
Professor Mechanical Engineering.....	1	
Instructors Mechanical Shop.....	4	
Mining Engineers.....	2	
	<hr/>	
Total.....		70

EDUCATIONAL AND LITERARY WORK.

Teachers.....	22	
Professors and Instructors in Colleges not included in above.....	8	
Superintendents of Schools.....	2	
Journalists	8	
	<hr/>	
Total.....		40

PROFESSIONS.

Lawyers.....	17	
Physicians.....	10	
Clergymen.....	3	
	<hr/>	
Total.....		30

BUSINESS.

Merchants.....	13	
Clerks.....	6	
Travelling Salesmen.....	2	
Bankers.....	3	
Real Estate Agents.....	2	
Insurance Agents.....	2	
	<hr/>	
Total.....		28
Miscellaneous employments.....		72
	<hr/>	
Total.....		348

The words of Hon. Phinehas Barnes, one of the most eminent men of his generation in this State, quoted in the report of the Secretary of the Board of Agriculture for 1866, may prove suggestive in connection with the foregoing tables:

“The comprehensive observation of all is, that the common scientific school, like the common college, though it may, like the college, draw many of its students from the ranks of laboring life, returns few or none to those ranks. If it educates the young man who was a hand worker, it educates him *out* of his labor—it does not usually so educate him that he will go back and belong to the “industrial classes.” It makes of him a professional man,—an honorable and a useful one, it may be,—but by the very act of his education in *that* form he ceases to be one of the class which the congressional endowment was designed to benefit and improve, as a class by themselves.”

It would indeed appear that while the College “may draw many of its students from the ranks of laboring life, it returns few or none to those ranks.” The records of older colleges show that the sons of farmers who achieve an education rarely return to the farm, and it would not appear that the work of the State College has wrought any considerable change in this regard.

The College to-day in its practical workings is a school of Science and Technology, and is so advertised. We do not question, but have every reason to believe, that *as such* it is an institution of high rank, and that its graduates are well equipped for professional or business life. At least two-thirds of its students, we should say, are following the technical courses, to wit: civil, mechanical and electrical engineering. Nine distinct courses of study are now open to all, without regard to residence, free of tuition, each requiring four years for completion. One of these is an “agricultural course,” which is treated, according to the last catalogue “as a branch of technology.”

“For those who wish practical rather than scientific training in agriculture shorter courses are provided.” The Pharmacy and Preparatory Medical courses have recently been added.

By accepting the National grant and deciding to establish an independent college, the State assumed to supply suitable buildings and appliances. It was not expected that the State would

be called upon for large or continuous appropriations, but that the buildings being provided, the income from the "donation of public lands with some little outside aid" would provide for the annual current expense. The intention to commit the State to a large annual outlay was distinctly disclaimed by those most urgent for the acceptance of the grant.

The "Commission on the proposed Agricultural College" reported as follows: (Pub. Doc., 1865.)

"We believe that the proposed institution should be sustained by the donation from government, and we are unwilling, as individuals, to become party to or endorse by our recommendation any arrangement, which by any possibility, can subject the State to loss, or impose on it any burthen or responsibility beyond that which it has voluntarily assumed in accepting the donation.

"The question presents itself, Shall we reject the donation because instead of yielding an annual income of twenty-five or fifty thousand dollars it will yield ten thousand only for the education of our industrial classes? This question we answer in the negative, because the expenditure of even that sum only for the proposed object cannot fail to be productive of good results; not to so great extent as the expenditure of a larger sum, but yet to *some* extent. We should answer the question in the affirmative, if by the acceptance of the donation the State was to be committed, directly or indirectly, to the expenditure of its own moneys in furtherance of the object."

It appears, however, that the State has appropriated for all purposes the following amounts, viz:

1867.....	\$20,000 00
1868.....	10,000 00
1870.....	50,000 00
1871.....	6,000 00
1872.....	18,000 00
1873.....	24,000 00
1874.....	12,500 00
1875.....	10,500 00
1876.....	8,000 00
1877.....	15,218 00
1878.....	6,500 00
1880.....	3,000 00
1881.....	3,500 00
1883.....	13,000 00
1885.....	12,400 00
1887.....	20,550 00
1888.....	14,050 00
1889.....	20,000 00
1890.....	10,000 00
1891.....	12,500 00
1892.....	12,000 00
1893.....	9,000 00
1894.....	3,000 00
1895.....	20,000 00
1896.....	20,000 00
Total.....	<u>\$353,718 00</u>

By the passage of the Federal law known as the "Hatch Act," in 1887, and the establishment of the Experiment Station as an adjunct to the College, \$15,000 has been added to the annual income.

In accordance with the terms of the Morrill act of 1890, the College receives this year the further sum of \$21,000, to be increased \$1,000, annually, until it reaches \$25,000, at which figure it is to remain.

The following tables show the recent rapid expansion of the College, and its present condition relatively to the other colleges in the State:

MAINE STATE COLLEGE.

Year.	No. of Students.	No. of Instructors.	No. of Courses.	Approximate Income, Including State Appropriation.
1884.....	91	10	5	\$16,000
1885.....	92	10	5	16,000
1886.....	103	10	5	14,000
1887.....	121	10	5	33,000
1888.....	122	10	5	46,000
1889.....	131	12	5	48,000
1890.....	113	14	5	42,000
1891.....	102	18	5	86,000
1892.....	128	19	5	69,000
1893.....	139	24	5	49,000
1894.....	203	24	5	53,000
1895.....	279	31	8	57,000
1896.....	316	31	9	68,000

YEARS 1895-6.

	No. of Students.	No. of Instructors.	Approximate Income.
Bowdoin.....	243	19	\$47,000
Colby.....	206	17	33,500
Bates.....	218	9	36,600
Maine State.....	316	*31	48,000

We come now to the claim so often and so effectively urged upon the legislature, that by accepting the National land grant the State became bound to support the College, and that to keep faith with the Federal Government it must continue such support. We cannot agree to this unqualified proposition. It was not so understood by the early friends of the College, it was never so contemplated by the people at large, it cannot be sustained by the conditions of any act of Congress or of the Maine legislature. By accepting the grant the State agreed: (1) To establish a school of the described character within five years; (2) To replace all losses to the fund; (3) To use the interest wholly in support of the school, and (4) To repair and

* Excluding State aid.

preserve the buildings, which the State was to provide. So much and *no more* the State *must* do to preserve faith with the National Government.

Appropriations for other purposes cannot be claimed on the ground of obligation, for the State long ago "established a school" within the meaning of the act, and must certainly be its own judge as to the extent of its further benefactions.

If the College can fairly enlarge its "plant," expand its courses of study, and increase its corps of instructors with no limitation save the needs of the rapidly growing number of students from within and without the State which free tuition may attract, and if the State is bound to make annual appropriations commensurate with such expansion, then one might almost be inclined to ask whether the College exists for the State, or the State for the College.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts divided the proceeds of its land grant between the Agricultural College at Amherst and the Institute of Technology in Boston, in the proportion of two-thirds and one-third. The State of Maine, on a basis of assessed valuation, has appropriated for the State College *two and one-half times as much as has Massachusetts in aid of both those institutions.* *Massachusetts* pays the Institute of Technology (a private corporation) annually, the tuition of twenty young men, the charge being \$200 per year. *This is all that is done by Massachusetts, with seven times our assessed, and twice our per capita, valuation, for such technical instruction as our State is furnishing free to everyone, a fact which young men of other states are not slow to recognize.*

The Massachusetts Agricultural College, an institution of the very highest rank, and which conforms more nearly, we believe, than any other, to the original design of such colleges, (showing in a total graduate list of 510, that 355 are engaged in farming and allied industries,) received for the year ending June 30, 1896, an income of \$60,000, as against that of the Maine State College of \$68,000.

The state of Vermont, with an assessed valuation somewhat more than one-half that of Maine, but with a larger per capita

valuation, has appropriated in aid of the University of Vermont, an old established classical and scientific institution, the sum of \$6,000 per year since 1888, of which amount \$3,600 is for the use of the Agricultural Department; making the sum total of appropriations, \$48,000.

On a basis of assessed valuation the State of Maine has done more than three and one-half times as much as Vermont, for their respective institutions.

In view of the foregoing facts, we do not think it reasonable that the State be asked to further increase its gifts to the College, by granting it a large fixed sum annually, nor a tax endowment of one-tenth of a mill on the State valuation, as has been often suggested.

We are squarely opposed to such legislation, believing it to be vicious in principle and unwise, whether applied to this or any other purpose. Nor do we believe in the justice of imposing a common tax for the continuous support of any college or professional school. The provisions of Article VIII of the Constitution clearly define the duty of the State to higher education. "All academies, colleges and seminaries of learning within the State" are to be encouraged and suitably endowed "from time to time, as the circumstances of the people may authorize," but it was never intended by the framers of the Constitution nor by the incorporators of the State College that collegiate training should be grafted on the public school system of the State and be supported by the same method. Common schools are supported by the State because they are essential to the "mutual defence" and the "common welfare." Professional education and the high liberal training necessary to the professions must be for the benefit of a small and special class, and therefore not (except by a strained construction,) within the reason why the State assumes to educate at all.

Aside from the principle involved, and considered only as a matter of sound business policy, we should deem it unwise for the State to commit itself to the support of a college, the growth and success of which is measured by the number of students attracted thereto by the multiplication of free courses

of study. There is no logical limit to such growth, nor to the demands upon the treasury which the increasing expenses of administration would entail.

When in the course of time the needs of the still growing university shall have outrun the income from the proposed fixed annual appropriation or tax endowment, will its friends then admit that it has reached the limit of its usefulness, and refrain from asking the State for further aid? The history of the College would not lead us to expect this.

The trustees and faculty have heretofore used the increased income of the College to broaden its courses of study, and the tendency will always be in this direction. With this we are not at present concerned, for no college thinks its income sufficient, nor rests content with its means of instruction; our disagreement touches solely the principle of State maintenance, and our position is the "New England idea" of higher education mainly at the expense of those immediately and directly benefited.

We do not wish to be misunderstood. While we would most gladly see the College rank with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in endowment, in equipment, and in popularity, we would have it maintained by the same means; we would not tax the people for its support. The College should be able, sooner or later, to stand alone. Private benevolence will never be largely attracted to it, if it is understood that the State will vote, however reluctantly, large sums of money annually for its use.

We would have the State do what it voluntarily undertook when it accepted the National land grant, for that is a matter of contract, but it is unreasonable to claim that because the State has already done more than it was bound to do, its obligation to the future support of the college is thereby correspondingly increased.

It seems to us that a tuition charge fairly representing the worth of the instruction received should be made to all students. At present, the College is free to everyone within and without

the State, although from 1879 to 1891 a fee of \$30 per year was charged. There is no universal rule in this respect; out of forty-five such colleges, thirty-eight are free to residents, and twenty-four to non-residents. If tuition were charged, we should favor the establishment of a certain number of scholarships by the State, to be at the disposal of the faculty, in aid of meritorious students. Aside from the injustice to the taxpayer we doubt if unlimited free tuition is an unmixed benefit either to the college or to the students.

Not all the undergraduates of the State College are unable to pay for their education, nor can it claim to be exclusively the College "of the people." The present freshman class of Colby University, (the only one of the three other colleges in the State to keep such statistics,) has sixty-one members. Of this number, the fathers of thirty-seven are either mechanics, laborers or farmers, while but seven are from the homes of professional men, and five are orphans.

Much more might be said upon this subject, and especially upon the logical basis of taxation for educational purposes, but your committee have undertaken to do little more than to state the facts concerning the College and their conclusions relative to the alleged obligation of the State to its permanent support. We have shown that the College was established mainly for the benefit which was expected to accrue to the farming interests of the State. We have called attention to the departure of the College from its original design, and its growth into a College of science and technology. We note in recent reports of the president and trustees that one of the "greatest needs of the College is more students," that its courses of study are "broadening every year," that if Maine will follow the example of Colorado "it would be possible to build up here an institution of the greatest breadth and usefulness, which would be able to furnish facilities and opportunities excelled by those of very few colleges."

It now remains to be seen if the legislature will commit the State to this idea of a university "of the greatest breadth and usefulness."

It is a question of justice as much as of generosity. Maine has never suffered for lack of colleges, although she has given them little aid.

Her grants to the three other colleges combined amount to less than the appropriations for the State College in a single year, although the constitutional provision extends equally to all. The State College has now an income, without State aid, larger than that of our best endowed colleges, and it would seem, with the receipts from such a tuition charge as might with entire reasonableness be made, that the work which it is especially prepared to do might be done with but small demands upon the State treasury.

We are told that Maine is a prosperous State, but we know that it is not a wealthy State; it became an organic community, not to shine by the amount of gratuitous instruction it can furnish, but "to establish justice, ensure tranquillity, provide for the mutual defence and promote the common welfare." Your committee believe that to adopt the plans and wishes of the trustees as the future policy of the State towards the College would mean an unreasonable and constantly increasing outlay, and a radical departure from the principles which have heretofore controlled the State in its relations to higher education.

Respectfully submitted,

ELIAS DUDLEY FREEMAN,
OLIVER B. CLASON,
JOSEPH C. HOLMAN.

STATE OF MAINE.

IN SENATE, January 19, 1897.

On motion by Mr. CLASON of Kennebec, laid on table to be printed,
pending reference.

KENDALL M. DUNBAR, *Secretary.*