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From the beginning of English colonization in America the granting of land for educational purposes was common. As early as 1619, just twelve years after the founding of Jamestown, the Virginia Company in England set aside ten thousand acres for the establishment of a university in the infant colony of Virginia, and two years later an additional thousand acres was appropriated for the partial support of a preparatory school at Charles City. Subsequently the governments of various of the other colonies made similar grants. That this procedure should be followed was entirely natural, for land was the main source of wealth throughout the colonial period and long afterward. During the latter years of the American Revolution and the period of readjustment immediately following, one after another of the original states transferred to the federal government such titles as it possessed to unsettled land west of the Allegheny mountains. Eventually, as the boundaries of the nation were extended westward, the so-called public domain came to embrace approximately three-fourths of the present area of the country. The government utilized this rich heritage not only to provide funds for its maintenance and for payments to war veterans but also to make extensive grants to individual states and private establishments for the promotion of internal improvements and public education.
The possibility of using public lands for the advancement of education was a topic of constant discussion in Congress under the Articles government. The Ordinance of 1787 maintained that since “religion, morals, and knowledge” were “necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged” and provided that the proceeds from the sale of land in one section in each township be set aside for the support of public education. The money thus acquired was used for the development of elementary education. As new states were admitted to the Union, however, Congress began making grants for the establishment of institutions of higher learning. For many years the typical appropriation was an area of two townships or 46,080 acres.

Washington during his presidency desired to found a national university in the capital city; Jefferson after he left office labored diligently in behalf of the University of Virginia; and hundreds of other men of prominence throughout the country advocated tax-supported colleges and universities. But for nearly a century after independence little progress was made in winning popular approval of such a system. One reason for this situation was the prevalent belief that special education was needed in only a few professions, such as the ministry, law, and medicine. Even in these fields college training was in many of the states neither required by law nor regarded as essential. At the same time, particularly in the West, there was widespread prejudice against the college-bred man. Moreover, the religious denominations almost without exception bitterly opposed the intrusion of the government into the field of higher education, which they insisted was a necessary and logical function of the churches; schools supported by the state, they feared, would become atheistic and anti-Christian in their teachings. As a matter of fact, since practically all the colleges of the country had been founded and maintained by religious groups, it was not unnatural that these bodies should resent the proposed participation of the government in their established interest.

Gradually, however, the attitude of the public toward higher education underwent a significant change. The extension of tax-supported elementary schools tended to eradicate or modify old

---

1 A township consisted of 36 sections of 640 acres each.
prejudices, and the colleges were at times led by their ever-present financial difficulties to seek aid from all available sources, even the government. While state grants of one sort or another to higher education were more common in the West than in the East, they gained popular approval in all parts of the Union.

Especially was this true in Pennsylvania. Indeed, throughout her entire history as an independent state the commonwealth has granted subsidies of one sort or another to her various colleges. As early as 1785 the legislature appropriated five hundred pounds sterling and ten thousand acres of public land toward the support of Dickinson College, and two years later a grant of ten thousand acres was made to Franklin College. By the act of incorporation of 1819 the legislature assigned forty acres of land in Allegheny City to the Western University (the University of Pittsburgh) "in accordance with the Pennsylvania policy of partial state maintenance of privately controlled schools of higher education." Meanwhile numerous other colleges became beneficiaries of the state. Though money constituted the usual form of assistance, appropriation of land was not uncommon. At first it was customary for the legislature to give the total amount in one payment, but after about 1810 the grants were made for specific sums to be paid annually for a period of years. In many respects, however, this latter plan was unsatisfactory both to the colleges and to the legislature. As a consequence a movement was started during the early thirties to place state appropriations to higher education on a permanent basis. Finally after a prolonged debate the legislature in 1838 authorized the annual payment of one thousand dollars for a period of ten years "to each University or College, now incorporated, or which may be incorporated by the legislature, and maintaining at least four professors and instructing constantly 100 students. . . ." But before the expiration of this period these annual appropriations were reduced. Eventually they were discontinued, and thenceforth direct grants of money or land were awarded only by special appropriations for specific purposes. Even these tended to decrease in amount during the forties and fifties.

One of the recipients of financial aid during these years was the Farmers' High School of Pennsylvania, chartered in 1855, which
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8 A. Starrett, *Through One Hundred and Fifty Years*, p. 66.
between 1857 and 1861 inclusive received for the erection of buildings grants totaling $99,900. In 1862 the name of the institution was changed to the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania and in 1874 to the Pennsylvania State College.

The First Land-Grant Bill, 1859

Coincident with the trend in Pennsylvania and other states toward some sort of state aid to higher education was the growing feeling that the existing schools were too exclusively classical, that consequently a new type of college education was needed to meet the requirements of scientific, mechanical, and practical vocations in life, and that it was the duty of the federal government to make substantial contributions toward its support. Nevertheless, in spite of the precedent for land subsidies to education in the Ordinance of 1787 and subsequent special grants to states for the founding of universities, the adoption of a permanent program was long delayed. It was, however, a topic of intermittent discussion in Congress. As early as 1836 the trustees of Rutgers College, learning that a plan was under consideration to make federal grants of lands to certain literary institutions, appointed a committee to represent the claims of their institution should the program be enacted into law. As time passed, the demand for training in the mechanic arts and in agriculture increased throughout the country. In 1850 the movement was given considerable impetus when the legislature of Michigan made a specific request of Congress for a subsidy for this purpose.

On February 18, 1859, a bill, introduced by Congressman Justin Morrill of Vermont, embodying a definite program of federal assistance passed the two houses of Congress under the general title "An Act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of Agriculture and the mechanic Arts." The aim of the gift as stated was the "endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college [in each state] where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific or classical studies, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, as the legislature 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."
President Buchanan, who regarded the measure as "both inexpedient and unconstitutional," returned it to Congress with his veto on February 24, stating his objections in a lengthy, carefully prepared message. He felt that the flooding of the market with an additional volume of land would seriously reduce the demand for government holdings, upon which a minimum price of $1.25 an acre had been placed by law. "At the present moment," he wrote, "the price has been reduced to those who purchase the bounty-land warrants of the old soldiers at 85 cents per acre, and of these warrants there are outstanding and unlocated . . . 11,990,391 acres. . . . If in addition thirty-three States shall enter the market with their land scrip, the price must be greatly reduced below even 85 cents per acre, as much to the prejudice of the old soldiers who have not already parted with their land warrants as to the Government. It is easy to perceive that with the glut of the market the Government can sell little or no land at $1.25 per acre, when the price of bounty warrants and scrip shall be reduced to half this sum. . . . Under the bill the States may sell their scrip at any price it may bring, . . . for without this fund they cannot proceed to establish their colleges within the five years to which they are limited. . . . It is manifest, therefore, that to the extent to which this bill will prevent the sale of public lands at $1.25 per acre, to that amount it will have precisely the same effect upon the Treasury as if we should impose a tax to create a loan to endow these State Colleges. . . ." The bill, he further declared, would operate to the injury of the new states, since it would make it possible for "wealthy individuals to acquire large tracts of public land and hold them for speculative purposes. The low price to which this land scrip will probably be reduced will tempt speculators to buy it in large amounts and locate it on the best lands belonging to the Government. The eventual consequences must be that the men who desire to cultivate the soil will be compelled to purchase these very lands at rates much higher than the price at which they could be obtained from the Government." Moreover, Buchanan branded the bill as a serious infringement on the rights of the states. In expressing the belief that it would "injuriously interfere with existing colleges . . . in many of which agriculture is taught and in all of which it ought to be so taught," he was voicing the sentiment of a large part of the population. "What the effect will be on these institutions of
creating an indefinite number of rival colleges sustained by the endowment of the Federal Government," he continued, "it is not difficult to determine." In conclusion he declared that Congress had no authority under the Constitution to donate public lands or even appropriate federal funds "to provide colleges for the purpose of educating their own people," since it would be an "actual consolidation of the Federal and State Governments so far as the great taxing and money power is concerned, and constitute a sort of partnership between the two in the Treasury of the United States, equally ruinous to both." The ideas expressed in this veto are significant not only because they represented a large public sentiment in the country, but also because they help to explain the attitude assumed later by organized groups toward the Morrill land-grant act of 1862.

**THE MORRILL ACT, JULY 2, 1862**

The veto message of President Buchanan was in harmony, of course, with the state-rights principles of the Democratic party of pre-Civil War years. In the presidential election of 1860, however, the new Republican party, which was favorably inclined toward the extension of federal authority, came into control of the government. Consequently the Morrill act was passed again by Congress and was approved by President Lincoln on July 2, 1862.

This "act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of Agriculture and the mechanic Arts" authorized the allocation of thirty thousand acres to each state or territory for each of its senators and representatives in Congress and provided that the distribution be made to individuals in parcels of not less than a quarter section (160 acres). When public lands existed within the limits of a state, the allotment was to be made from such lands therein as were subject to "private entry" at $1.25 an acre. Otherwise the selection was to be made elsewhere from land subject to the same entry restrictions. In such instances the Secretary of the Interior
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4 J. D. Richardson, *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, vol. v, pp. 543 ff.
5 The act of 1859 called for the allocation of twenty thousand acres for each congressman.
was instructed to issue land scrip "to the amount in acres for the deficiency (outside a State) of its distributive shares." In no case, however, could this scrip be located within the limits of any other state or territory of the United States, "but their assignees may thus locate said land scrip upon any of the unappropriated lands of the United States subject to sale at private entry." Mineral lands were expressly excluded from entry; and when lands "shall be selected from those which have been raised to double the minimum price, in consequence of railroad grants, they shall be computed to the States at the maximum price, and the number of acres proportionally diminished."

Each state was to bear all the expense of the management of the land or scrip, which was to be sold. The proceeds, invested "in stocks of the United States or some other safe stocks yielding not less than five percentum upon the par value of said stocks," were to constitute a "perpetual fund," the capital of which was to "remain forever undiminished." The interest on this investment was to "be inviolably appropriated" by the state, which was to take and claim the benefits of the act to the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college, where the object should be, not 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 a 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." · No part of the funds realized was to be applied directly or indirectly "for the erection or the repair of buildings." The act permitted, however, the use of a sum equal to ten per cent of the total receipts from the land sales for the purchase of acreage for experimental farms but forbade its use for buildings or for the repair of buildings on such farms.

Legislative acceptance of the land grants was required by the Morrill act, and no land was to be located before January 1, 1863. Any state participating in the benefits of the act was required to establish within five years one or more colleges according to the specifications outlined in the law. The rigid restrictions placed

*United States Statutes at Large, vol. xii, pp. 503 ff.
The original act was amended three times. The amendments of April 14, 1864, and July 23, 1866, extended to July 23, 1871, the time in which states
on the acceptance of the benefits of the Morrill act by the states were designed to prevent the dissipation of the funds derived from the sale of the land grants and at the same time to guarantee as far as possible the fulfillment of the main educational objective of the donation, "to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, . . . in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life." Indeed, the sponsors of the act appear to have realized fully the opportunities for graft, misuse of funds, and political favoritism which the disposal of the land and the supervision of the moneys derived from its sale placed in the hands of unscrupulous politicians; and they endeavored to erect every possible safeguard against them.

In the course of time the forty-eight states and the territories of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, each of which has become a recipient of the benefits of the Morrill act, have developed considerable difference in the methods of allocating the income from the grants received. Sixty-nine institutions, seventeen of which are for negro students, are now designated land-grant colleges and universities. A number of the southern states follow the practice of dividing the income between an institution for white students and one for negroes, and each of the other states and territories excepting Massachusetts maintains one college or university to receive the benefits of the funds. Massachusetts apportions her funds to two colleges but has no university. At the other extreme Ohio has three universities aided by the state, one of which, Ohio State University at Columbus, receives the whole of the land-grant income. Nineteen of the states have independent colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts in addition to state universities, twenty-one conduct colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts as parts of their state universities, and seven have no state universities.7

might accept the provisions of the original act. The third amendment, passed on March 3, 1883, permitted the investment of the capital derived from the sale of lands in a greater variety of stocks and bonds than had been allowed by the original act. The so-called "Second Morrill Act of 1890" and the "Nelson Amendment" of 1905 provided for annual grants of money to land-grant colleges and universities for specific purposes.

7For a general detailed description of the Morrill land grant see: Maude Farr, Preliminary Report Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, 1940, Circular 187, U. S. Office of Education; and Benj. F. Andrews, The Land
Pennsylvania’s Acceptance of the Morrill Act,
April 1, 1863

In the passage of the Morrill act the Pennsylvania Agricultural Society, which was largely responsible for the establishment of the Farmers’ High School of Pennsylvania, played a conspicuous role, as did also a number of congressmen from the state. On January 6, 1864, President Pugh of the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania, formerly the Farmers’ High School, stated in a report to the board of trustees: “The friends of the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania secured the passage of the Land Grant bill by Congress. A member of their Board of Trustees (James T. Hale, then as now, a prominent member of Congress) devoted almost an entire session in Congress, and other friends of the College visited Washington several times for the same purpose. Without their aid the bill would not have passed.” Whether or not this claim is justified, certainly the agricultural interests of Pennsylvania were extremely active in support of both the Morrill act of 1859, which was vetoed by President Buchanan, and that of 1862, which was signed by President Lincoln, and the Farmers’ High School of Pennsylvania was expected to be the recipient of the financial benefits conferred by the act. Indeed, the change of the name of the institution to the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania by court action on May 6, 1862, two months before the passage of the Morrill act, appears to have been prompted in part by a desire to make it wholly eligible for the land grant. As a matter of fact, the initial name had originated, as is stated in an early report, “partly in a feeling that the farmers might be prejudiced against the word ‘college’ as that of a place where boys contracted idle habits.” Nevertheless, the institution had always been conducted on the scholastic level of a college regardless of the fact that emphasis had been placed on practical education. Hence, since in the Morrill act the specific words “college Grant of 1862 and the Land Grant Colleges, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin No. 13, 1908, 63 pp.
The federal government has supplemented the Morrill act of 1862 by making grants of money for specific purposes in the following laws: 1887, Hatch act; 1890, second Morrill act; 1905, Nelson amendment to Morrill act; 1906, Adams act; 1914, Smith-Lever act; 1917, Smith-Hughes act; 1924, Clarke-McNair act; 1925, Purnell act; 1928, Capper-Ketcham act; and 1935, Bankhead-Jones act.

or university” were used, it was deemed advisable to make the name conform to the requirements of the law.

In Pennsylvania, as in the other states and territories of the Union, the question of the enactment of the legislation necessary to meet the conditions of the Morrill act came before the legislature for its consideration at its regular session in 1863. Prior to this meeting not only the matter of the acceptance of the land grant but also the problem of the disposition of the funds to be derived from the sale of the land was widely discussed by the press and in educational centers throughout the state. Despite considerable skepticism about the entrance of the federal government into the field of higher education within the state, outspoken opposition to participation in the benefits of the Morrill act declined appreciably after its passage. Indeed, numerous organized groups and educational institutions hoping to share in its benefits urged its acceptance. Especially influential in obtaining favorable action were the petitions and the personal efforts of the agricultural societies and the agricultural leaders of the state.

As early as September 2, 1862, the board of trustees of the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania resolved that “whereas by an Act of Congress of the United States . . . an act donating Public Lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of ‘Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts’ requires the action of the Legislature of Pennsylvania at its next session,” a committee of three members be appointed to present the claims of “our institution” in order that it “may derive the benefits therefrom to which it may be entitled.”9

The members of the committee—Frederick Watts of Carlisle, James T. Hale of Centre county, and A. O. Heister of Harrisburg, all influential men in the state—made a forceful presentation of the case for the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania. There appears to have been little opposition in the legislature to the acceptance of the grant; the only difference of opinion was as to the disposition of the funds to be derived from the land sales. A number of the members felt that the money should be distributed among several institutions, and a strong plea was made in favor of grant-

*Minute Book, Board of Trustees, Pennsylvania State College, Sept. 2, 1862.
ing at least part of the income to the Polytechnic College of Philadelphia.

When the legislature assembled early in 1863, a bill "to accept the grant of Public Lands, by the United States, to the several States, for the endowment of Agricultural Colleges" was introduced. After issuing a brief enumeration of the conditions of the Morrill act, the benefits from which might be obtained only by such states as should "express their acceptance of the same" within two years after its passage, and a statement that "the legislature of Pennsylvania has already shown its high regard for the agricultural interest of the state, by the establishment of the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania, and by making liberal appropriations thereto," that body accepted in behalf of the state of Pennsylvania the Morrill act "with all its provisions and conditions, and the faith of the state is hereby pledged to carry the same into effect." It then authorized "until otherwise ordered by the legislature of Pennsylvania" the payment of the "annual interest accruing from any investment of funds acquired under the said act of Congress ... to the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania, for the endowment, support, and maintenance of the said institution, which college, is now in full and successful operation, and where the leading object is, 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."

The main arguments in favor of a definite assignment of the benefits of the Morrill act to the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania seem to have been made by Senator Henry Johnson in an address before the senate on May 20, 1863.

"The question arising here," he said, "is whether we will pledge to the Congress of the United States our faith, that we will appropriate out of the funds of the Commonwealth, some two or three hundred thousand dollars, for the erection of an agricultural college, accompanied with an annual expense thereafter, out of the Commonwealth, for keeping that college in repair, or whether we will avail ourselves of the circumstances in which we find ourselves placed at this time, in reference to the agricultural college, erected in the County of Centre, which is a State institution,

having been erected in part out of the funds paid out of the treasury of the Commonwealth, and in part by the contributions of citizens of this State—an institution which is in every particular just such a one as contemplated and described in this act of Congress." It is a significant fact that when the land-grant act was passed by Congress in 1862, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Michigan alone of all the states in the Union had schools of agriculture.

A number of speakers presented the case for the privately endowed colleges of the state, among which the Polytechnic College of Philadelphia was mentioned specifically as coming within the conditions of the Morrill act. There was general acceptance, however, of the opinion expressed by John P. Vincent of Erie county that the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania was the only college in the state eligible for participation in the land-grant funds but that there was "nothing in the act to prevent the State from appropriating a portion of the amount to any other which may be hereafter established." In order to clarify this question and to silence the opposition of the privately endowed colleges Cyrus L. Pershing of Cambria county secured the adoption of an amendment to the bill to permit the legislature to appropriate a proportional part of the fund to any other agricultural college which might be incorporated in the future either as an independent institution or as part of an existing college.

The bill vested the disposal of the land scrip obtained in a board of commissioners composed of the surveyor-general, the auditor-general, and the governor, but did not provide funds to meet the expenses incurred in the advertisement and sale of the land, inasmuch as the act forbade the use of any of the money obtained from the transactions for administrative purposes. The measure finally passed the house of representatives by a vote of eighty-two to nine and the senate by twenty-one to seven and was signed by the governor on April 1, 1863.
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96 An amendment to fix a minimum price of seventy-five cents an acre on the land was rejected.
97 Legislative Record, 1863, pp. 289 ff.; 499 ff.
Almost immediately after the passage of the state act a powerful movement was begun to amend it in several important respects. As a matter of fact, the measure had been passed hastily with comparatively little debate, for the members of the legislature had desired to meet the requirements of the federal law as early as possible. Consequently, when the legislature assembled early in 1864, a considerable number of petitions were presented to it praying for its reconsideration. The public demand for this action may be indicated by the statement of Senator J. L. Graham of Allegheny county: "We have had applicants from all parts of the State and from almost every educational institution in the State, asking for a portion of this land which was last year donated; and I think no Senator can be surprised" that the question should be brought up "at this time."

The sympathetic attitude toward these requests was voiced by Hiester Clymer of Berks county when he stated in the senate: "I suppose those of us who were here last winter will recollect that it was well understood at that time that this grant was merely temporary. No other institution seemed to be in a position to comply with the terms required by the act of Congress." Moreover, the majority believed that the law did not intend to restrict or prohibit the assignment of any or all of the land scrip to other institutions which might comply in the future with the conditions named in the Morrill act. There was therefore little opposition to reconsideration.

The extent of the federal grant was of sufficient magnitude to cause the usual scramble for participation in it regardless of the rather drastic restrictions written into the Morrill act by Congress. Since many of these petitions were prompted merely by a desire to share in the benefits of the act rather than to carry out its purposes, they were given scant consideration by the legislature. One was a request from citizens of Erie county "that the land grant of the National Government be appropriated to the common schools." Another informed the legislature that the

16 Legislative Record, 1864, p. 776.
17 Ibid., pp. 776 ff.
18 Ibid., p. 270.
land-grant funds could be most profitably used in caring for the orphaned children of sailors and soldiers. Representative Miller, in behalf of citizens of Harrisburg, introduced a resolution begging that in view of the contemplated "removal of the seat of Government of the State to Philadelphia... the Committee on Education be instructed to make inquiry as to the expediency of establishing a State College, the leading object of which shall be a thorough military education; not excluding, however, scientific and classical studies, and such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, which college, in case of removal, shall occupy the present State Capitol buildings and grounds...."

By far the greatest number of petitions concerning the acceptance law were presented either by the colleges of the state or in their behalf. Some of these merely asked for a general distribution among the colleges without naming any specific institutions; others called for a division of the funds among four to six colleges; and still others, among which were the University of Pennsylvania, the Western University of Pennsylvania (the University of Pittsburgh), and Allegheny College, presented their respective claims for "portion[s] of the proceeds of the land scrip donated by the National Government for the promotion of the science of agriculture and of the mechanic arts." The petition of Allegheny College, submitted to the senate on April 11, 1864, may be cited as typical.

Gentlemen:—The Trustees of Allegheny College would respectfully set forth the following facts:
1 That Allegheny College was chartered in the year 1817, with all the powers, rights, privileges, and immunities usually granted to colleges and universities.
2 That it has ample buildings for chapel, lecture rooms, recitation rooms, library and cabinet rooms.
3 That it has over ten thousand volumes (sic) in its libraries; also, apparatus, philosophical and chemical, and a large geological, mineralogical and conchological cabinet.
4 That it has six chairs filled with competent professors.
5 That it has an endowment of eighty thousand dollars.

"Legislative Record, 1864, p. 228.
Ibid., pp. 108, 308, 270, 291, 250, 178, 229, 311, 356, 421, 468, etc."
That all its property is free from incumbrance.

That the aggregate number of students catalogued for ten years (from 1850 to 1860) was two thousand five hundred and sixty-five, of which number one thousand six hundred and thirteen were from the State of Pennsylvania.

That it has a healthful location in an agricultural district in the vicinity of oil wells and of bituminous coal beds.

That superior railroad facilities render it accessible from all parts of the State.

That by the charter the Governor of the State, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and the Attorney General are trustees by virtue of their office.

In view of the foregoing facts, the trustees deem Allegheny College worthy of the patronage and fostering care of the State. They respectfully request the Legislature to grant to the College one third of the lands donated to the State by Congress for educational purposes, relating to agriculture, mechanic arts and military tactics, and propose to pay the commissioners eighty cents per acre for the land scrip, the money to be invested by them for the benefit of the college, and the interest and dividends to be paid by the Treasurer of the State as they accrue; and for such State benefactions they agree to make the leading object of the school the application of science to the industrial pursuits, and grant tuition free.

GEORGE LOOMIS,
President of Faculty.  

Other colleges in their respective petitions also expressed their willingness to make such adjustments as were necessary to meet the requirements of the Morrill act and to guarantee a minimum price of eighty cents for such portions of the public land as the legislature might allocate to them.

As a result of this general demand for a reconsideration of some of the provisions of the act of April 1, 1863, accepting the land grant, a bill was introduced in both houses of the legislature early in 1864 calling for a repeal of the section providing for the donation of the income from the sale of the land scrip to the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania and fixing a minimum

\textsuperscript{21} Legislative Record, 1864, p. 928.
price of eighty cents an acre on the land.\textsuperscript{22} During the ensuing debate the object of the sponsors seemed to be to bring about a division of the benefits of the land grant among some three to six institutions rather than to place the entire proceeds at the disposal of any one institution. The demand for the fixing of a minimum price on the land was occasioned by rumors that the board of commissioners in charge of the sale of the land was about to sacrifice it for the meager price of thirty cents an acre.\textsuperscript{23}

Meanwhile the friends of the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania put forth every effort to prevent the passage of the new bill, and the college itself worked feverishly to get a definite program under way embodying all the requirements of the Morrill act. As early as January 6, 1864, President Pugh presented to the board of trustees "a proposed plan of organization of The Agricultural College of Pennsylvania, so soon as the anticipated income from the land scrip . . . would admit of such organization." During the course of the next three years there were entered in the minutes of the board many references to the efforts of the college to "give efficiency to those Laws by the organization of a faculty and such other action as may be necessary to carry into effect the beneficent intentions of Congress and our State Legislature."\textsuperscript{24} At the same time the trustees brought such pressure to bear as they could to speed up the sale of the land by the board of commissioners in order that funds might be available to execute the program and, incidentally, to thwart the plans of the privately endowed colleges to obtain a reallocation of the land-grant funds.\textsuperscript{25}

Despite these efforts the senate on April 21, 1864, gave its approval to the proposed amendments to the acceptance act of April 1, 1863, by a vote of twenty-three to nine. Fortunately for the Agricultural College this action came near the end of the session, and a resolution to postpone "indefinitely further consideration" of the question passed the house of representatives by the close vote of forty-seven to forty-four.\textsuperscript{26}

The movement to force a reallocation of the income from the

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., p. 776.
\textsuperscript{23} See Legislative Record, 1864, pp. 743 ff.; 771 ff.
\textsuperscript{24} Minute Book, Board of Trustees, Penna. State College, Jan. 6, 1864.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., Jan. 6, July 14, and Oct. 27, 1864; June 22, 1865; and May 10, 1866.
\textsuperscript{26} Legislative Record, 1864, pp. 1044 ff.
land-grant fund did not end, however, with the adjournment of the legislature in 1864. Indeed, it was brought before practically every session in some form or other over a period of twenty years. The seriousness with which the board of trustees of the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania viewed the succession of attempts to deprive it of some of its income may be indicated by the following excerpt from its minutes on June 22, 1865: "Some ten or fifteen literary sectarian institutions, located in different parts of the State, have for the past two or three years, been soliciting the repeal of the Act of April 1, 1863, which makes provision for the sale of the land Scrip, the investment of the proceeds, and the payment of the interest arising thereon to the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania, and asking the appropriation of portions thereof to their respective institutions under the pretense that they will qualify themselves for the discharge of the duties imposed by the Act of Congress, whereby the advantages confidently expected from the endowment have been delayed and frustrated."

Not until February 19, 1867, after all the land scrip had been disposed of, did the legislature specifically designate the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania as the sole beneficiary of the federal land grant. In his annual message on January 7, 1868, Governor John White Geary reviewed at length the incidents leading up to the passage of this legislation, an event "which has thereby" made the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania "subject to the supervision and guardianship of the State." "The college," he declared, "has been thoroughly re-organized in order to make it fully respond to the objects and requirements of the act of Congress and to the educational interests of the industrial classes, and to meet these ends it now gives courses of instruction in general science, agriculture, mechanical and civil engineering, metallurgy and mining, ancient and modern languages, and military tactics, employing a faculty comprising six professors and two instructors in the college department and three instructors in the grammar school. This important educational enterprise in the interest of agriculture and the mechanic arts deserves favorable consideration."
Although the disposal of the land-grant funds and the indirect recognition of the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania as a state institution, entitled as such to the support of the state, appeared to have been settled finally, opposition to this program was destined to continue for many years.

**Preliminary Plans for the Sale of Land Scrip, 1864-1866**

Coincident with the long controversy over the selection of one or more educational institutions in the state to receive the land-grant funds was the formulation of plans for the sale of the land scrip and the investment of the moneys thus obtained. Because of the promptness of the legislature in accepting the Morrill act on April 1, 1863, Pennsylvania was unable to use the experience of other states as a guide.

As already explained, the law provided for the distribution of the land in two ways. Those states with public lands within their borders were allowed to locate and take up the actual acreage. If the state had no lands within its borders subject to entry, as was the case in Pennsylvania as well as in the others of the original thirteen states, it received scrip. The land represented by this scrip could not be located by the state receiving it, but the individual purchaser of the scrip might locate the lands in any state or territory which had public land subject to entry at the minimum price of $1.25 an acre. In the management of their allotments the different states showed great diversity. Some sacrificed their holdings (either scrip or actual land) at very small prices, partly because of the need for immediate funds with which to establish educational institutions within the time limit of five years set by the Morrill act and partly, in a few instances, because of carelessness and downright neglect of public responsibility. Others fortunate enough to have public lands within their borders ultimately obtained fair prices for them.

Since under the census of 1860 Pennsylvania had twenty-four representatives and two senators in Congress, she was entitled to receive from the federal government land scrip representing 30,000 acres for each of them, or a total of 780,000 acres. As soon as this land scrip was delivered in the summer of 1864, the state was free to proceed with the sale of the land. The legislature, as already mentioned, had by the act of April 1, 1863,
conferred this task on a board of commissioners, composed of the governor, Andrew Gregg Curtin; the auditor-general, J. F. Hartranft; and the surveyor-general, J. M. Campbell.

This board held its first meeting on July 14, 1864, and named Lewis U. Stout secretary. For its guidance it adopted the following rules and regulations:

1. That it is expedient immediately to dispose of the land scrip donated by Congress, that the proceeds thereof may be funded for the purpose provided by law.

2. That the Surveyor-General is hereby directed to appoint an agent whose duty it shall be to make such arrangements for the sale of the scrip as may be deemed adequate for the attainment of the object, reporting his action for the approval of the board.

3. When the action of the agent shall have been approved by the board, and the scrip or any part thereof shall have been sold, and the price paid to the State thereof, the Surveyor-General is directed to issue and deliver from time to time the said scrip to the purchaser or purchasers.

4. When such payments shall have been made, the same shall be invested as they accrue in the stocks of the State of Pennsylvania.

5. The interest which shall arise from such investments shall be paid over to the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania, in pursuance of the third section of the act of Assembly.

Professor William H. Allen, president of the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania, was appointed to make the necessary arrangements for the sale of the land scrip.

From the outset the board of commissioners was faced with a number of serious difficulties over which it had little or no control. Not only was the country in the midst of the Civil War, which absorbed the time and the money of the people everywhere, but the legislature had neglected to provide funds to meet the expenses required to advertise and sell the scrip most advantageously, and the Morrill act specifically forbade the use of money derived from the land sales for this purpose. Moreover, though the land available for entry under the Morrill act had not been definitely...
located, it was generally believed that the entries would be made in the remote Dakotas and Nebraska, in a section which for nearly half a century had been designated in most geographies as "the great American desert." At first adequate transportation facilities to this region were almost wholly lacking, but immediately after the close of the Civil War parts of it were pierced by the Union Pacific, central link in the first transcontinental railway. An even greater complication was the ease with which public land was obtainable. It could be purchased outright from the government at the minimum price of $1.25 an acre, or it could be acquired under the provisions of the Homestead act of 1862 merely by the payment of some small registration fees and the establishment of residence. Moreover, there was at that time available at the minimum price of eighty-five cents an acre approximately ten million acres of soldiers' land warrants; soon afterwards the huge subsidy grants of millions of acres made to the transcontinental railroads began to glut the market further.

Regardless of the obstacles which the board of commissioners had to face in putting 780,000 acres of land on the market under these unfavorable circumstances, there was little choice in the matter, for the Morrill act specified that the colleges which were to be its beneficiaries must be established within a period of five years. Needless to say, this feat could not be accomplished unless the land funds were first made available. In fact, the minutes of the board of trustees of the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania contain many references to the crying need for money with which to meet the requirements of the act.\(^3\) The urgent necessity for a speedy disposal of the land caused the commissioners to be the objects of much suspicion and even led to outspoken insinuations of favoritism and connivance with certain "disreputable" land speculators. In spite of their high character members of the board were openly charged in the legislative session of 1864 with being about to barter away the land for a mere thirty cents an acre. This accusation played a conspicuous part in the debates in the assembly of that year over the bill to repeal those sections of the act of April 1, 1863, which accepted the land grant and made the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania its beneficiary. It was one of the chief arguments

\(^3\) Minute Book, Board of Trustees, Pennsylvania State College, 1864-1867.
brought forth by the representatives of the privately endowed colleges in their effort to obtain part of the land-grant income. Some went so far as to guarantee a minimum price of eighty cents an acre on such lands as might be assigned to them.

Meanwhile the commissioners, acting largely through President Allen, did what they could to market the land. On December 5, 1864, the board agreed that eighty-five cents an acre “should be the minimum price at which any of the scrip should be sold”; twelve bids, all made by individuals living in the vicinity of State College, for seventy-eight quarter sections of one hundred and sixty acres each were accepted at that price. Offers were few, and on May 5, 1865, the minimum price was reduced from eighty-five to seventy-five cents an acre. On June 22, 1865, nineteen quarter sections were sold to nine individuals at prices ranging from seventy-five cents to one dollar and one and one-half cents an acre. The largest single purchaser was Forney and Brothers of Harrisburg, who paid eighty cents an acre for six quarter sections.

Because large land speculators, operating for the most part in the Middle West, seemed unwilling to bid much above fifty cents an acre, the board decided to appeal to small purchasers, and accordingly on May 5, 1865, it authorized the surveyor-general “to advertise the sale of the lands donated, at the expense and under such arrangements as he deems proper with the Agricultural College. The advertisements to be put in two papers in Harrisburg, at least two in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, and in every county and city where there is a college or university.” Evidently the college was expected to finance this undertaking, inasmuch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Lynn</td>
<td>Bellefonte, Pa.</td>
<td>1 q section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gordon</td>
<td>Zion, Pa.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Blanchard</td>
<td>Bellefonte, Pa.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. H. Duncan</td>
<td>Spring Mills, Pa.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James McMannus</td>
<td>Bellefonte, Pa.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. W. Hale</td>
<td>Bellefonte, Pa.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. C. Humes</td>
<td>Bellefonte, Pa.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Allison</td>
<td>Potter’s Mills, Pa.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. N. McAllister and</td>
<td>Bellefonte, Pa.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Beaver</td>
<td>Bellefonte, Pa.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. P. Wilson</td>
<td>Bellefonte, Pa.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob S. Ahl</td>
<td>Boalsburg, Pa.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Irwin, Jr.</td>
<td>Howard, Pa.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agricultural Land Minute Book, Minutes for May 5, and June 22, 1865.
Ibid., Minutes for May 5, 1865.
as the legislature had provided no funds for this purpose and the Morrill act forbade the use of money obtained from the sale of the lands for administrative purposes. Unfortunately the college could not raise the money, and the advertising program was consequently delayed.

Regardless of the fact that the minimum price had been reduced to seventy-five cents an acre, the disposal of the land scrip continued to proceed in a most unsatisfactory manner. Indeed, up to February 8, 1866, only one hundred and forty quarter sections had been sold for the aggregate sum of $18,258. Thus it was increasingly evident that if the land scrip was to be disposed of within a reasonable time, the price might have to be reduced still further. In addition, the labor and expense incurred in the sale of the land in small tracts were becoming more and more of a problem every day.

**Sale of Land Scrip Under the Act of April 11, 1866**

The situation was helped considerably when the legislature on April 11, 1866, voted funds to meet expenses connected with the sale of the land scrip, even though it was stipulated that not more than one-third of the original grant might be sold without further authorization. The commissioners adopted an aggressive program. Early in May, President Allen was delegated to visit Philadelphia and New York in the hope of interesting large land firms or wealthy financiers in the purchase of the entire tract of approximately 233,000 acres, the maximum then available for sale under the new law, 27,000 acres having been sold previously. In a lengthy report on his negotiations President Allen informed the board on May 23 that the only responsible proposition “worthy of being entertained, was an informal one from Jay Cooke, of Philadelphia.” In spite of the fact that Cooke was apparently willing to buy the land only at a very low figure, the board authorized the surveyor-general to write him for a formal proposition for the entire amount. But satisfactory arrangements could

---

35 Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Feb. 8, 1866. In December, 1865, the board of commissioners of Pennsylvania endeavored to persuade other states to join with Pennsylvania in fixing a uniform price for the sale of the lands granted by the Morrill act.

36 Agricultural Land Minute Book, May 23, 1866.
PENNSYLVANIA'S LAND GRANT

not be made with the Philadelphia banker, and on July 11, 1866, the board authorized the printing of fifteen hundred copies of a circular "inviting proposals for the purchase of land scrip and that the same be printed as an advertisement, until the 15th of August, 1866," in a representative group of newspapers in each of the counties and cities of the state. The advertisement significantly contained no mention of a minimum price limit; conditions under which the land might be acquired, however, were described as follows:

Proposals
PENNSYLVANIA AGRICULTURAL LAND SCRIP SALE

The United States Government having granted to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Land Scrip, representing 780,000 acres of Public Land, for the endowment of Agricultural Colleges in this State, the Board of Commissioners now offer this Land Scrip to the public.

Proposals for the purchase of this Land Scrip, addressed to The Board of Commissioners of Agricultural Land Scrip, will be received at the Surveyor-General's office, at Harrisburg, until Wednesday, August 15, 1866.

This land may be located in any State or Territory, by the holder of the Scrip, upon any of the unappropriated lands (except mineral lands) of the United States, which may be subject to sale or private entry. Each piece of scrip represents a quarter section of one hundred and sixty acres. Bids must be made as per acre, and no bids will be received for less than one quarter section.

The Scrip will be issued immediately on the payment of the money to the Surveyor-General, one-third of which must be paid within ten days, and the remaining two-thirds within thirty days after notification of the acceptance of the bid or bids by the Board of Commissioners.

J. M. CAMPBELL,
Surveyor-General
For the Board of Commissioners.38

Harrisburg, July 16, 1866

The response was encouraging. Forty-eight bids, ranging in price from twenty-five cents to one dollar an acre and in amount of land from one quarter section to 1,159 acres, were received

37 Ibid., July 11, 1866.
38 The Harrisburg Telegraph, August 3, 1866.
by August 16. With but few exceptions the bidders for small tracts were Pennsylvanians. The larger bidders, offering from fifty to seventy-five cents an acre, were big land-speculating companies located for the most part in the upper Mississippi valley. Among them were David Preston and Company, of Detroit, Michigan; H. Thompson and George Nelson, of St. Paul, Minnesota; G. F. Lewis and Alvan Wilkins, of Detroit, Michigan; James H. Gower, of Iowa City, Iowa; C. and G. Woodman, of New York; and Drexel and Company, of Philadelphia. A number of awards were immediately made to buyers who complied with the requirements of the board and who met the minimum price of fifty-five cents which had been tentatively set. Other bids came in from time to time, with the result that by February 27, 1867, the entire 260,000 acres, comprising one-third of the total amount available for sale under the act of the assembly of April 11, 1866, had been disposed of at an average price of slightly more than fifty-eight cents an acre. The funds obtained from these sales were invested in state securities as they were received, and the proceeds were appropriated for the use of the college.

**SALE OF LAND SCRIP UNDER THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 19, 1867**

Despite the success of these sales there was a growing anxiety, as indicated by the minutes of the Board of Trustees of the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania, over the progress of the disposition of the land scrip. The institution was suffering serious financial difficulties, due in part to the reorganization of the educational program in conformance to the requirements of the Morrill act. As early as September 6, 1866, it was urging the board of commissioners to petition the legislature for permission to sell the entire assignment of land scrip, for the reasons expressed in part in the following resolution: "Resolved, That in view of the large amount of Land Scrip voted to the Southern States by the late Act of Congress for educational purposes, much of which has already been thrown upon the market for sale, and all of which it may be reasonably supposed will be offered for sale during the coming fall and winter, and as we

---

108 *Agricultural Land Minute Book, August 16, 1866.*  
"Ibid., February 27, 1867."
have information that already there has been a heavy depreciation and suggestions of a further glut in the market, that we therefore respectfully urge upon the Commissioners the immediate sale of the residue of the Scrip granted to Pennsylvania, on the best terms they can procure for the same." The following December the trustees appointed a committee of three members to prepare a memorial for presentation to the legislature "exhibiting the financial condition of the College, and asking that the income arising from the sale of the Land Scrip be absolutely appropriated for the use of the College, or that the State shall take the College and its property into its own hands, and make provision for the payment of its debts..."  

In response to this petition the legislature on February 19, 1867, appropriated the income of the "entire residue of the proceeds" of the sale of land scrip to the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania. This action, according to Governor Geary in his annual message to the legislature the next January, caused the college to become "subject to the supervision and guardianship of the State." At the same time the legislature authorized the use of ten per cent of the proceeds from the sale of the land scrip for the establishment of three experimental farms—one near State College, one in the eastern part of the state, and another in the western. The most significant matter to the board of trustees, however, was the empowering of the board of commissioners to sell the remaining two-thirds of the land scrip.  

The board of commissioners, now possessing legislative permission, prepared at once to complete the sale of the remaining 520,000 acres of land scrip at the earliest possible date. At a meeting held in the executive chamber at Harrisburg on February 27, 1867, it drew up an advertisement "calling for proposals up to the 10th day of April, 1867, for the purchase" of the land scrip and authorized its insertion in at least one newspaper in each county of the state as well as its publication in the form of a circular, of which four thousand copies were to be printed. The advertisement, which appeared in the newspapers early in March,

---

41 Agricultural Land Minute Book, September 6, 1866.  
42 Minute Book, Board of Trustees, Pennsylvania State College, Dec. 20, 1866.  
44 Agricultural Land Minute Book, February 27, 1867.
was not essentially different from that issued the previous year; but the statement, "On all bids of less than 40,000 acres, one-third of the purchase money must be paid within ten days, and the remaining two-thirds within thirty days after notification of acceptance of the bid or bids by the Board of Commissioners," indicated that the board intended to dispose of the remainder of the land in large tracts if satisfactory terms could be arranged with the land brokers.45

The bids were opened at a meeting held in the surveyor-general's office in Harrisburg on April 10, 1867. They numbered 275 and ranged in amounts from the minimum of one quarter section to the entire lot of 520,000 acres. There was similar variance in price. One hundred and seventy-six of the bidders offered less than fifty-five cents an acre, with the lowest figure only ten cents. The remaining ninety-nine ranged from fifty-five cents to one dollar an acre, with the majority of them near the minimum price of fifty-five cents tentatively set by the board.46

45 PROPOSALS
PENNSYLVANIA AGRICULTURAL LAND SCRIP FOR SALE

The Board of Commissioners now offer for sale 520,000 acres of Agricultural College Land Scrip, being the balance of the Scrip granted to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the endowment of Agricultural Colleges of the State.

Proposals for the purchase of this Land Scrip, addressed to "The Board of Commissioners of the Agricultural Land Scrip," will be received at the Surveyor-General's office, at Harrisburg, until 12 o'clock, M., on Wednesday, April 10, 1867. This land may be located in any State or Territory, by the holders of the Scrip, upon any unappropriated lands (except mineral lands) of the United States, which may be subject to sale or private entry. Each piece represents a quarter section of one hundred and sixty acres, is issued in blank, and will be transferable without endorsement or formal assignment. The blank need not be filed until the Scrip is presented for location and entry, when the party holding it can fill the blank and enter the land in his own name. Bids must be made as per acre, and no bid will be received for less than one quarter section.

The Scrip will be issued immediately on the payment of the money to the Surveyor-General. On all bids of less than 40,000 acres, one-third of the purchase money must be paid within ten days, and the remaining two-thirds within thirty days after notification of the acceptance of the bid or bids by the Board of Commissioners.

Jacob M. Campbell
Surveyor-General
Harrisburg, Feb. 27, 1867

(From the Philadelphia Evening Telegraph, March 4, 1867)

46 A number of the bids were conditional. For instance, that of David Preston of Detroit was for 520,000 acres at $.53 4/; 320,000 acres at .54 4/; 160,000 acres at .54 1/; 80,000 acres at .54 3/; and 64,000 acres at .54 5/.

Among the bids of less than fifty-five cents an acre, all of which were rejected, occur the names of Archer and Davil of Baltimore, Edward
An analysis of the bids accepted shows that there were seventy-six for tracts of from 160 to 1000 acres, twelve between 1000 and 5000 acres, and eleven for more than 5000 acres. Most of the bidders in the first two groups were Pennsylvanians. With the exception of P. Wise of Harrisburg, who was awarded 300,000 acres at the minimum price of fifty-five cents an acre (later forfeited and resold to G. F. Lewis), the purchasers of large tracts, as before, were land brokers or land speculators from west of the Alleghenies. The best known of these was G. F. Lewis of Detroit, who represented a group of land jobbers located for the most part in Ohio and Michigan. He and his associates received more than half of the entire 780,000 acres. His name appears prominently also in the records of many other states in connection with the disposal of the land scrip under the Morrill act.

On September 17, 1867, the board of commissioners, having completed the sale of the land scrip, made its final report to the legislature and approved the payment of $2,531.28 for various Wheelan of Philadelphia, H. Thompson of St. Paul, William Colder of Harrisburg, R. B. Kellogg of Oshkosh (Wisconsin), G. F. Lewis of Detroit (one bid for 520,000 acres at $.54 53/100 an acre), B. F. Clarke of New York, J. Comstock of Baltimore, and W. S. Sheppard of Granville (Pennsylvania).

Agricultural Land Minute Book. A summary of all sales with the names of the purchasers is given at the end of this minute book. On the list of 183 individual sales given in the Agricultural Land Minute Book for the entire 780,000 acres are the following purchasers of large tracts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Purchaser</th>
<th>Price per acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 16, 1866</td>
<td>200 Quarter Sections</td>
<td>G. F. Lewis</td>
<td>55¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 5, 1866</td>
<td>80 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 7, 1866</td>
<td>100 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 11, 1866</td>
<td>100 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 21, 1866</td>
<td>400 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 12, 1867</td>
<td>200 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 24, 1866</td>
<td>100 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 12, 1867</td>
<td>236 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20, 1867</td>
<td>100 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23, 1867</td>
<td>16 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16, 1867</td>
<td>125 Quarter Sections</td>
<td>John Crothers</td>
<td>55¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20, 1867</td>
<td>200 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 1867</td>
<td>300 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 12, 1867</td>
<td>345 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 20, 1867</td>
<td>130 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 9, 1867</td>
<td>245 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 28, 1867</td>
<td>100 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 29, 1867</td>
<td>300 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 13, 1867</td>
<td>100 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 1867</td>
<td>87 Quarter Sections</td>
<td>Alexander Kennedy</td>
<td>55¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 21, 1867</td>
<td>10 Quarter Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
items of expense in connection with the sale. These bills were met out of the general appropriation of the legislature, of course, and not deducted from the proceeds of the land scrip. The total receipts from the land sales were $439,186.80, or an average of 56.3 cents an acre. Of this sum $43,886.50 was diverted from the "perpetual endowment fund," as permitted by legislative enactment in 1867, for the purchase of three "Model and Experimental Farms," and the remainder was invested in bonds and securities as provided by law.

THE REFUNDING OF THE LAND-GRAIN ENDOWMENT FUND, 1872

More or less dissatisfaction was voiced over the smallness of the amount obtained for the land scrip and over the fact that the college was deprived of income from the total fund for a period of two or three years. The surveyor-general expressed the discontent in his annual report to the legislature in 1871, in which he openly charged that body with responsibility for the situation and asked that out of fairness to the federal government, which had donated the land, and the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania, which had been made the beneficiary of the fund, the state authorize the sale of the land-scrip securities and the issuance of

---

48 This sum was expended as follows: for a farm in Centre county $8,000; for a farm in Chester county $17,500; and for a farm in Indiana county $18,136.50.

49 Surveyor-General's Office
Harrisburg, Penna. Aug. 28, 1867
Board of Com' for Sale of Ag. Col. Scrip
Statement
Cash received for 716,000 acres of Scrip $403,986.80
Invested
U. S. 5 - 20 Bonds (Jan. & July) 126,000.00
Penna. War Loan 20,000.00
Penna. Loan of 1867 235,500.00
Total amount of Bonds $381,500.00
Premiums on 5/20 Bonds $ 6,625.00
Premium on War Loan 110.30
Premium on Loan of 1867 7,065.00
Cash on hand 8,686.50
64,000 acres of Scrip at 55c not lifted 35,200.00
Bal. to be accounted for on closing acct 43,886.50
J. M. Campbell
Sur. Gen'l
for Board of Com
new bonds to the amount of $500,000. In support of this recommendation he said: "It is a well-known fact, however, that the State did not enact any efficient legislation looking to the sale of the land scrip, until four years after the passage of the act of Congress donating the same, and not until many of the other States had disposed of a large portion of their scrip, thereby, in a great measure, supplying the demand and stocking the market with it, so that the price had fallen off about fifty per cent, with a further downward tendency, before the necessary legislation was had, and which then only provided for the sale of one-third of the scrip held by the State. . . . Thus it may be fairly inferred, that for the want of prompt action by the Legislature, the fund is not as large as it should have been, and the college endowed by it has not derived the aid it should have received from the interest on the funds for four or five years."

Finally, on April 3, 1872, after considerable debate, the legislature authorized the surveyor-general to sell the land-scrip bonds and to issue a single bond of the state for $500,000 at six per cent payable in fifty years after date for the benefit of the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania.50

In pursuance of this authorization the securities held by the commissioners were sold—the proceeds, including the premium of $14,960.20, amounting to $410,290.50—and a single six-per-cent bond of $500,000 payable fifty years after date was issued for the benefit of the college. The state was thus obliged to add $89,709.50 to the endowment fund out of its general revenues to make up the required amount.

At the expiration of the fifty-year period the bond was redeemed and a new issue for the same amount sold. The state obligated itself to guarantee not only the principal but also the five-per-cent rate of interest specified in the Morrill act. This money was designated the "Agricultural Land Scrip Fund."

THE STATE COLLEGE EXPERIMENT-FARM FUND

That portion of the proceeds from the sale of the land scrip—$43,886.50—which was expended for the purchase of three experi-

50 Address to the People of Pennsylvania, 1880. By a Committee appointed by the Board of Trustees of the Pennsylvania State College. Pamphlet (1880).
mental farms was an integral part of the land-grant fund. Because of the cost of maintenance and the inability of those in charge of them to get quick results from their programs of experimentation, these farms were for many years a subject of constant criticism in agricultural centers throughout the state and in the legislature as well. At last, on May 13, 1887, after legislative committees had made a series of investigations of the Pennsylvania State College, the legislature ordered that "the farms commonly known as the eastern and western experimental farms be sold." The proceeds were to be paid into the state treasury, to be held there as a special fund "to be invested in the bonds of the State, or otherwise, the interest on which, at six percentum per annum, shall be paid by the State Treasurer, . . . to the Trustees of the State College, (to be used by them for the sole and exclusive purpose of maintaining a mechanical workshop and chemical laboratories, and of conducting educational and scientific experiments on the experimental farm located at the State College and laboratory tests and investigations connected therewith) . . . ."

In compliance with this authorization in 1888 the so-called eastern experimental farm was sold for $10,000 and the western for $7,000. Since the original cost of these farms was $35,886.50, not to mention sums considerably in excess of this amount which had been spent on them out of state revenues, this sale price of $17,000 represented an appreciable loss.

CONCLUSION

Much has been said and written about the management of the sale of the land scrip donated to Pennsylvania under the Morrill act, and open charges of mismanagement and even of graft have

--In 1874 the name of the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania was changed to the Pennsylvania State College.
--In 1881 a special committee of the legislature placed these expenditures on the eastern farm from 1869 to 1881 at $18,800 and those on the western farm at $16,050. Other expenses were incurred for which state funds were used between 1881 and 1888, when the farms were finally sold.
--An act of the legislature of April 9, 1929, decreed that "all moneys derived from the sale of the eastern and western experimental farms of State College, which were originally purchased from Federal Moneys . . . shall be credited to the 'State College Experimental Farm Fund.'"
been hurled at the board of commissioners. The fact that all but six or seven states received larger prices per acre for their land than did Pennsylvania was responsible for the general feeling that the commissioners must have been guilty at least of very poor judgment in the transactions. Obviously the college was not involved, since neither its trustees nor any of its officers had any voice in the matter, except that President Allen for a time acted as a sort of sales agent for the board of commissioners. To be sure, the trustees were on several occasions led by the urgent need for funds to ask for a speedy disposal of the land. As has been said, however, they were justified in this policy both by the fact that the land market was glutted and was destined to become more so as additional allotments of land scrip were offered for sale and by the even more significant fact that the Morrill act required the establishment of its educational program within the brief period of five years. As far as the board of commissioners was concerned, there is no evidence to show that it was derelict in any way in the performance of its duties, and there appear to be absolutely no grounds for any charges of graft, either direct or indirect. Such mismanagement as occurred must be blamed on the legislature, since it allowed the board of commissioners to offer for sale only one-third of the grant before 1866 and thus prevented the remainder from being sold before the price had declined considerably.

In those instances in which states were permitted to locate government land within their own borders rather than to accept scrip in distant states or territories greater freedom was allowed in determining the conditions under which the land might be sold and in fixing advantageous times for sale. Consequently the prices they obtained were for the most part well above those

---

The states that received less than sixty cents an acre for their land were New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Maine, Maryland, and Massachusetts in the East, and Indiana and Kentucky in the trans-Allegheny West. Among the states that received prices ranging from three to seven dollars an acre were New York, Nebraska, Minnesota, Michigan, Kansas, Idaho, Colorado, California, and Arizona. New York sold its scrip to Ezra Cornell, who used it to enter lands in the West and then turned them back to Cornell University. Though this procedure was a violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of the law, it gave Cornell University an opportunity to decide both the time and the conditions under which her lands should be placed on the market. As a result, she received approximately five dollars an acre for her land, nearly ten times the price received by Pennsylvania.
received by Pennsylvania and the other states that had been granted land scrip. Moreover, the states that attempted to sell their land or scrip within the five-year period specified by the Morrill act for the establishment of land-grant educational institutions generally received relatively low prices because in the years 1863-1868 the demand for farms was small and the market was saturated with relatively cheap land. Fortunately for themselves many of the western and southern states either obtained their lands at later dates or received extensions of time.

Possibly better prices could have been obtained for Pennsylvania's land scrip had the board of commissioners received sufficient funds in the beginning with which to carry on a vigorous advertising campaign. No doubt, however, the legislators thought it reasonable to expect the market to improve at the close of the war. Unfortunately this did not prove to be the case for a much longer period of time than they had anticipated. Land appears to have commanded higher prices between 1864 and 1866 than during the years immediately following. In any event, the scrip sold prior to late summer of 1866 brought a better price than that sold subsequently. In fact, as time went on, the commissioners were forced to lower the minimum price successively from eighty-five to fifty-five cents an acre.

Furthermore, the board of trustees of the college desired that Pennsylvania's land scrip be sold at the earliest possible date. Indeed, the institution had such great financial needs that at times its very existence seemed to depend on the prompt conversion of the scrip into cash. In its minutes are found many items concerning the appointment of special committees and the adoption of resolutions or petitions urging the board of commissioners or the legislature to immediate action. On one occasion in 1866 the trustees urged the board of commissioners to sell the scrip immediately at the market price regardless of what it happened to be.

Thus the present endowment of the Pennsylvania State College, derived from the sale of the land donated to the state under the Morrill act of 1862 and the several refinancing undertakings, amounts to $517,000 ($500,000 in the fund established in 1872

56 Twenty-eight of the states were allocated 8,160,000 acres of scrip, and the remaining twenty were assigned 2,890,000 acres of land within their respective boundaries. In 1914, 1,209,837 of the total of 11,050,000 acres remained unsold, although some of this was under lease.
and $17,000 in the State College experiment-farm fund obtained from the sale of the eastern and western experimental farms). Figured on this basis rather than on that of the original sale price of a little more than fifty-six cents an acre, the endowment fund represents an average price of approximately sixty-six cents an acre on the entire lot of 780,000 acres.87

87 The income derived from the land-grant fund of $517,000 is considerably more than Dr. E. Pugh, the first president of the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania, estimated that it would be. In 1864 he expressed the belief that it would be between ten and fifteen thousand dollars a year. In conformity with this anticipated budget Dr. Pugh prepared a tentative curriculum for the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania.

In 1914 the total capital of the land-grant fund for all the states and territories was $13,621,712.07 and the annual income $964,379. For the year 1939-40 this income had increased to $1,124,737.