5.

Getting and Spending: 1903–1914

During the first decades of the twentieth century the University moved rapidly from its position as a medium-sized business venture into that of a large-scale agency. In the fiscal year 1900–1901 the total receipts of the University from all sources amounted to $502,341.01. Twenty-five years later the total receipts of the University amounted to $6,951,340.77. This rate of increase did not continue over the next ten years. During the fiscal year of 1936 total receipts amounted to $7,717,814.25. Five years later they exceeded ten million.

As late as 1910 the contribution of the state amounted to more than three-quarters of the whole amount, but ten years later it had decreased to a little more than half of it. In part this showed the reluctance of the state to continue increasing its contribution; in part it indicated the increased contribution from the federal government and from private gifts, but in large measure it reflected the widening business activity of the University, which involved management of dormitories, dining rooms, the Memorial Union, the hospital, athletic contests, sale of farm products, and numerous other enterprises. On the whole these receipts shown each year in the official report merely represented collections by the University for bedding, feeding, and entertaining students; the disbursements canceled out the receipts. Although these activities were necessary in the academic community, they represented essentially noneducational
functions. The law required an annual report showing all receipts and expenditures. The careless reader of these reports often derived a wholly distorted impression of the prosperity of the University. But this bookkeeping should not obscure the large part the state’s contribution had played and must play in maintaining educational activities of the University.

Like all other growing organizations the University had to accommodate itself to its enlarged business activities by adding new officers with new duties. In 1906, partly as a result of legislative criticism, the University accounting system was reorganized and the office of University auditor established. Up to then general supervision of the University accounts had been in the hands of the secretary of the Board of Regents, and auditing had been done by a committee of the Board. The new system, with an auditor to make a daily check on receipts and disbursements, went into operation on July 1, 1906.¹ Five years later the regents created the office of business manager.² In this office was lodged responsibility for supervising all business affairs of the University. Certain members of the Board, in making the business manager responsible to the regents, had hoped to divest the president of some of his power. Their attempt was not wholly successful. The creation of this office was probably incapable in view of the large sums of money handled by the University and the wide variety of business activities in which it engaged. Similar offices were created in other institutions. The development was not looked upon with favor by all university presidents or by others who saw in the rise of business managers a genuine threat to the faculty and to presidential control of educational policies. In 1922 President David Kinley of the University of Illinois wrote to President Birge: “I am strongly, indeed bitterly, opposed to having our educational policy formulated, modified or determined by the business

² Ibid., 1911-12, p. 6. In 1911 Hermon Carey Bumpus, formerly director of the American Museum of Natural History, was appointed business manager. Three years later, when Bumpus resigned to accept the presidency of Tufts College, Halsten J. Thorkelson was appointed. Thorkelson had graduated from the University in 1898 and after several years in business had returned as a member of the engineering faculty. When he resigned in the early 1920’s to accept an appointment with the General Education Board, another member of the faculty, Professor James David Phillips, was made business manager.
agents of the Universities. From what I have seen of the reports of the meetings of these business agents, they have been, whether conscious of the fact or not, undertaking to do that very thing in a large way and in important matters." Supervision of the accounts whether by business managers or budget directors appeared to encourage the supervisor to venture into the creation and control of academic policy.

Behind the tall columns of figures of the annual report of the business manager there lay the University's biennial appeal to the legislature for funds. In the academic community, particularly in the more sequestered portions of it, the biennial joust with the legislature was often misunderstood. The function of the sound and fury was to vote money for the University, but beyond that the political and personal needs of the legislators had to be satisfied. In the tradition of American politics, requests for appropriations are often accompanied by oration. The oratory, whether in the legislative chamber or in the newspapers, very often becomes intemperate, inflammatory, even abusive, depending on the political necessities to be served. Politicians have a biennial if not perennial capacity for shocked surprise and pained indignation upon learning publicly what the professors are doing or what they are not doing. The legislature during this period, however, always gave funds to the University, but its support was less generous after the first World War.

In 1895, it will be recalled, the University, having been granted a tax of 17/40 of a mill for each dollar of assessed valuation of property in the state, enjoyed perhaps the largest millage tax of any university in the Middle West. In 1899 the mill tax was repealed and in its place a fixed money appropriation was made. University authorities sought to recover the mill

---

8 David Kinley to Edward A. Birge, January 27, 1922, Presidents' Papers.
9 Fitzpatrick tells of a hearing when University officials were being grilled by a legislator on the subject of how much time the professors worked. Upon learning that some taught only seven hours of classes a week, he was preparing to object but was cut short by McCarthy, watchdog of University interests: "Mr. Chairman, you're all wrong in your kind of question. If you are asking the value of a bore [sic] pig or a stud horse, you wouldn't ask him how many hours he works, you'd ask what his product is. That's what you ought to ask about University Professors." Edward A. Fitzpatrick, _McCarthy of Wisconsin_ (New York, 1944), 298.
tax but failed in 1901 and again in 1903. It became Van Hise's first great objective to win back and increase the mill tax for University support and, in addition, to reduce if possible the number of specific appropriations made by the legislature. This practice of specified appropriation had reduced the discretionary power of the Board.

In getting money from the legislature Van Hise enjoyed a large measure of success, but it must be observed that the proportion of state taxes given to the University decreased. One investigator has reported that "in 1910 the citizen of Wisconsin contributed to the support of his University five cents out of every dollar of tax money which he paid out for all purposes. In 1920 he paid two and seven tenths cents." This decrease was partly the result of less generous support of the University by the state and partly the result of the many new and increasingly expensive activities which the state had launched. The new state boards and commissions, the state-supported highway construction program, and even the slowly increasing state aids for public schools, all demanded increasing amounts of money. Indeed, less than thirty-five years after the state highway-building program was launched, more money was being devoted annually for highway construction and maintenance than had been given to the University for buildings and land during ninety-odd years of its existence. Although there was a decrease in the percentage of the total tax collections of the state that went to the University, it must be recognized that many new and valuable governmental functions had been added and the total amount of money collected by the state increased with almost terrifying rapidity—so rapidly in fact that before 1915 several prominent groups had argued that the tax burden had become intolerable. And in a sense the complaint was justified. The new expensive agencies of the state, attributes of an urban industrial society rather than an agricultural one, were being largely maintained by a tax system based chiefly upon land and physical property. And Wisconsin's wealth was less in her soil than in her industry and commerce.

The struggle of the University officials for greater amounts of money and the reaction of the legislature to these demands constitute the central part of the story of University finances. The interest of the legislature in what the University did increased with the amounts of money it appropriated. This interest was reflected in periodic investigations of one aspect or another of University activity, in the movement to reduce the power of the regents and president by specifying exactly how money was to be spent, in the attempt on the part of the legislature to control the expenditure of University income not derived from the state, in the determination by law of tuition fees for out-of-state students, and in various attempts of the legislature to influence educational policy, to investigate and advise on matters of student conduct and even of professorial behavior. Often, even though the legislature failed to pass a certain law, the consideration of it caused the regents or the faculty to make changes to meet the criticism implicit in the proposed legislation. Thus the legislature not only provided money and determined larger matters of policy, but it influenced, directly and indirectly, such matters as University entrance requirements, the prerequisites for a degree, and the courses of study.

It is, of course, impracticable to attempt a discussion of all legislation bearing on the University. The number of bills relating to some aspect of the University increased each session; in 1915 forty-two bills were introduced relating to the institution; in 1923 eighty-two such bills and resolutions were introduced. Most of them did not pass but, because they had influence, some attention must be given to these measures.

Long before the legislature of 1905 came into session, Van Hise gave notice of his intention to press for larger and more secure support from the state. In his report to the Board, he pointed out that rising costs of living required an increase in faculty salaries, and that the great increase in the number of students required additional appointments to the faculty and an extensive building program. He complained that in terms of income the University of Wisconsin, in comparison with neighboring institutions, was losing ground. The states of California, Michigan, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Colorado, and North Da-
kota were all relatively more generous in the support of their institutions of higher education than was Wisconsin. Under the present system of support, the regents could not plan ahead, could only do what each successive legislature provided for. Van Hise asked for support of a program under which the income of the University would not only be assured but would expand with the prosperity of the state. This meant, of course, a mill tax.  

Governor La Follette reiterated Van Hise's requests. He pleaded for additional funds and pointed out the valuable contributions made by the University to the economy of the state. There were other contributions, La Follette said: "The true and constantly growing spirit of democracy fostered by the state university is by no means one of its least valuable returns to the commonwealth. This spirit is essential to and insures permanency of popular government in its best form."  

Identical bills providing support for the University on a mill-tax basis and appropriating other funds to the University were introduced in the Assembly and the Senate on February 14, 1905. The one in the Assembly, presented by Herman L. Ekern, was permitted to die; the Senate bill, presented by William H. Hatton, was the one on which action was taken. Even before the bills were introduced, Van Hise and other University officials were busily engaged in winning popular support. Copies of the Jubilee volume, containing Van Hise's inaugural address and many other speeches, had been widely distributed along with the biennial report of the Board. A circular letter, prepared by Van Hise, outlining the needs of the University, had been sent to political leaders, University alumni, and prominent citizens. Van Hise and others wrote numerous letters asking for support of the bill. They received a sympathetic hearing and many promises of help. Emil Baensch, president of the Wisconsin Press Association, wrote: "You know the views I have held for many years, that the institution should be put on a firm basis, that its representatives and friends ought not to be biennially and eternally forced in[to] the disagree-
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7 *Senate Journal, 1905,* pp. 102-103.
8 *Assembly Journal, 1905,* p. 359; *Senate Journal, 1905,* p. 329.
able ranks of lobbyists.” Malcolm C. Douglas, managing editor of the *Milwaukee Sentinel*, wanted to promote the best interests of the University and promised that the columns of the newspaper would always be open to Van Hise to make public the work of the University. So carefully did Van Hise select people to assist, and so persuasive were his letters, that in the large collection of letters and answers in his legislative file of that year, only one letter registered a clear-cut refusal to help.

Most of the work on the appropriation bill was done in the Senate. The Hatton Bill, which had provided a levy of 2/5 of a mill for the support of the University, and other appropriation measures were referred first to the Committee on Education. Van Hise’s correspondence files show that, in addition to his extensive campaign to win popular support for the bill, he had collected pertinent information as to the way in which other universities were supported. For the committee hearings he tabulated the data from other states on the use of mill taxes for university support. For the Committee on Education he prepared a long statement again showing the needs of the University and advantages of the steady but elastic support offered by a mill tax. He lamented that the tax of 17/40 of a mill which had existed until 1899 had been repealed. He appealed to the state pride of the members of the committee by pointing out that through the generous and stable support of the University given in the 1890’s under a mill tax, the prevalent distrust of state universities had been allayed, and that the University had been able to attract good men to the faculty. The system of biennial appropriations was undermining the confidence which had been created.

In April the committee was ready to report with a bill which
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9 Emil Baensch to Charles R. Van Hise, March 25, 1905, Presidents’ Papers, filed under Legislative. All letters to and from Van Hise in this chapter are in the Presidents’ Papers filed under Legislative, unless otherwise indicated.

10 Malcolm C. Douglas to Van Hise, March 25, 1905.

11 This man had been “grieved by the expensive mode of living of the average student there [at the University], caused largely as I believe by the fraternities, which I deem an abomination, and so long as I view the situation as I do now, I am not disposed to render the assistance you desire.” Clarence C. Coe to Van Hise, January 14, 1905.

12 Syllabus for education committee, 1905, Presidents’ Papers, filed under Legislative.
had reduced the millage tax from 2/5 to 2/7 of a mill; changed a provision granting specified sums for repair, construction, and support to a general provision granting $200,000 a year for building and improvements in the order of greatest need as determined by the regents; and included a section, not in the original bill, providing that no new school or college was to be established without the authorization of the legislature. On the recommendation of the Committee on Education the bill was referred to the Committee on Claims. For the Committee on Claims, Van Hise prepared another long statement setting forth the needs of the University, arguing the wisdom of a steady and growing support of the University to match its greater needs and increasing student body. He sought to win back a part of the support lost when the education committee reduced the sum from 2/5 to 2/7 of a mill by asking for 3/10 of a mill. In his pleas to the committee he said, as he had said before and would say again, that he held the view "that a University in a democracy may be as high grade as a University under a monarchy." To hold the opposite view "would be the most fundamental charge which was ever made against a democracy." To the provision which had been added, directing that no new colleges be established without the consent of the legislature, Van Hise had no objection.

The Committee on Claims, like the Committee on Education, was friendly. In May the bill was reported to the Senate for passage. It came up for debate on May 26. Senator John M. Whitehead of Janesville proposed an amendment to substitute a specific money appropriation instead of the mill tax. The amendment found little support. Senator Hatton argued that the University should have a steady and dependable income. Senator Julius E. Roehr echoed Van Hise in declaring that the
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13 Senate Bills, 4598, 1905; Senate Journal, 1905, p. 870. Hereafter the bills and joint resolutions will be cited by number only, the S signifying that the bill was introduced in the Senate and the A, in the Assembly. Printed copies of these bills are bound serially for each legislature and are preserved in the Document Room of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

14 Senate Journal, 1905, p. 870.

15 Syllabus for claims committee, 1905, Presidents' Papers, filed under Legislative.

16 Ibid.

17 Senate Journal, 1905, p. 1035.

18 Ibid., 1234-1235.
University should not be required to live from hand to mouth and upon the favor of the legislature. Senator Andrew L. Kreutzner thought that it would be a good thing for the University to show the legislature around the campus and explain to members the need for the money asked, but he would bow to the will of the Committee on Claims.\textsuperscript{19} When the amendment came to a vote, it lost by a vote of 20 to 7.\textsuperscript{20} The next day the bill passed the Senate by a unanimous vote.\textsuperscript{21} In the Assembly the bill was read a first and second time and ordered to a third and final reading without going to committee. On June 2, it was passed by a vote of 77 to 2, with 21 assemblymen not voting.\textsuperscript{22}

The bill, which thus became law upon the governor's signature, was brief. It provided for the levy and collection of a state tax of 2/7 of a mill for each dollar of assessed valuation of the taxable general property in the state. This money was appropriated to the University Fund income to be used for current and administrative expenditures and for additions and improvements in the facilities of the University. The regents were restricted only to the extent of being required to apportion funds to the various colleges as stipulated in the \textit{Statutes} of 1898. Since property taxes would not be collected in time to provide for the first half of the fiscal year, the law provided that the regents might borrow money from state trust funds. The money was to be repaid with interest after taxes were collected. The law also provided $200,000 a year for three years for construction and equipment. Although release of these funds from the state treasury required the approval of the governor, and the general purpose of the fund was stipulated by the legislature, the regents were given wide latitude in determining how the funds were to be used. Lastly the law contained the provision that no new schools or colleges were to be established unless authorized by the legislature.\textsuperscript{23} Because there

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Wisconsin State Journal}, May 26, 1905. 
\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Senate Journal}, 1905, p. 1235. 
\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Ibid.}, 1252. 
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Assembly Journal}, 1905, pp. 1683, 1730, 1773. 
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Laws of Wisconsin}, 1905, pp. 491–493. The 2/7 mill tax of 1905 was, to be sure, smaller than the 17/40 of ten years before, but the tax rate alone does not tell the story. In 1901 the state assessment had been increased from $630,000,000 to $1,436,884,000. Nils P. Haugen, "Pioneer and Political Reminiscences," \textit{The Wisconsin Magazine of History}, 12:180 (December, 1928).
was little money available in the state trust funds a supplemental law was passed authorizing the secretary of state, upon approval of the governor, to transfer from the general fund to the University Fund income such money as might be necessary to meet current expenses of the University. As soon as taxes were collected, the money was to be returned by a transfer.\(^{24}\)

A number of other laws were adopted in the same session, mostly noncontroversial, providing funds for cranberry and tobacco experiments by the College of Agriculture, permitting the regents to establish branch experiment stations, providing funds for the state hygienic laboratory which had been established two years before, establishing a state forestry board on which the president of the University and the dean of the College of Agriculture were to be members, and making provision for the preparation of a history of Wisconsin soldiers in the Civil War in which the "head professor of American history in the state University" was to have a part.\(^{25}\)

Van Hise was pleased with the results of the session. In an address before the representatives of the Association of State Universities in November, 1905, he spoke of the important steps which had been taken. He described the mill tax and declared: "The amount derived from this tax is placed almost without restriction in the hands of the Regents to be distributed between the various needs of the University as seems most desirable. The legislature held that this continuous body was the one that could wisely decide as to the distribution of the income among the various departments."\(^{26}\)

Van Hise's elation was premature. The legislature came into special session late in 1905. Several things brought the University to its attention. A professor in the agricultural college had been dismissed and had publicly charged that there were ir-

\(^{24}\) Laws of Wisconsin, 1905, pp. 804-805.
\(^{25}\) Ibid., 760-761, 620, 109, 809, 383, 456.
\(^{26}\) The quotation was taken from a manuscript copy of the address. Dean Henry, it might be added, had opposed this legislation, fearing that the agricultural college would suffer. In a long and agitated letter to Van Hise he reviewed the history of the agricultural college, declaring that only the legislative safeguards placed on the funds, the alertness of several members of the regents, his own vigilant efforts, and the occasional intervention of the governor had kept the Board from diverting the agricultural funds to the other colleges. William A. Henry to Van Hise, February 22, 1905, Presidents' Papers.
regularities in the management of the college. Moreover, a wide discrepancy apparently existed between the amount of the University funds in the records of the secretary of state and in those of the regents, and charges were made that the University had been guilty of extravagance. The charges were based on a misunderstanding of University finances. From 1899 until the end of the fiscal year of 1904–1905, University appropriations had been made from the general fund and were available at the beginning of each period as needed. Under the reinstated mill tax no funds could be claimed until taxes were collected. The fiscal year of the University began on July 1, 1905. Mill taxes were not collected until the first quarter of 1906. This left a period of over six months during which the University had to be financed but had no money. To cover this period, it will be recalled, the legislature had authorized the University to borrow from the state trust funds and from the general fund on condition that the borrowed money be returned as soon as funds collected under the mill tax became available. Another element in the financial misunderstanding may have been that political opponents of La Follette were willing to use any opportunity to embarrass or discredit the governor. The plain facts of the law and bookkeeping should have been simple enough for almost anyone to understand. La Follette himself had suggested that the mill-tax law be amended to provide more fully for the temporary transfer of funds from the general fund to the University Fund income.\(^\text{27}\)

On December 7, Assemblyman P. A. Cleary introduced a joint resolution providing for an investigation of the University. "It is reported," ran Cleary's resolution, "and rumored that extravagance and waste in the financial affairs of the University of Wisconsin exist, and that, notwithstanding the liberal appropriations made by the legislature from year to year for the maintenance of that institution, there now exists a large deficiency."\(^\text{28}\) Van Hise promptly prepared a statement for the legislature and for publication denying the charges and explaining the financial condition of the University.\(^\text{29}\) He made it

\(^{27}\) *Assembly Journal,* Special Session, 1905, p. 41.


\(^{29}\) *Wisconsin State Journal,* December 8, 1905.
clear, however, that officials of the University would welcome an investigation of its finances. The Wisconsin State Journal reported that the legislative committee would also look into Professor Knapp’s charges of irregularities in the agricultural college. Though asserting its impartiality, the Journal remarked that the excitement over University finances served to emphasize a point. The state administration, while claiming to reduce taxes, had been the most expensive in history. “The important facts are that the money has been spent, and that in the face of increasing burdens to the tax payers, the administration jugglers issued their no-state-tax announcement, and then a few weeks later it is shown that the tax payers must make good a deficit of nearly a half million in the University’s income.”

Two days later the Journal printed a story summarizing the opinion of the attorney general in support of the legality of the University’s borrowing from the state.

Meanwhile the Cleary resolution had been sent to the judiciary committee to consider the admissibility of the resolution at the special session. It was here amended so as to link the investigation directly to the mill-tax law passed in the regular session. The substitute was adopted and sent to the Senate, where it was passed. The Assembly and Senate Committees on Education had met jointly, considered “certain apparent discrepancies in the university accounts,” and appointed a subcommittee to investigate. This committee reported that under the mill-tax law funds were not available during the first six months of the University year, and the funds adequate for University operations were not available in the state trust funds. Accordingly money had been obtained from the general fund. Under this arrangement $302,000 had been advanced to the University and it was estimated that this amount would be increased to $350,000 by February, 1906, when the whole sum would be repaid. On July 1, 1906, advances would again have to be made, but according to University estimates the whole advance should not exceed $250,000. In view of the expected large expenditures of the University, and the period
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34 Ibid., 115; Senate Journal, Special Session, 1905, p. 107.
of time which must elapse between the beginning of the fiscal year and the time of tax collections, the University would in the future have to anticipate its income and borrow to meet current expenses.\textsuperscript{34}

This matter-of-fact report allayed some suspicion. Van Hise, meanwhile, publicly welcomed the appointment of a legislative committee. He declared that the regents had long urged the creation of a legislative committee on University problems. He hoped subsequent legislatures would appoint similar committees which would report to the governor before the meeting of each legislature. "By adopting this policy," Van Hise declared, "each legislature will have a complete and exhaustive statement as to the management, condition and needs of the university, as a result of an investigation made by one of its own committees, and therefore will not have to rely entirely upon the statements of the university authorities, which some may think biased. Such a report will relieve the university authorities from much of the embarrassment under which they have labored in the past when university legislation was pending."\textsuperscript{35}

The resolution of the joint committee, as adopted, called for a full inquiry into the "conditions, affairs, management, expenses, and needs of the University with reference to any amendment which may be germane to chapter 468 of the law of 1905, or to any subject mentioned there, also into all transactions between the university and its agents, employees and other persons, it being the intention hereby to give such committee the fullest power and authority and not to limit in any wise the extent and manner of its inquiry." The committee was to be made up of two senators and three assemblymen and to report to the governor before November 1, 1906.\textsuperscript{36} Ten thousand dollars was appropriated for the investigation.\textsuperscript{37} The legislature also amended the mill-tax law, again permitting transfer

\textsuperscript{34} Statement from the Committee on Education, James Huff Stout, chairman, \textit{Assembly Journal}, Special Session 1905, pp. 185–187.

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Daily Cardinal}, December 19, 1905.

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{Laws of Wisconsin}, Special Session, 1905, p. 41.

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{Ibid.}, 13. In approving the appropriation, Governor La Follette said there might be some question about the constitutionality of considering a measure not specifically provided for in the proclamation convening the special session,
of funds from the general fund to the University Fund income but providing that the University must pay interest at the rate of three and a half per cent for such funds.\textsuperscript{38}

Thus the resolution to investigate the University, born of suspicion and perhaps hostility, was adopted. The inquiry now had the public support of the governor and University authorities. The suspicion had certainly been allayed. Van Hise had given notice that he would try to turn the investigation into a broad and intelligent effort to inform the legislature about all phases of the University.

The committee was in session for forty-five days between February 5 and October 25, 1906, and collected 2,055 typed written pages of testimony. With its counsel, accountant, and clerks, it manifested a catholic interest in all the affairs of the University. One hundred and forty-four witnesses appeared before it to give information or opinions, or to make objections. Some witnesses came because they were called, some because they wanted to, and some appeared because they happened to be passing by while the committee was in session. The committee's interest ranged from fraternities (which it did not like), football, and out-of-state tuitions to the working hours of professors, the conduct of secretaries at the agricultural college, the personality of the farm superintendent, the relations of Dean Henry to his staff, the financial system of the Board, the procedures of the executive committee, the methods of acquiring land, the construction of buildings and the methods of inviting bids. The \textit{Wisconsin State Journal} followed the hearing with the ill-concealed hope that some scandal would turn up. Late in February, Assemblyman Cleary appeared as a witness and acknowledged that the charges he had made against but that he would not veto the bill. "To veto this bill for any reason, might operate to prejudice the university with the public. The work which that great institution is doing is worth millions of dollars annually to agriculture and to other material interests of the state. The confidence and support of the people of this commonwealth is vital to full accomplishment of its high mission. I am confident that the authorities at the university will welcome the most careful scrutiny of its management." He objected, too, that the amount of money for the inquiry seemed "extravagant" but was sure the committee could exercise "prudence and economy." With these reservations he had approved the bill. \textit{Senate Journal}, Special Session, 1905, p. 115-116.

\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Laws of Wisconsin}, Special Session, 1905, pp. 30-31.
the University were based on hearsay. Early in March the State Journal’s interest revived when the dean of the College of Agriculture, the dean’s secretary, the farm superintendent, and others were called to testify. There were hopes that the agricultural college linen would be washed in public, and the testimony, which at least revealed the irritability of the dean, was fully reported. The Milwaukee Sentinel also began to carry stories on this part of the investigation. The Madison Democrat, on the other hand, made light of the investigation and studiously avoided the gossip. But it reported when the committee found the records and accounts of the college in good order and informed its readers before the end of the month that the agricultural college had been vindicated by the investigation.

By the time of the April meeting of the Board the inquiry had gone far enough for Van Hise to be confident that he could report on the principal conclusions which the committee would reach. Among those upon which Van Hise looked with disfavor were a recommendation that the business system of the University would be reorganized and the University required to submit a budget for the approval of the governor, secretary of state, and treasurer, and another recommendation which would urge that the president of the University be relieved of all financial responsibility. He felt that the adoption of the first would mean the virtual abolition of the Board of Regents. As to the second, he felt that the president should not be relieved of financial responsibility, since the most important expenditures were for educational purposes, and if the president were to direct educational policy he must not be separated from financial responsibility. He also reported that the censure of Dean Henry, if it were made, should carry with it recognition of Henry’s great contribution to the state and nation.

When the committee’s report was published in October, it was milder and more helpful than Van Hise had anticipated.

40 Wisconsin State Journal, March 2, 10, 12, 15, 1906; Milwaukee Sentinel, March 3, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 1906. 
42 Ibid., March 25, 1906. 
43 Reports to the Regents, E:81–83, April 17, 1906.
It found that the agricultural college had "suffered through a distrust that has become somewhat prevalent in the college" and that this was partly responsible for the loss of several good men. Dismissal of Knapp was not, the committee held, fully justified, but the resignation of the farm superintendent had "in great measure, reestablished confidence, and given promise of improved conditions in the future." Dean Henry was not mentioned by name. The committee criticized the system of letting contracts, objected to the illegal practice, sometimes followed, of purchasing property from persons connected with the University, supported the principle of extension work but opposed engaging in it on the grounds of economy, urged that out-of-state students be required to pay higher fees, and urged the regents to become better acquainted with the work of the institution; and it disapproved of fraternities and college athletics but felt that these matters had best be left in the hands of the faculty. The committee also recommended that an emergency appropriation of $250,000 be made to the University to enable it to meet expenses from the beginning of the next fiscal year until the time when tax money under the mill tax would be available. Moreover, it recommended adoption of a law providing that each year's budget be approved by the governor, the secretary of state, and the treasurer; requiring the University to remain within the limits of the budget; and requiring further that all funds be used for the purpose for which the appropriations were made.

The last was the recommendation Van Hise least wanted, since it would impose restrictions on the regents' disposition of the funds allotted to them. In effect, if carried out, it would immediately cancel the advantages gained from the law of 1905 which gave wide latitude to the regents in the expenditure of funds. As it turned out, however, this recommendation, like the one calling for an appropriation of $250,000, was not enacted into law.

On the whole the report of the committee was fair and square.

"Report of the Joint Legislative Committee on the Affairs of the University (Madison, 1906), 6.
Ibid., 8–14.
Ibid., 10.
Before it was released the *State Journal* had prepared its readers for such a report. It had pointed out that the charges made by Professor Knapp after his dismissal and the reports that the University was bankrupt had combined to produce "a panicky effect on the minds of the legislators, most of whom know little of the university except by hearsay, and the resolution had easy sailing through both houses." The *Journal* did not add that its own reports had contributed not a little to the "panicky effect." Nor was it content to accept complete vindication of the University. On October 25, it reported that reforms advocated by the committee, whose report had not yet been released, were already under way. The next day it published a report of the committee findings under the headline, "Legislative Report in Scorching Roasts of Frats, Regents, and Profs," a palpable exaggeration of the strictures of the committee. The *Madison Democrat*, on the other hand, found the report "favorable" and declared that the University had been given "a clean bill of health." The *Democrat* next day gave a front-page headline to the committee recommendation that the University be given another $250,000 and declared that this was the most important result of the investigation: "The investigation was born in sensationalism, rumor, jealousy and envy. It was fortunately placed in the hands of men of ability, common sense and fairness. Their report shows how exhaustively and with what earnestness they did their work. The great institution has been given a thorough trial—the result is the recommendation for a gift of $250,000, and for some changes of administrative character." Commenting four days later, the *Democrat* thought "the investigation was not amiss. It will do good, but, just the same here's a cheer for the university! and throughout the great commonwealth will be heard a swelling chorus of reverberations."

The committee, as the *Democrat* remarked, was fair and sensible; but the motivation of the investigation and the newspaper accounts distinguished it slightly from earlier legislative investi-
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48 Ibid., October 26, 1906.
49 *Madison Democrat*, October 26, 1906.
50 Ibid., October 27, 1906.
51 Ibid., October 31, 1906.
gations of the University. The accusations were vaguely connected with attacks upon La Follette, whose good friend was president of the University. To be sure, there had been political bias in earlier investigations, but bias of a somewhat amorphous character; the president of the University, though sometimes attacked, had not been considered the creature of one political group. He had been merely a state official, fair game for any political attack.

When the next legislature met in 1907, President Van Hise not only was prepared to ask for additional funds for the University functions already established, but he presented a long argument for the establishment of a school of medicine. He rested his plea in part upon the fact that almost all state universities in the states adjacent to Wisconsin had medical schools, that in the very beginning the legislature had stipulated that a department of medicine must be a part of the University, and that this provision had not been wholly dropped by succeeding legislatures. Chiefly, however, he argued that Wisconsin students must now leave the state for medical training, that distinguished authorities in medical education and outstanding graduates of the University who were now practicing physicians urged that a medical school be established, and that excellent medical education, for at least the first two years, could be offered by the University. He submitted a plan prepared by Professor Charles R. Bardeen outlining the groups of studies needed for medical education. The University could easily provide the first two years of training and he therefore advocated incorporation of a two-year medical course.\footnote{Van Hise to the regents, Regents' Biennial Report, 1905–06, pp. 40–58.}

The legislative program of the University moved forward smoothly. Van Hise conducted a wide correspondence spreading information about the nature and purpose of the University, asking and seeking support in all quarters, while Professor Bardeen conducted an extensive correspondence with medical men and others to win support for a two-year medical school. There were two medical schools in Milwaukee and opposition to the establishment of a medical school at the University came from both of them. Early in March, Bardeen warned Van Hise
that Dr. Washburn of the Wisconsin College of Physicians and Surgeons at Milwaukee was "bent by hook or crook, chiefly the latter, to force us to take over his school or remain unincorporated."53 Later Washburn informed Bardeen that his school could not accept students from the University; still later he said he could see no reason why "friendly and cordial relations" should not exist between the University and the Wisconsin College of Physicians and Surgeons.54 Meanwhile, Van Hise informed another inquirer that up to then nothing had been decided about what to do in the matter of training in clinical medicine, that he himself would approve having one or both Milwaukee institutions joined with the University of Wisconsin.55 Such cordiality did not exist between the Milwaukee Medical College and the University. The material presented in a statement by the lobbyist of this institution to the Committee on Claims was subsequently published anonymously in a twenty-seven-page pamphlet entitled, Some Facts and Figures Concerning the State University. Mainly intended to defeat the plans for a medical school, the pamphlet was an inaccurate and inflammatory attack upon the University, particularly for its profligate ways. The institution, the pamphlet charged, was "becoming a deplorable example of the evils of money lust." The inaccuracies in the statistical data of the pamphlet were quickly revealed, its source identified by University authorities, and its influence largely negated.56

Authorization to establish a medical school was contained in the appropriation bill for the University. Supporting opinion was strong enough to check any effort in the Senate to remove the provision from the bill. In the Assembly an amendment was offered to strike out the clause authorizing the medical college, but it was promptly defeated by a vote of 58 to 13.57 The bill passed both houses with substantial majorities. Be-

53 Charles R. Bardeen to Van Hise, memorandum on a letter of Dr. Henry Vining Ogden to Bardeen, March 1, 1907, Presidents' Papers, filed under Legislative.
54 Dr. Washburn to Bardeen, March 6, 16, 1907, Presidents' Papers, filed under Legislative.
55 Van Hise to a Dr. Francis, March 18, 1907.
56 Pamphlet and memorandum concerning a pamphlet, Presidents' Papers, filed under Legislative.
57 Assembly Journal, 1907, p. 1147.
sides authorizing the medical school, the appropriation bill specifically provided that the secretary of state transfer not more than $250,000 each year from the general fund to the University Fund income. The building appropriation of $200,000 a year for three years was extended to cover a five-year period, and another appropriation of $100,000 a year for a period of four years was voted for the construction and equipment of men’s dormitories and a women’s building with a gymnasium. The legislature directed that the women’s building should be constructed first. In other appropriation bills the legislature contributed $20,000 a year for an extension department in the University, increased to $20,000 a year the funds available for farmers’ institutes, and passed a law giving the regents somewhat more power in acquiring land.

At the instigation of Superintendent of Public Instruction Cary the legislature had considered, but it refused to adopt, resolutions modifying the entrance requirements of the University; it had adopted a bill providing that no license could be granted for the sale of liquor “to be drunk on the premises within 3,200 feet of the main building of any state university”; and it had adopted a resolution condemning the plans of University students to hold a regatta on Lake Mendota on Memorial Day. These acts indicated that the legislature was increasingly willing to consider matters of educational policy, student morals and conduct; that some of its members were prepared to inform the University authorities about the proper requirements for admission to the University and the prerequisites for graduation. In part, this was an outcome of voting larger appropriations; in part, it must be accounted a result of Van Hise’s policy of encouraging the legislature to inform itself
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69 Joint Resolutions, 56A, 1907; *Assembly Journal*, 1907, pp. 198, 399; *Senate Journal*, 1907, pp. 393, 516.
69 *Laws of Wisconsin*, 1907, pp. 364, 1228. The bill originally stipulated that the distance be half a mile from the campus.
69 The resolution denounced “such and all similar celebrations, fetes, and amusements, as a desecration... of Memorial Day and a disregard and violation of its sacred and solemn character.” *Laws of Wisconsin*, 1907, p. 1283.
about the University. If, as Van Hise insisted, the University existed to serve the state, then indeed the people's representatives had to concern themselves with the quality of the service and the effectiveness of legislation in widening or limiting it.

Van Hise asked the legislature of 1909 for increased funds. He wanted legislative approval for participation in the Carnegie plan for retirement allowances of University professors, and among the needs of the University he listed increased salaries and staff, additional buildings, research funds for the College of Letters and Science, new departments, a heating plant, additional land, and many other things, including an increased appropriation for residence halls. He asked that the mill-tax rate be increased from 2/7 to 3/8 of a mill. He concluded his request with the statement, "If the amounts asked for are granted, it is our confident belief that every dollar will be returned many fold to the state, even if the material point of view alone be considered." 64

His proposals were not cordially received. The first enthusiasm for Van Hise apparently had worn off, and newspapers had begun to snipe at the University. Its increased cost and rapid growth and prosperity made it a conspicuous target for any politician. Its lengthening list of activities could not please everybody. Even before the 1909 legislature met, the *Jackson County Journal*, published by Merlin Hull, assemblyman-elect, carried an editorial entitled, "The Champion Wanter." Van Hise was accused of making excessive demands for funds. 65 A Boscobel lawyer, on the other hand, warned that there were "a bunch of dinky newspapers in this section of the state ... who delight in making attacks upon the State University on account of its alleged extravagance." 66 Assemblyman Henry E. Roethe on March 3 delivered a hostile speech, accusing the University of extravagance, opposing funds for a medical building, and objecting to the continuous requests from the University for more money: "We all know how these things go, it's the same story
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65 *Jackson County Journal*, Black River Falls, Wisconsin, December 30, 1908.
66 Otto Kuenzli, Boscobel, to the registrar, March 31, 1909, Presidents' Papers, filed under Legislative.
over and over again, always more money needed, and I wish
to compliment the University right here that its lobbyists are
the slickest and the smoothest that ever came down the pike.” 67

The work being done at Madison, particularly by the ex-
tension department, won the enthusiastic and often uncritical
approval of the reformers throughout the country. In February,
1909, Lincoln Steffens’ article, “Sending a State to College,”
appeared in the American Magazine. Steffens was already
known as a leading muckraker. The admiring articles he had
written about La Follette and the Progressives identified him
as a supporter of La Follette, and his enthusiasm for the Uni-
versity was construed as evidence that the University was carry-
ing out the program of the Progressives. The very fact that Stef-
fens approved what the University was doing was for many a
sufficient reason to oppose the University program. His refer-
cence to the “Tory Regents,” a mere qualification in his essay
of headlong approval, did not escape the sensitive Board.

There was another element in the situation. The old titans
on the Board were gone, the men who had been so potent in
helping to steer the University through the roiled political
waters of the 1890’s, who had given respectability to academic
freedom in 1894, who by virtue of their eminence maintained,
if not a nonpartisan, at least a bipartisan aura about the Univer-
sity. General Lucius Fairchild had died in 1896, John Johnston
in 1904, and Breese Stevens in 1903. William F. Vilas, one of the
last and perhaps most powerful of them all, died in 1908. These
men, and others like them, both Republicans and Democrats,
had given great support to the University. Vilas, in his will,
attested his belief in the University and in academic freedom
by providing that eventually his whole estate be devoted to the
University. His stipulations as to the salary to be paid to the
William F. Vilas professors and the teaching duties to be de-
manded of them stood, and perhaps were intended to stand, as
a biennial rebuke to the stinginess of the legislature. To a
former regent, Van Hise confessed that he missed Vilas very
much. “His death has indeed been a loss to us this year. In
legislative matters he and [I] worked as one. Each one knew

67 Madison Democrat, March 4, 1909.
Getting and Spending: 1903–1914

exactly what the other did at all times, and the remarkable legislation which we secured four years ago and two years ago was very largely due to that fact."\(^{68}\)

The character of the Board had changed. Men friendly to Van Hise had been replaced. State Superintendent Cary, regent ex officio, was becoming more and more shrill in his denunciations. Among the new appointees to the Board were G. D. Jones, a graduate of the University, wealthy, conservative, and outspoken; Magnus Swenson and Pliny Norcross, also conservative alumni; and William D. Hoard, former governor, early supporter of La Follette, an important influence in the agricultural college, who now in his last years was about to break with La Follette and denounce Van Hise for seeking to create a governing aristocracy. Swenson was the most irascible. G. D. Jones, whose initials suggested a nickname to the irreverent, stoutly opposed Van Hise on many issues. Against Van Hise’s pleas that the regents stand firm in their defense of the full demands of the University, Jones objected that the regents should accept modifications “in the spirit of fairness.”\(^{69}\) Jones, then new on the Board and suspicious of Van Hise, wrote him in May objecting to the statements of the Socialists in the legislature and complaining that Van Hise allowed himself to be “unduly influenced” by them. “Thank God the State of Wisconsin is not socialistic. I am afraid it is true, however, that the University of Wisconsin allows itself to be influenced more by these theories than by any others in the state.” Jones was angry at what he had heard about the “poltroonery and the disloyalty of the regents to the University. I am sure that without intending to do so you have encouraged this feeling. It is a most absurd and ridiculous charge, and I feel that you should see to it yourself that it is promptly and vigorously refuted. The Regents of the University are not only loyal to the University itself, but they have shown a loyalty to the president of the University that has not been reciprocated.”\(^{70}\) A week later Jones, his temper unimproved, wrote Van Hise to excoriate Professor Gilmore’s theories about prop-

\(^{68}\) Van Hise to Major C. Mead, May 24, 1909.
\(^{69}\) G. D. Jones to Van Hise, March 31, 1909.
\(^{70}\) Ibid., May 3, 1909.
Hoard, too, wrote Van Hise about attacks against the regents which had been made in the legislature.

Major C. Mead, a former regent, sought to console Van Hise by telling him what a great work he was doing for the University. "Your splendid efforts are thoroughly appreciated by the alumni everywhere and by the good people of the state, generally, and it is disgusting to me to know, as I do, that you have these guerillas on the board of regents."

Some aspects of the difficulties of the years 1909 to 1911 have been treated in the chapters on Van Hise. They are noted here only in relation to the legislative program. In view of the attacks being made upon the Board and the evidences of distrust for Van Hise among some members of the Board, perhaps it was remarkable that the legislature turned out to be as liberal as it was. For all the uproar, charges against the University were not taken too seriously, and Van Hise and other University officials were effective in winning support and meeting objections. Van Hise as usual had appealed to alumni throughout the state for assistance in explaining the purposes of the University and assuring legislators of their support of appropriations. On the whole, the legislative program went off well. Although not enthusiastic, Governor Davidson was cordial to the University. The legislature refused to increase the mill-tax rate to 3/8 of a mill, it repealed the appropriation of $100,000 a year for building women's dormitories, and it refused a number of other requests, but it did provide a two-year grant of $100,000 a year for general purposes, $50,000 a year for two years for books, apparatus, furniture, and equipment, and it extended the $200,000 annual building appropriation for seven years after 1905. It also provided $125,000 for the next two years for extension but incorporated the extension budget into the University budget; and it made an additional appropriation for the agricultural college. The legislature also considered limiting the mill-tax appropriation to only two years,
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an action which Van Hise gloomily predicted would of necessity drive the University into politics.\textsuperscript{77}

Many other laws bearing on the University were passed. The legislature authorized the regents to apply to the Carnegie Foundation for the benefits of the retirement fund. It displayed remarkable solicitude for the women, first by providing that at least two members of the Board of Regents be women, and second, partly in answer to the ill-advised suggestion of Van Hise that some segregation of the sexes should be made in teaching certain classes, by decreeing that all schools and colleges of the University, "in their respective departments and class exercises," be open "without distinction to students of both sexes." It also attached the Library School more closely to the University, authorized the regents to establish two branch agricultural experiment stations and appropriated funds for that purpose, assigned nursery and orchard inspection duties to the agricultural college, directed the dean of the agricultural college to serve on a board to determine the proper location of county schools of agriculture and domestic science, and placed him on the state Board of Immigration. It approved the expenditure of a possible $50,000 of University funds for the construction of a forest products laboratory for cooperative work with the United States Forestry Service. It provided funds for paving Park Street "with asphaltum" from Lake Mendota to University Avenue and generously promised to give the old dome of the state capitol, which had survived the capitol fire of 1904, to the regents to be placed on the "main hall of the university building," if the regents or the legislature in the future so provided. The removal and reconstruction cost could be no more than $25,000. It also adopted one resolution requesting the regents to investigate the fraternities and sororities for the purpose of remedying the antidemocratic and cliquelike tendencies of these organizations, and another providing for a joint committee to investigate University supervision and inspection of high schools.\textsuperscript{78}

\textsuperscript{77} Van Hise to Thomas Lloyd Jones, May 11, 1909.

But in addition to the ones passed, the legislature had considered bills fixing the terms of admission to the University, changing the course of study of the normal schools, providing for a chair of "race culture" in the medical school to promote the "study of human degeneracy and deterioration";79 numerous bills which would have increased the funds appropriated for extension work; a bill to abolish the medical school;80 a bill to regulate the faculty in its handling of discipline cases;81 and bills directing the establishment in the college of agriculture of a poultry department and chairs of plant pathology and entomology.82

Before the next legislature convened, although the carping criticism of the University and the differences between the Board on the one side and the president and faculty on the other had not entirely disappeared, the air had been cleared somewhat by the frank discussion which had taken place between a committee of the faculty and the Board. Fully as important was the fact that in the election of 1910 the Progressives had been triumphant. Francis E. McGovern, a graduate of the University, was elected governor. The legislature elected at the same time was to be known throughout the country for carrying through one of the most remarkable programs of reform legislation ever witnessed in an American state.

In his report Van Hise again called for an increase of the millage tax from 2/7 to 3/8 to provide for the growing needs of the University, an increase in salaries, and the establishment of new departments. He boldly outlined a building program which called for an outlay of between $805,000 and $930,000 for educational buildings, $1,000,000 for student dormitories and other student buildings, additional funds for the extension work, and funds for an addition to the historical library building, now crammed from attic to basement.83 Again Van Hise assured the Board that every dollar would be "returned many fold to the state even if the material point of view alone be considered." The president of the regents, Wil-
William D. Hoard, in transmitting the report to the governor repeated Van Hise's words, saying: "It is my belief that in the future as in the past the investment of funds in the University will be one which will be returned to the state manyfold." 84

In his message to the legislature, McGovern was almost as unreserved as Van Hise. Pointing to the work of the extension division and other branches of the University, he recommended an adequate appropriation. "If those for whom it exists still cherish the high educational ideal which it has fostered and championed, that the boy or girl of humblest parentage but with brilliant intellectual endowment should have an opportunity for education equal to that enjoyed by the children of the most wealthy, it will not now fail of proper support. I desire only to remind you that grants of revenue for the maintenance of the University should be regarded as investments." 85

The legislature of 1911 did not grant all that was asked, but it did increase the mill tax to 3/8 of a mill as Van Hise had requested. It increased the $200,000-a-year grant for construction to $300,000 a year for the fiscal years beginning July 1, 1912 and July 1, 1913, providing however that $50,000 a year of this increase should be used for purchase of books, apparatus, furniture, and equipment. It did not provide a million dollars for student buildings, although it granted a total of $150,000 for the next two years for a women's dormitory, gave generously to the extension division and to the traveling schools of agriculture, and granted funds for the purchase of additional property. This appropriation bill was the first passed by a legislature in which the regular appropriations to the University and the other state institutions were submitted together. 86 Attempts in the Senate to substitute a cash appropriation instead of the millage tax and to require out-of-state students to pay a fee equal to the cost of instruction were defeated. 87 The legislature also provided funds for construction of an additional wing of the library. 88

Laws were also passed which governed the printing of University catalogues and other publications, 89 extended the term

84 Ibid., 2. 85 Assembly Journal, 1911, pp. 63-64.
86 Laws of Wisconsin, 1911, 831-836. 87 Senate Journal, 1911, p. 1116.
88 Laws of Wisconsin, 1911, pp. 729-731. 89 Ibid., 993. 955-956.
of the regents from three to six years,\textsuperscript{90} authorized further agricultural demonstration stations, and modified the law under which the college maintained the stallion-registration service.\textsuperscript{91} The legislature appropriated $10,000 for the purchase of two stump-pulling machines to be used by the College of Agriculture in land-clearing experiments and demonstration.\textsuperscript{92}

Although the legislature passed no bills to hamper the University, and passed a great many helpful ones, its admiration was apparently tempered. It enacted a statute creating the state Board of Public Affairs, the precursor of the budget department; but it expressly stipulated that no member of the University faculty might be appointed to this board which, among its other functions, was intended to study the operation of the government and make recommendations for its greater efficiency. The legislature also considered but did not pass bills designed to abolish the farmers' institutes, require the University to purchase a flag and display it daily on University Hall, investigate University purchasing methods, require all male students entering the University to sign a written pledge promising to abstain from the use of intoxicants while at the University, prohibit the sale of liquor within one mile of the University, authorize the establishment of municipal universities to cooperate with the University, and establish an accident prevention museum.\textsuperscript{93} It also considered a bill which would have fixed the admission requirements to the University,\textsuperscript{94} and one which would have abolished the Board of Regents and established a central board of education.\textsuperscript{95}

\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., 308.
\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., 61, 826–827.
\textsuperscript{92} Ibid., 565–567. The removal of stumps from cutover land in northern Wisconsin and Minnesota had been the subject of cooperative investigations for several seasons by the United States Bureau of Plant Industry and the Minnesota and Wisconsin Experiment Stations. This was, Dean Russell had reported, "the most serious drawback to the rapid settlement of this region." Regent's Biennial Report, 1909–10, p. 162. This law was introduced, appropriately enough, by Assemblyman A. J. Plowman. Assembly Journal, 1911, p. 212.
\textsuperscript{94} Assembly Bill 992A, Assembly Journal, 1911, pp. 283, 878.
\textsuperscript{95} Assembly Bill 278A, ibid., 159, 1412.
The legislature of 1913 was the last with which Van Hise enjoyed large success. The great well of energy within the University was perhaps subsiding. More important, the Progressives were divided. Senator La Follette had unsuccessfully sought the Republican nomination for the presidency in 1912. The Progressives were divided over the problem of whether to remain within the Republican Party, which La Follette did, support Roosevelt, which McGovern did, or bolt the party to support Wilson, which John J. Blaine of Boscobel did. The La Follette men apparently held nothing against Blaine for supporting Wilson, for La Follette himself campaigned in the summer of 1914 for Blaine, who ran for the Wisconsin governorship as an independent. But McGovern and his followers were not forgiven. McGovern, many La Follette men believed, had conspired with Roosevelt to deprive La Follette of the nomination in Chicago. When Roosevelt failed to get the nomination, McGovern had followed him into the Bull Moose campaign. McGovern retained the governorship in 1912 but Wisconsin returned its electoral votes for Wilson.

Van Hise appealed to the legislature for additional funds. He again asked for money for higher salaries, $878,000 beyond what had been appropriated for educational buildings, $607,000 for student buildings, and additional sums for miscellaneous purposes. He argued more specifically than ever before about the money value of the University to the state. Besides taking considerable pains to defend University expenditures on a purely material basis, he also protested the frequent misrepresentations of the cost of the University. These misrepresentations resulted from taking the total sum reported as spent and giving it as the cost of the University to the state. Van Hise properly denounced such "reckless" statements. They took no account of the contribution made by the federal government, or of private gifts, or of income derived from donations, from the farm, or from other sources.

In his message to the legislature McGovern explained that the pre-eminence of the University was due "principally to its willingness to serve all the people of the state, especially those

---

who have never been within its walls as resident students." He acknowledged that there had been criticisms of the institution but "the fear of university interference with the liberties of the people which in some quarters has taken the place of the primitive prejudice against higher education, is due entirely to a failure to recognize this function. The man who is working in the dark does not regard the bringing of light as an interference with his liberty unless he happens to be a safe blower.... Instead of interfering with freedom the University stands and through its extension division reaches out as the servant of all the people, holding aloft as its motto the inspiring greeting: 'And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.' [67]

In terms of money grants alone the University fared well with the 1913 legislature in the requests for funds both for operating expenses and for buildings. Over one million dollars was appropriated for land purchase, educational buildings, and student buildings. Some of these appropriations would not become available until the next legislature was in session, but the grants were impressive. For other University activities, too, the legislature was far from niggardly in its appropriations.68

This appropriation bill was noteworthy not only because it was the product of the last reasonably generous legislature for many years but because the legislature in 1913 returned to the practice of specifying the purpose for which appropriated monies should be spent. Moreover the legislature in its appropriation act chose to invade the prerogatives hitherto belonging to the regents. It appropriated funds which were derived from sources other than the state. This problem had been raised while La Follette was governor and had been put to rest. Now it was raised again, largely for the same reason, and for four years the legislature was to insist upon appropriating to the University all funds expended by the regents, whatever the source.

The appropriation bill of 1913, like the bill of two years before, was introduced by the Joint Committee on Finance and

67 Senate Journal, 1913, pp. 45-46.
provided funds for both the normal schools and the University. Unlike the earlier bills, it was long, detailed, and explicit, and for the University appropriation it added some thirty new subsections to the statutes. Seventeen of these new sections merely provided the amount of money to be used for each specified activity of the University during the coming two years. In appropriating $645,500 for construction of educational buildings, the legislature named the buildings which should be built and the amount of money which should be spent, although a clause was inserted giving the regents authority to reapportion up to ten per cent of the funds so obligated. Thereafter, a number of subsections were inserted to assure that all income of the University would be turned over to the state treasurer for deposit. The income was appropriated by the legislature to support the activity from which it was derived. The legislature, moreover, not content with what it had done, added another section which outlined the sources of funds to be used for the support and endowment of the University, stipulated that the income of all these funds should, "so far as appropriated by the legislature," be placed at the disposal of the Board of Regents, and further provided that the 3/8 mill tax be added to the University Fund income to be used "as specifically appropriated by the legislature." The legislature in this bill also fixed the rate of tuition for out-of-state students at one hundred dollars a year, a provision which reflected the belief that out-of-state students were not contributing their full share to the support of the University. Attempts to increase the out-of-state tuition to $125 a year and to require the regents to collect from out-of-state students tuition fees equal to the per capita cost of instruction and operation of the University had been defeated. Governor McGovern signed the appropriation bill but objected to passing appropriations for public institutions in an omnibus bill which, since the governor had to approve all or nothing, deprived him of his power. Other legislation adopted was of minor or passing impor-

\[10\] Ibid., 1185.


\[101\] Assembly Journal, 1913, pp. 1688–1692.
tance. A law was passed requiring the regents' meeting to be open to the press and public, although the regents' right to hold executive sessions was granted, provided the decisions of the session were made part of the record. There were also laws relating to the establishment of a pharmaceutical experiment station, of county agricultural representatives, and of a soils laboratory and legislation on eradication of contagious diseases among animals, on the manufacture of hog cholera serum, on tuberculin tests of cattle, and on stallion enrollment. Three laws were passed relating to the improvement of the Camp Randall Memorial Park.

Many of the bills which were introduced but not passed indicated drifts of opinion. A central board of education was proposed. A law was passed altering the composition of the Board of Visitors and extending its power, but it was vetoed by the governor. Several bills were introduced directing that the University conduct research or offer instruction in phases of cooperative activity. Bills were also introduced relating to the sale of liquor near the University. Interest in student conduct was attested by a resolution calling for another investigation of the fraternities and sororities, a resolution under which the president of the Senate would have appointed a committee to confer with the Board of Regents of the University regarding "immoral conduct" in Madison, and another bill which would have prohibited dancing in state-owned buildings.
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