

authority for the statement that when the Dingley bill was under consideration in the Senate, Senators Allison, Aldrich and Quay came over to the Democratic side of the chamber and appealed to the Democratic Senators to permit them to attach to the bill, without publicity, a number of amendments, not with a view to making them law, but purely for the effect on the protected interests in Quay's and Aldrich's States. These amendments, it was explained, included the duty on anthracite coal (p. 418) and several others, and, according to the programme, were to be "yielded in conference." To this proposition the Democrats assented. Similar tactics were followed in the House, duties being inserted which it was expected to use as a "trading basis" with the Senate conferees. The Representatives of the extremely protected interests, however, saw their advantage and, for the sake of their own proteges, accepted the bill as passed in the Senate. These "fake" schedules became in consequence a part of that measure on which the country is urged to "stand pat" because its schedules are too sacred for revision. The point to which we would call attention in this connection is the culpability of the Democratic senators who made themselves parties to this form of deception, which, as it turns out, has cost the coal consumers of the country thousands upon thousands of dollars. Such methods are to be expected from the promoters of the policy of protection. Representing a fraud, they naturally enough support it fraudulently. But the Democrats who help them in their frauds are worse than they. The startling thing about it is that Democrats admit these facts without any apparent appreciation of the moral turpitude involved in their own conduct.

In one of the editorials which the statistical bureau of the treasury department at Washington is sending out regularly for consumption by Republican editors, the boast is made that "the export figures for

September are extremely encouraging." By this it appears to be meant that they have risen. Yet nothing is said about pay for these exports; and if the treasury figures are correct they never have been paid for, are not being paid for now, and there is no reasonable probability of their ever being paid for in the future. What encouragement is there, pray, in increased exporting under those circumstances?

#### THE PROSPEROUS FARMER.

Much is being said during the present political year of the great prosperity of the farmer, census statistics being quoted as proof of the unprecedented increase in farm property during the past decade.

According to the Republican campaign text-book, "The 'Man with the Hoe' is the man with the 'dough.'" The same idea we find expressed in the Literary Digest of August 9th, in an article headed "The farmers the richest class in the United States."

As there is probably no class that contributes so much to the welfare of the community as the agricultural class, it would seem but just that this should be in fact our wealthiest class. But is it?

After quoting census statistics as showing that the wealth of our farmers amounts to over twenty billions of dollars, the Literary Digest quotes the New York Financier, as follows:

The farmer, so far as actual wealth is concerned, is the capitalist of the United States. The census bureau report on the value of farming property of the country, issued last week, estimates that the 5,739,657 farms of the United States are worth \$16,674,690,247. Of this amount \$3,560,198,191, or 21.4 per cent., represents the value of buildings, and \$13,114,492,056, or 87.6 per cent., represents the value of lands and improvements. Farm implements and machinery are worth \$761,261,350, and live stock \$3,078,050,091, making the total farming wealth over \$20,514,000,000."

As further quoted, the Financier compares farming property with railway property, saying:

"The railway industry was in its infancy in 1850, so that comparisons extending back 50 years are unfair; but taking 1890 as a basis, it is found that

railway property, as indicated by total capitalization, rose from \$10,029,000,000 in that year to \$11,892,000,000 in 1900. This is an increase of 18.5 per cent., or nearly 10 per cent. less than the increase in the value of farms."

The foregoing quotations are fair specimens of the manner in which statistics are used by those who are anxious to demonstrate the prosperity of our industrial classes.

Neither the Literary Digest nor the Financier seems to have thought it worth while to inquire how much of the agricultural property reported by the census belongs to those who farm farms and how much to those who farm farmers.

According to the census, less than 60 per cent. of the farms are owned by those who operate them, and of these over 31 per cent. are owned subject to encumbrance. In the census tables the proportion of those operating their own farms is given as 63.7 per cent., but this includes "part owners," and "owners and tenants," among the owned farms. These classes belong as properly in the tenant as in the owning class. "Part owners" are those owning part and hiring part of the farm they operate, and the class "owners and tenants" includes farms operated by an owner and tenant conjointly. It seems fair to assign one-half of these classes to the owning and the other half to the tenant class.

On page 144, volume v. of the census reports, may be found the value of farm property of the different classes, and also the value of products and the amount expended for labor and fertilizers. The total value of all farm property of farms operated by "owners" is given as \$11,029,293,472. That of farms operated by "part owners," as \$2,477,915,092, and of farms operated by "owners and tenants," \$249,400,935.

Taking the amount reported for the first class together with half the amount reported for the two other classes, we have \$12,392,951,485 as representing the value of the farm property of farmers who operate their farms.

The tenant farmers own some part of the stock and implements of the tenant farms, but it probably will not equal the indebtedness of

those owning the farms they operate. Regarding this we have no data except that obtained from the population schedule, which indicates that 31 per cent. of the owned farm homes are encumbered. The amount of encumbrance is not reported.

Our agricultural workers constitute over 35 per cent. of those having gainful pursuits, and should possess that proportion of the property of the community instead of about 13 per cent. According to the estimate of the Bureau of Statistics the total value of property in the United States amounts to \$94,300,000,000. From this it would appear that our agricultural class are the possessors of only about one-third of the amount of property that they are justly entitled to.

There is no more industrious class than our farmers, and none less given to extravagant expenditures, and the fact that farmers have so small a proportion of the property of the country would seem sufficient evidence that they are not well paid for their labor.

Let us see what the census shows regarding that. On page 145, vol. v., of the report for 1900, we find the average value of farms and farm property reported as \$3,574, of which \$2,285 represents land and improvements except buildings; \$620 represents buildings, \$133 implements and machinery, and \$536 live stock. The value of products not fed to live stock is given at \$656. The expenditures reported are labor \$64 and fertilizers \$10. These, however, are not all the expenditures, though they were all that were called for by the census schedule. Now, if we estimate 6 per cent. interest on the investment and 15 per cent. of the value of machinery and implements for renewal and repairs, and nothing at all for repairs of buildings and fences, and nothing at all for taxes, and deduct these with the costs of labor and fertilizers from the value of the product, we find that the operator of the average farm obtains but \$357.51 as the reward of his year's labor, supplemented by that of his wife and children.

This product of \$656 not fed to live stock included that part of the product which has been consumed

by the family. Thus the \$357.50 is not the amount obtained over and above living expenses or any part of them, but the entire value realized for the year's labor.

If the cultivator of the farm owns it free of encumbrance he may obtain part of his support from the return on his investment. But even in this case he is hardly on a par with the railway capitalist in his ability to invest in steam yachts.

But we have seen that less than one-half of our farmers are the owners of farms free of encumbrance; that is less than 60 per cent. own their farms and over 31 per cent. of those who do own own subject to encumbrance.

On this average farm the value of the buildings is reported as but \$620. So that if the dwelling is worth as much and no more than the barn and sheds, the cultivator of this average farm dwells in a palatial mansion valued at \$310.

There are doubtless many farmers whose condition is far superior to that of the operator of the average farm, but it must be remembered, as we are dealing with averages, that for every farmer that is more fortunate there must be others that are correspondingly less fortunate.

Having seen what the census shows as to the average farmer of the United States, let us next take the statistics for a State where conditions might be expected to be more favorable. Let us take the statistics for the State of Ohio.

In this State the value of the average farm, together with improvements, implements and live stock, amounts to \$4,333. The buildings are valued at \$793, implements at \$132, and the value of product not fed to live stock at \$726. Deducting interest on investment \$259, repair and renewal of machinery and implements \$19.80, the amount paid for labor \$52, and the amount for fertilizers \$10, we have remaining \$386.22 as the earnings of the farmer operating the average Ohio farm. This is nearly \$30 better than the earnings of the cultivator of the average farm in the United States, and we find that he dwells in a still more palatial residence; for the value

of the farm buildings in Ohio averages the princely sum of \$793.

Perhaps these figures are not altogether reliable, but they are those of the census, which are being cited as proof of great agricultural prosperity, and that the farmer has become the real capitalist of the country.

Next let us see as to agricultural labor as a whole, taking the estimate of the agricultural statistician, presented on page cxxxi., of volume v., of the reports of the present census. Here we find the various items for the whole country given as follows:

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| Gross farm income, including additions to the value of farm property ..... | \$4,187,892,706 |
| Product not fed to live stock .....  | 8,742,129,867   |
| Annual income in value of farm property .....                              | 445,763,349     |
| Interest on the value of farm property at 6 per cent. ....                 | 1,226,334,070   |
| Number of persons engaged in agriculture .....                             | 10,273,770      |

From these items the statistician figures out the average earnings of those engaged in agriculture as \$288.26. Nothing is here deducted for renewal or repairs of any kind, while there is a large item added as representing the increase in the value of farm properties.

The absurdity as well as impropriety of including this item of \$445,763,349 as a part of the farm income is apparent, when we discover how this item is obtained. Omitting this item and deducting for renewal and repairs of machinery and implements, we obtain an amount \$54 less than that computed in the census, making the average labor income of those engaged in agricultural pursuits \$234 instead of \$288.

This estimate is subject to further reduction because the census statisticians' calculation fails to include the entire number of persons engaged in agricultural industry. The occupation tables report a large body of labor as "laborers (not specified)," with this explanation in a foot note: "In agricultural districts agricultural laborers, and similarly in manufacturing districts unskilled workmen, are often reported simply as laborers." Of the number thus reported, 2,640,420, a large proportion must have been engaged in agriculture. If we make the very conservative estimate that one-third of this number were thus employed and include

them with the number reported as engaged in agriculture we shall have to reduce the estimated average earnings by something over \$20, making the average labor income of those engaged in agriculture less than \$214. This would be still further reduced had we considered the amount paid as taxes on farm property.

To obtain the annual increase in the value of farm property, the census has taken one-tenth of the amount representing the difference in the value of farm property as reported in the censuses of 1890 and 1900. As there was no increase but a decrease in the value of farms and improvement from \$21.31 an acre in 1890 to \$19.82 in 1900, the increase in the value of farm property at the last census is the result of the inclusion of property not enumerated in 1900. According to the census there was an increase in the number of farms from 4,564,641 in 1890 to 5,739,657 in 1900, with an increase in acreage from 623,218,619 acres in 1890 to 841,201,546 in 1900. This unprecedented increase forms the only basis for the claim that the census indicates unparalleled agricultural prosperity.

Much of this increase results from the settling of new lands, but a very large proportion is fictitious. According to the census there was an increase in farm acreage in Illinois of 2,296,451 acres. In Ohio the increase shown is 1,149,577 acres. Here in Cook county, which is practically Chicago, according to the census there is also a remarkable agricultural development, the increase in farm acreage amounting to 19,718 acres. This is over 30 square miles of territory, and if in one tract would occupy an extent of over 6 miles long and 5 miles wide. How do they get it? Why, by enumerating as farms all the potato and cabbage patches on city lots. Even the Pingree potato patches in the district in which the writer resides were enumerated as farms. Enumerators were paid 18 cents for each tract thus enumerated, while they received but 4 cents for each death reported and were required to hunt up the attending physician and obtain his statement of the cause of death. They seem to

have got in everything that could possibly be enumerated as a farm, though their report as to mortality was very defective. The census schedule of 1890 did not admit the enumeration as a farm of any tract of less than 3 acres unless there was a product to the value of \$500 actually sold from it. Larger tracts were also excluded unless they required the labor of at least one able-bodied man for the year.

It is absurd to suppose that there could be any considerable increase in farm acreage in old settled States like Ohio and Illinois. On the contrary there must have been an actual decrease through the growth of cities and towns and the appropriation of land for residence and manufacturing purposes.

The inclusion of a larger number of small tracts as farms at the present than at the former census tends to decrease the average size of farms, and the fact that this average has increased from 136.5 acres in 1890 to 146.6 in 1900 is accounted for by the increased number of "bonanza farms."

The census reports 47,276 farms of 1,000 acres and over—the average size being 4,237.3 acres—making a total of 200,324,045 acres in farms of 1,000 acres and over, and almost one-fourth of the entire farm acreage of the United States, which is reported as 841,201,546 acres. In 1890 there were but 31,546 farms of 1,000 acres and over. The average size was not reported.

While there seems to be no reason to question the correctness of the census reports as to great farms, the reported increase in the small ones is largely fictitious. If there is prosperity among the farmers, then, as the census figures are said to show, it must be among the bonanza farmers, and not among the small ones. Not the land farmer, therefore, is prospering, according to the census, but the land monopolist.

HENRY L. BLISS.

## NEWS

To perfect the arbitration agreement in compromise of the anthracite coal strike (p. 438), a delegate

convention of anthracite coal miners' unions met at Wilkesbarre, Pa., on the 20th. The convention had been called on the 15th for the purpose of acting upon a unanimous recommendation of the executive boards of districts 1, 7 and 9 of the Mine Workers' Union of America, "that all mine workers now on strike return to their former positions and working places and submit to the commission appointed by the President of the United States all questions at issue between the operators and mine workers of the anthracite coal fields." When the convention met there were 662 delegates in attendance, the basis of representation being one delegate from each local union for every 100 members.

Mr. Mitchell opened the proceedings with a speech, in the course of which he made the following significant suggestions with reference to reciprocal relations between the coal miners' union and the coal trust in the future:

For our opponents we entertain no feeling of malice. While they have maligned our characters, impugned our motives and sought the victory by methods which we should scorn to use, yet on this day when we have secured an avenue of redress, on this day when the realization of our hopes and ambitions seems near, when the prospect of a brighter and happier future seems assured, we should hold out to them the hand of friendship and ask them to join us in providing for such business relations as shall for all time establish peace and tranquility in the coal fields. The day is past when great organizations of capital can maintain the false position that their employes shall be denied the right to organize into compact bodies and speak through the organization of which they are members. We recognize the right of capital to consolidate, to federate and to speak and act through its organization, but in according these rights and privileges to capital we demand and shall assert the same privileges for those who toil. Between the combination of capital, on the one hand, and the organization of labor on the other, there should be and need be no irreconcilable conflict; each is a factor in the economic development of our civilization and the application of business judgment and plain common sense by each would enable them to work in harmony.

No definite action was taken by the convention on the first day of its session, but on the 21st, after a long debate over a minor question, the convention accepted the proposed