

postal subsidy than is a magazine. The postmaster general is wrong (except from the point of view of paternalism) in advocating on educational grounds a postal subsidy for newspapers as distinguished from magazines. The dissemination of what is called "news," is no more educative, it is often less so than the circulation of instructive magazines. But if a distinction of this kind were made, "populistic" weeklies could easily be jammed into the magazine class because they lack current news such as the Associated Press provides, and so be compelled to pay higher postage than their plutocratic competitors. And this doubtless is one of the objects of Postmaster General Payne's reform.

Is it imagined that the postmaster general would make no unfair discrimination? Rough experience is a better witness than confiding expectation. Down in Florida there is a paper called "Freedom." Its teachings are not agreeable to the postmaster general. Otherwise its rights to the mail are the same as every other paper in the country. A year or so ago the department denied it publishers' rates. There was no hearing, no legal process of any kind, no consideration whatever of property rights; nothing but a bureaucratic ipse dixit. A hearing was subsequently given at Washington, and the original order was revoked. There had confessedly been no cause whatever for denying ordinary publishers' rights to the paper. Yet meantime the publisher of Freedom had been obliged to deposit cash sufficient to cover postage at full third-class rates, as the condition of being allowed to continue the publication. Since the examination was prolonged, the deposit so required was heavy. It would have been enough to necessitate suspension had not the publisher been well off. Recently the department again attacked this paper. In one of its issues it printed an illustrated description of the town in which it is published—Sea Breeze—something that has long been com-

mon with newspapers. For that reason, and apparently for that reason alone, the department has again denied Freedom the publisher's mailing rights. This is only one instance that happens to be unusually prominent, but it is typical. It is an indication of what a corporation tool in the postal department would do if his opportunities for censorship were broadened.

Fortunately the courts are now intervening to protect publishers from the high-handed policy of the postal bureau. Within the week, in the case of the Monthly Official Railway List, which was ousted arbitrarily from the mails a year ago, the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia has decided that when a paper is once admitted to second-class privileges it has a property right therein which cannot be withdrawn except by due process of law. This is good legal doctrine and sound political policy.

A terrible explosion, causing many deaths, occurred in the Swift packing house, Chicago, last week. It was caused by the carelessness of some of the men who replenished an almost empty boiler with water. This was the immediate cause. But the primary cause was the employment of tired men in the boiler room for twelve long hours a day. If the grand jury does not make an investigation and take that fact into consideration it will neglect an obvious duty.

A customs officer of the name of Theobald has been peremptorily dismissed, nominally "for the good of the service," but evidently for no other reason than because he has been spying upon rich smugglers and causing them to be searched and their smuggled goods confiscated when they land in New York. Spying of this kind is not nice business, truly, and one can sympathize with Secretary Shaw's repugnance to having such a creature in his department. But the man was doing his duty under the law, and if we are to have "protection to American indus-

try" we should not shrink from its disagreeable incidents. So long as rich protectionists try to evade the law there must be spying Theobalds to detect them. Does Mr. Shaw intend that protection shall not apply to Americans who are rich enough to go to Europe annually and become their own smugglers? It would seem so. Theobald's abrupt dismissal can mean nothing to the other treasury spies than that they must confine their spying to the steerage and to merchants, and allow rich smugglers to bring in their goods without question. Among the seizures Theobald had made and for which he has been dismissed, was a diamond necklace worth \$17,000, which he found among the trinkets of Mr. Schwab, of steel trust fame.

THE JUGGLED CENSUS.

In a pamphlet, "Our Juggled Census," the writer of the present article sought to demonstrate the grossly misleading character of statistics of the present census. His assertions, as far as they relate to agricultural statistics, find strong confirmation in the report, since published, of a special committee of inquiry appointed by the National Board of Trade.

This committee, which, besides others, included the statistician of the New York Produce Exchange, the editor of the Chicago Daily Trade Bulletin, and the editor of the Cincinnati Price Current, found the most glaring errors in the census report of farm areas, with corresponding errors in the crops harvested. In explanation of the reason for the investigation that report says:

The chairman of the committee on crop reports in his statement referred to the fact that when agricultural statistics of the census bureau were made available to the public last spring they were in many particulars so decidedly at variance with prevailing expectations, based on other official data and unofficial investigation, that a sense of surprise was manifested, and the importance of questions involved led to much of comment suggestive of the need or desirability of an investigation which should support or discredit such exhibits. In recognition of this situation, and its relation to service to follow on presentation of such information, the matter was taken up

by the president of the national board of trade.

In the report we find, also, the following statement:

Features of inconsistency in the census bureau work are to be found in comparisons of area, in instances where the agricultural returns make the farm areas equal to or exceed the land surface, according to survey records as presented by the twelfth census. There appear many such instances. In 20 states, in which there are 1,490 counties, there are 101 counties made to appear as having farm lands equal to or in excess of the entire surveyed land surface. This number includes a few which by a small fraction of one per cent. are under 100 in the comparison, but which practically represent the entire land surface. The excesses over an equal extent of area range up to 40 per cent., the aggregate number of acres indicated in the farm returns for these 101 counties being five per cent. greater than their entire surface, without allowances for highways, towns, railroads, etc. Of the 101 counties there are 69 which appear to have more farm acres than the surveyed land records indicate within their boundary lines; there are 23 having over five per cent. excess of such area; there are 13 having over ten per cent. of such excess; ten having over 15 per cent. of such excess; eight having over 20 per cent. of excess, in comparison with the reported actual land surface. For Ohio, 19 per cent. of the number of counties are shown to represent 100 per cent. or more of the entire surface as in farm lands; in Iowa 17 per cent.; Kansas 12 per cent.; Kentucky nine per cent.; Missouri nine per cent.; Tennessee six per cent.; Indiana six per cent., etc.

In addition to these 101 counties found by analysis of census bureau data to reflect returns of farm lands equal to or in excess of the surveyed land surface of such counties there are 700 other counties showing 90 per cent. or more, of which 335 represent 95 per cent. or more, in such comparison. Thus over 28 per cent. of all the 2,800 counties of the country represent farm areas reported as 90 per cent. or more of the surveyed land surface.

Whether these conditions, reflecting a large extent of farm acreage in excess of what can be accepted as the true position, are due to overestimates in returns of enumerators, or to duplications in the mechanical operations incident to the methods of the census office in the tabulating work, or to both of these, with inconsistent work in editing the schedules, and other causes, cannot be stated by the committee, but they are evidences of erroneous work, the measure of which in influence on results cannot be satisfactorily estimated.

While there are the large number of instances of inconsistencies and excesses in the comparisons of farm returns of area and survey records here-in mentioned and demonstrable by the available data, it does not follow that all the census exhibits of farm areas not having such evidences of inconsistency are free from errors, or exaggerations, in the statements of farm areas. For instance, a county which may have only 60 per cent. of its area actually in farm lands may be exaggerated 50 per cent., and not appear to be over 90 per cent. in the comparison with the land surface of such county. Again, a county which may have only 45 per cent. of its area in farm lands may be doubled in the crop exhibit without going over the 90 per cent. relation to actual land area. It is therefore impossible to determine or to suggest the limit to which such exaggerations or errors may exist in portions of the work wherein the conditions do not admit of such demonstration as in such cases as are herein specifically stated. Exaggerations or errors which enlarge the area basis correspondingly affect unduly the results in regard to production of crops represented.

In reply to this report Mr. Powers, the United States statistician-in-chief for agriculture, has given out a statement maintaining the substantial correctness of the census reports, in which, among other things, he declares that the Board of Trade committee in making its report did not possess statistics of surveyed lands for a single State.

It is true that the data of areas published in the twelfth census, which was used by the committee, are not, as the committee seems to have supposed, statistics of surveys of the land office. They are, however, the data of areas adopted by the census office at both the eleventh and twelfth censuses and are shown to vary from the surveys of the land office by less than one-tenth of one per cent. That being so, the answer of the agricultural statistician seems but a contemptible evasion.

Further evidence of the gross exaggeration of farm acreage as reported at the present census is found in a comparison with the acreage as reported at preceding censuses, for States and counties in which there could be no possible increase and in which there must, on the contrary, have been an actual decrease owing to the growth of towns and cities. A

careful comparison of the data of the two censuses indicates a general and remarkable increase in farm acreage even in counties where there are rapidly growing cities.

In Cook county, Ill., which embraces Chicago, there is shown an increase of farm acreage of 19,718 acres; and in the state of Illinois one of 2,296,451 acres.

In Ohio there is an apparent increase of 1,149,577 acres, and in Hamilton county, of that State, which embraces Cincinnati, an increase of 22,367 acres. For Cuyahoga county, embracing Cleveland, a city which during the decade increased its population by 120,325, there is shown an increased farm acreage of 7,669 acres.

The increase for Hamilton county would represent an area, if in one tract, over seven miles long and five miles wide; and that for Cook county an area over six miles long and five miles wide.

In the counties embracing the rapidly growing cities of Detroit and Grand Rapids, Michigan, there are shown increases of 12,018, and 42,700 acres respectively, and these are not exceptional cases, but fair instances of a general increase indicated where no increase is possible.

Taking the country as a whole a comparison of the data of the two censuses indicates an increase in farm acreage during the last decade of 215,373,314 acres, exclusive of Hawaii. During this period, according to the report of the land office as given in the United States Statistical Abstract, the total amount of land disposed of by the land office during the ten years preceding the census year amounted to 113,508,000 acres. Of that amount 22,379,593 acres were lands selected by railroads. From these figures it appears quite evident that there could have been no such actual increase in farm acreage as is indicated by census figures.

As was shown in my pamphlet, and also in my recent article in the Public (p. 452), much of this apparent increase is due to a change in the census classification of farms which results in the return as farms of small tracts of land that were not

considered farms at any previous censuses.

This enumeration as farms of cabbage and potato patches on city lots, while it accounts for much of the apparent increase in farm acreage, does not account for the wide discrepancy between the figures of the department of agriculture and those of the census as to the production of wheat and other staple products. According to the estimates of the department of agriculture the amount of wheat produced during the census year was 547,303,846 bushels and according to the census it was 661,143,657 bushels, a difference of nearly 114,000,000 bushels. That this discrepancy is largely due to the exaggerated census figures appears from our statistics of exports, which indicate that but 186,096,762 bushels of the wheat crop of the census year were exported. This, if we accept the census figures, would show that in this year our people consumed nearly $6\frac{1}{4}$ bushels of wheat per capita, or from 40 to 50 per cent. more than the usual amount as indicated by official estimates for other years. This increase might be taken as unmistakable evidence of the prosperity of the consumers, were not the prosperity theory conclusively disproved by census wage statistics, which, when honestly compared, show a decided decrease in average earnings during the last decade.

This important fact the census office has sought to conceal by an adroit juggling of the data.

HENRY L. BLISS.

NEWS

The second session of the Fifty-seventh Congress began on the 1st. Only routine business was done, the Senate adjourning for the day in less than a quarter of an hour and the House in less than an hour. On the 2d both houses adjourned for the day after each had listened to the reading of the President's annual message. But on the 3d the regular business of the session began. In the Senate a substitute for the bill passed by the House at the previous session, for the admission of New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma as States, was reported by the committee on territories. It recommends the admission of

Oklahoma and the Indian Territory as one State, omitting New Mexico and Arizona. The House, after discussion, appropriated \$50,000 for the anthracite coal strike arbitration commission.

In his message, President Roosevelt dwells upon the prosperity of the country. While recognizing that this prosperity "is not the creature of the law," he declares that "undoubtedly the laws under which we work have been instrumental in creating the conditions which made it possible," and that "by unwise legislation it would be easy enough to destroy it."

Noting then a great increase and general diffusion of the wealth of the country, the President observes that the conditions favoring it have "also favored somewhat the growth of what was evil," and this leads him to a consideration of the trust question. He believes that "monopolies, unjust discriminations, which prevent or cripple competition, fraudulent over-capitalization, and other evils in trust organizations, and practices which injuriously affect interstate trade, can be prevented under the power of the Congress to 'regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States,' through regulations and requirements operating directly upon such commerce, the instrumentalities thereof, and those engaged therein." Accordingly, he recommends "the passage of a law, reasonable in its provisions and effective in its operation, under which the questions can be finally adjudicated that now raise doubts as to the necessity of constitutional amendment." If, however, such a law be invalid, then he urges that "we should not shrink from amending the Constitution so as to secure beyond peradventure the power sought." In this connection Mr. Roosevelt considers the proposition to deprive trust-made goods of tariff protection. "Not merely would this be wholly ineffective," he argues, "but the diversion of our efforts in such a direction would mean the abandonment of all intelligent attempt to do away with these evils."

Moreover, he proceeds, the abolition of tariffs on trust-made goods would tend to destroy the protective system. This he would scrupulously avoid, because "the mere threat" of "dislocation" of that system, "not to

speak of the performance, would produce paralysis in the business energies of the community." Yet he would not fossilize the tariff, but would readjust its terms by reciprocity treaties and upon reports of commissions, which, while regarding "fixity of principle as regards the tariff," will permit "the necessary reapplication of the principle" from time to time "to the shifting national needs."

On the currency question Mr. Roosevelt recommends that upon banks, as "the natural servants of commerce," should be "placed, as far as practicable, the burden of furnishing and maintaining a circulation adequate to supply the needs of our diversified industries and commerce." He urges, furthermore, that all kinds of currency should be made "interchangeable, and at the will of the holder convertible into the established gold standard."

On the subject of capital and labor the message contains a homily but without specific recommendation.

The policy in the Philippines is described as having established a large measure of American liberty in those islands. "Not only," reads the message, "does each Filipino enjoy such rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness as he has never before known during the recorded history of the islands, but the people taken as a whole now enjoy a measure of self-government greater than that granted to any other Orientals by any foreign power, and greater than that enjoyed by any other Orientals under their own governments, save the Japanese alone." Mr. Roosevelt adds that while "we have not gone too far in granting these rights of liberty and self-government," "we have gone to the limit in the interests of the Philippine people themselves it was wise or just to go."

The other subjects mentioned in the message are Cuba, reciprocity with New Foundland, The Hague tribunal, the Isthmian canal, the Pacific cable, army reorganization, increase of the navy, the postal service, irrigation of and other matters relating to the public lands, Alaska, the Indian tribes, government aid to farmers, the government of the District of Columbia, and the public printing establishment.

From the press dispatches the