

ber of farms less than 10 acres during the last decade of 118,252, that the number of farms of less than 10 acres with a product of less than \$100 was 114,043. It appears also that the number of farms of this size with a product of less than \$250 was 214,326. Very few of these could have been reported according to the requirements of the census of 1890, for very few could have required the services of one able-bodied workman. The increase in the number of farms over 10 and under 20 acres was 141,462, and the number with a product of less than \$100 was 106,146. The number reporting a product of less than \$250 was 288,719. Of farms over 20 and under 50 acres we find the ten years' increase to have been 355,008, and the number with a product less than \$100, 147,784. The number with a product of less than \$250 was 602,688.

Considering that from this product must come not only the farmer's recompense for his labor, but also the return for investment, it appears that few farms with a product of less than \$250 could have met the requirements of the census schedules of 1890. Taking farms in the South Atlantic and South Central divisions with products of less than \$100, and those North Atlantic, North Central and Western divisions reporting a product of less than \$250, and we have a total number of farms under 50 acres of 650,659, which number exceeds the increase in the number of farms of less than 50 acres by 35,937.

To arrive at a correct conclusion as to the actual increase in the number of farms during the last decade, we must also consider, besides the foregoing facts, that the census enumeration of 1890 was notoriously deficient and unreliable. This was unquestionably due in large measure to the fact that the census office had been made a part of the political machine and that appointments of census enumerators were made with little regard to fitness. Another reason, and perhaps the most important one, was that stated by Congressman Hopkins, of Illinois, in introducing the bill for the present census. He is reported in the Congressional Record, vol. 32, p. 1,510, as saying:

"The only trouble was that such a mass of information was required from the enumerators that their returns were not accurate and in many cases had to be taken again. . . . Under such circumstances it will readily be seen that accurate and desirable information, such as should be embodied in a report of this character, could not be collected." In this debate Congressman Johnson, of Indiana, said: "Mr. Carroll D. Wright, who succeeded Mr. Porter in his office, declared positively, and I think that we all have reason to know his statement to be true, that the last census was an exceedingly unreliable one and was also a very expensive piece of work."

That there exists a "possibility" that all the farms of the nation were not enumerated in 1890 is admitted by Statistician Powers who, as supporting such conclusion, on p. lxxi, Part I, Agricultural Census, presents a table in which the number of farms as reported on the agricultural schedules in 1890 is compared with the number of farm families as shown in the report on Farms and Homes of that census. According to this comparative table the number of farm homes, as shown by the latter report, is 4,767,179, which is greater by 202,538 than the number of farms as given in the agricultural reports.

It is noticeable that while Mr. Powers quotes the figures of the report on Farms and Homes as having been compiled from the population schedules, he makes no mention of the fact that the statistics of occupation, also compiled from the population schedules, show the number of persons engaged in operating farms in 1890 as 5,354,158, which is more than three-quarters of a million greater than the number of farms reported on the agricultural schedules, and more than half a million greater than the number of farm homes as given in the report on farms and homes. It is evident that the farms most likely to be omitted by census enumerators would be the small and not the large ones.

Considering these facts, it appears that the great increase in small farms, like the great increase in farm acreage indicated by the census for the last decade, is fictitious. HENRY L. BLISS.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

KANSAS.

Topeka, Kan., May 2.—Ever since the dismissal of Prof. James H. Canfield as professor of political economy in the University of Kansas by a Republican board of regents, some twenty years ago, because he taught political economy in a scientific and fearless manner, that study has been practically barred in that institution. In its stead is taught something called sociology. But everything relating to taxation, land tenure, tariffs, currency systems, public utilities, corporations, trusts, etc., is looked upon as dangerous and improper. Any student daring to ask a question upon these topics is silenced by an icy stare and an ominous shrug of the shoulders.

The students' time is employed in an aimless study of unrelated details of personal and family life, habits of tramps, routines of life and labor by different classes of workers, and life in asylums, jails, poorhouses, etc. As a sample of what the professor of political economy calls excellent original research by an advanced student I copy the following from the student's study of farm life:

The house is of stone, on a south hillside, near the center of the farm and contains fourteen rooms. Some of the rooms have carpets on the floors and in one is a bookcase, two rockers and several straight-backed wooden chairs. The sleeping rooms are upstairs and the dining-room, laundry and kitchen downstairs. The eight horses are of Perchon, Clydesdale, Hambletonian or mixed breeds. The cattle are Shorthorn, Hereford, Jersey and Galway breeds—about fifty in number. The hogs are Jersey Duroc breed, the poultry Plymouth Rocks, and the dog shepherd.

He does not give the cat's pedigree, but it was probably mixed.

And people are taxed to pay the professor \$2,500 a year. Moreover, he actually threatens to write a book on political economy and sociology for use in schools and colleges! Government by injunction might do some good in his case.

Not long ago I talked with a recent graduate of this department of our State university and found him profoundly ignorant of even the rudiments of the science. In place of any knowledge of economic principles or authors he had a mass of utterly useless details, totally unrelated. That satraps of plutocracy are very distrustful of this study is natural, but it is rare that one is so frank as one of our Kansas Congressmen when he said to me: "I don't believe there is really anything in this stuff they call political economy, but what some feller has got up in his own head to try to hurt the Republican party."

W. H. T. WAKEFIELD.

AUSTRALIA.

Corowa, N. S. W., Australia, April 1.—The Federal parliament has now been