

'TWO VIEWS ON CROPS.'

SECRETARY RUSK AND STATISTICIAN DODGE.

Sanguine Uncle Jerry Congratulates the Country—He Thinks Protection Has Dispelled the Agricultural Cloud—Statistician Dodge Reports Poor Crops.

In his second annual report Secretary Rusk congratulates the President "and the country at large upon the generally improved outlook in agricultural matters." He calls attention to agricultural depression in 1889 when the present administration went into power. But when he looks at the present condition of agriculture, Uncle Jerry imagines that he sees a vast improvement. He says:

"The cloud which seemed to rest gloomily upon American agriculture has been lightened, while the wise, economic legislation already secured holds out still brighter promise for the future."

Uncle Jerry seems honestly to fancy that the "in-whistle duties," as Butterworth called them, on wheat, corn, barley, eggs, etc., are really going to improve the condition of the farmers. He gives tables to show the increase in price of a number of agricultural products, which increase the old gentleman imagines to be the result largely of the higher duties on these articles.

But how the McKinley duty—or any duty, for that matter—on corn can raise the price of corn he does not undertake to show. As we imported only 1,626 bushels of corn for the fiscal year 1890, against 101,000,000 exported, it would tax the sanguine genius of even Uncle Jerry to show how the corn duty has helped our farmers or can help them.

About the same time the Secretary's report was issued another publication was sent forth from the Department of Agriculture. This was the statistician's "Report on the yield of crops per acre." On the very first page of this report it is stated that the yield of corn per acre for the current year is the lowest ever reported, except the year 1881. The report also states that the yield per acre in 1889 was nearly one-half larger. Secretary Rusk is gratified at the improved outlook for agriculture, but our farmers will hesitate to accept his rosy anticipation, as they know very well that the higher prices of the present time are caused by short crops. No sensible farmer is willing to have higher prices at the expense of poor crops; he prefers rather large crops at low prices. The larger part of the corn grown by our farmers is consumed on the farm as food for man and beast. So far as this part of the corn crop is concerned, high prices avail nothing, and low production is disastrous. It is stated that many farmers in Illinois are actually buying corn at existing high prices to feed to their stock, so low was their yield.

Returning to the statistician's report, he says that the corn shortage this year is "principally" in the corn-surplus States. That shortage is explained in detail in several pages of the report. Some of the causes of the failure of the crop are as follows: "Worms," "hot winds," "hail-storms in August," "mid-summer drought," "excessive rains," "frosts," and "all possible drawbacks." The farmers usually look upon all these things as evils to be deplored.

The report on the yield of potatoes is of a similar nature. The average yield is stated to be the lowest, with two exceptions, ever reported. The acreage was smaller than usual, and this fact, together with the failure of the crop, makes the supply per capita smaller than in any recent year. The statistician thinks that these facts "amply warrant the advance in prices now ruling in all markets." When our own crop is short there is usually a considerable importation of potatoes; but the statistician is of the opinion that the recent increase in the duty to 25 cents a bushel may check the large importation which our own scarcity would seem to make necessary. In other words, when our farmers have hardly any potatoes to sell, the duty comes into play to add greatly to the cost of the potatoes consumed by the poor in cities; but when our crop is abundant we supply our own market, and the duty then cannot possibly benefit our farmers. On the other hand, many of our farmers will be compelled to buy seed potatoes next spring with the McKinley duty added.

Fruit is an important product of many of our farmers. The statistician reports that "the season has been the worst for fruit that the department has ever reported." McKinley raised the duties on all kinds of fruit, but it is difficult to see how this will affect our farmers, except to increase the prices of the few lemons and oranges, nuts, raisins and prunes which they buy for their children.

The only crop that the statistician reports very favorably is sugar, saying, "the crop will be a large one." But what do the farmers in general think of the McKinley bounty of 2 cents a pound on sugar. The larger the crop of sugar the greater the sum taken out of the treasury to pay the sugar growers for doing their own work. The prospect is that, with the introduction of the sugar beet, our sugar production will increase enormously in the next fifteen years, and in proportion as this sugar bounty grows in volume so much the more clearly will all other farmers be convinced of the injustice of the whole bounty system. Why should the grower of sugar have a bounty while the growers of wheat and corn and cotton are neglected? Is the grower of sugar a public benefactor in any higher sense than is the grower of other farm products?

The fact is that the high tariff makers are so accustomed to treating the farmer as the common burden-bearer of the entire country that when they do make a show of giving him some of the "benefits of protection" it is half hubub and pretense and half undisguised paternalism, for which there is no warrant in the Constitution.

Wages and Land.

In the United States there are 32.7 acres per head of the entire population, while in England, Germany, France, Italy, Holland and Belgium, the average is only 2.8 acres for each person. In Europe the number of people is so great that competition for employment is necessarily very sharp, and this reduces wages to the lowest possible figure. That is why there is a great stream of European laborers coming to our shores every year. Here there is more room, and a man can set up on a farm rather than work in a mill at starvation wages. For this reason the competition in the labor market is less severe with us than in Europe, and wages have not yet been forced down to so low a figure as the European level.

It is mainly on account of our 32.7 acres for each person that we have higher wages than Europe. Protection

has nothing to do with the general average of wages with us. It is well known that the general average of wages in our protected industries is lower than in the non-protected industries.

TARIFF LETTERS TO FARMER BROWN.
NO. 11.

Can Protection Increase Wealth?

DEAR FARMER BROWN: You and I are familiar with the claim of the protectionists that protection increases the country's wealth. We look into their papers and we find reports of the vast increase of production in various industries. One will give us tables showing the growth of iron production—in 1885 we produced 4,044,000 tons of pig iron, in 1890 probably 9,000,000 tons. Others will run through the yearly reports of steel rail production, nail-making, barbed wire-making, plate and window glass, woolen and cotton goods industries—and everywhere they are able to point to growth, a growth which they claim in all cases is the result of protection.

In every case this claim rests upon that error in reasoning which is usually expressed in the Latin words, *post hoc, ergo propter hoc* (coming after this, therefore caused by this). The protectionist coolly assumes that since the country prospers under protection, therefore protection is the cause of such prosperity. If you should raise a good crop notwithstanding the drought, you would not be so simple as to say that the drought caused your good crop. On the contrary, you are sure you would have had a still better crop if rain had come as you needed it.

Imagine a steamboat beating its way down from Chicago to the northern end of Lake Michigan in the face of a fierce wind. The vessel certainly makes speed,

the domestic manufacturer than it would be if that product was imported, is it not clear that we are buying at home at a loss, and that loss precisely equal to the difference of price between the domestic article and the similar foreign article? For why do we labor? Is it for the sake of toll itself? Do we not rather labor for the sake of the things which labor produces, for what we call goods? But if goods can be had with less labor by an exchange with a foreign people do we not impose unnecessary labor upon ourselves when we undertake to make those goods ourselves?

Where a people are let alone by the tariff maker they naturally take to those employments which pay best, or, in other words, in which their labor is most productive. If, however, the tariff maker comes along and says that people must produce goods which they have not yet undertaken to produce, is it not clear that people must be taken away from profitable employment and put to doing what is relatively less profitable?

We do not make tin plates. Why not? Because our people find that they can make more money by doing other things. The present high McKinley duty on tin plates will doubtless cause some of our people to undertake the manufacture of them, and it may be done, too, at a profit, but this profit will be possible only by reason of the higher price caused by the duty of 2-10 cents a pound. The makers of tin plates may grow rich, they may give employment to several thousand laborers, and protectionists will then point to the wealthy capitalists in this business, and to the homes of the laborers engaged in it, and tell us that this is an example of wealth created by protection. But I deny beforehand that it will be anything of the kind—deny it emphatically. The effect pointed to will

BENNY, THE JUGGLER.



Uncle Sam and Columbia—Wonder how long 'twill be before they are all smashed?—Chicago Times.

but if a certain passenger should claim that the speed was caused by this north wind, he would be laughed at as a fool, every intelligent passenger knowing that the vessel was only retarded in its course by the wind. If the passenger should point to the receding fields and groves on the shore to prove that the vessel was going forward, and should still insist the progress was due to the north wind, the passengers would think either that he was crazy, or else that he was some belated Rip Van Winkle who fell asleep in the last century, before the day of steam, and who cannot now take account of anything else than the wind as a propelling force for ships. In the same way the country goes forward, not by reason of protection, but despite protection. As the vessel has within it a force which is able to overcome the external hindrance of wind, so the country has in its natural forces of brain and muscle, inventive genius and skill of hand, Nature's rich resources and man's courage and industry, which are able to force the industrial ship of state forward in its course, notwithstanding the contrary wind of protection.

When the protectionists try to establish their claim that protection enriches the country, they always examine the matter from the standpoint of the producer, the consumer being rarely taken account of. If they can show, as they doubtless can in many instances, that the profits of an industry are caused by the protective duty, they at once conclude that protection is a wealth-producing factor in the nation's life. Some of them, however, do take account of the protection, if only to show that although protection may make him pay more for his goods, still the money he pays for them remains in the country, and therefore the country is none the poorer for his loss.

But the true standpoint from which to estimate the cost of a given product to the country is the standpoint of the consumer. The total cost to all consumers is the measure of cost to the country. If the product in question is put down to the consumers at a higher price by

this case, and the question is, Does it pay to spend ten million a year in order to have its nine or ten plate glass factories? Is not the country poorer by just the amount of \$10,650,000 by reason of manufacturing its own plate glass? Would you conduct your business on such principles? Would you insist that it would be true economy to make your own farm wagon, costing you two weeks of labor, when you might buy one with one week of labor put upon your wheat fields? Would you think you had saved anything by having found a new way in which to employ yourself?

But this one case is enough; it contains all the elements of the question, "Can protection increase wealth?" What is true of plate glass will be found true of every other protected industry in which the duty is really protective. From one you can judge all. This is a typical case, and one of the greatest standbys of the protectionists. If plate glass is produced at a loss to the country, you may conclude that the whole system of protection is a dead weight upon our progress—not a producer but a destroyer of wealth. Yours truly,

RICHARD KNOX.

The Working Women of New York. The statement is made by Mr. Rus, in recently published work, that there are about 150,000 honest women in New York City who, by working fifteen hours or more a day, can earn barely 60 cents daily. This figure seems very low, indeed, when it is remembered that the expense of living in a city like New York is much higher than in smaller towns and in country districts. Sixty cents a day in New York means hardly as much as 30 cents in any small country town.

What renders the plight of these poor, hard-working women of New York still more pitiable is the fact that the money which they do earn is by the Mc-

ALL THE STATE NEWS

IS GIVEN BELOW IN THESE TWO COLUMNS.

Death Preferable to Eviction—Burned to Death—A Watermelon Story—Accidental Shooting—Badly Mangled—New Factory for Jeffersonville—A Goshen Gourmand.

—Elwood's talk of annexing Alexandria.

—There are seventy-seven coal mines in Indiana.

—Logansport's supply of natural gas is all right.

—Columbus is getting ready to manufacture ice.

—Union City will have incandescent light by Feb. 1.

—Arthur Sturgeon was sandbagged and robbed at Logansport.

—Levi Beal, near Shideler, lost his house and contents by fire.

—Richmond is working hard to secure a new Government Building.

—Eighty head of Brown County cattle have died lately of an unknown disease.

—Frank Smith lost a leg at Noblesville by attempting to board a moving train.

—They've got lots of sand in Michigan City; have shipped over 1,000,000 tons this year.

—M. K. Donaldson was knocked down, beaten and robbed by footpads at Fort Wayne.

—Jesse Austin, of Frankfort, a brakeman on the Cloverleaf road, was crushed to death by cars.

—Morgan County is to have a workhouse.

—Marion citizens are pondering over measures to prevent the squandering of their natural gas.

—Rochester claims to be the "healthiest, neatest and most business-like little city in the State."

—Charles Bauer, proprietor of the Terre Haute House, was seriously injured in a runaway.

—A new Christian Church at Martz, was freed from debt and dedicated by Rev. L. L. Carpenter.

—Oliver Worle, of Lorree, Miami County, was sandbagged and robbed of about \$25 and his watch.

—Otis Hughes, of English, while drunk, fell off a bridge seventy-five feet and was practically unhurt.

—The Western Indiana Poultry Association will hold its annual poultry show in Lebanon, January 5 to 10.

—The present electric-light company at Crawfordsville will sell the plant to the city upon favorable terms.

—David Adkinson attempted suicide with strychnine, at Marion, and died. Domestic trouble was the cause.

—The City House and Holland Hotel were destroyed by fire at Milltown, Crawford County. Loss, \$3,000.

—Evansville Journal says several society ladies are on the grand jury's list, there, for gambling. Do tell!

—Capt. Ed Howard, of Jeffersonville, is putting in a steel ship-building plant, which will employ 200 skilled men.

—J. Brevort, an eccentric Columbus farmer, died recently and left his fortune of \$7,000 to the Butler University.

—Sullivan County Commissioners will work their jail prisoners on a stone pile, in a yard enclosed with high fence.

—Mrs. Dado Ballard's Mooresville heirs are contesting her will. She left \$10,000 in a shape they do not like.

—Jackson and Scott County farmers are losing their horses from a disease similar to distemper, but more fatal.

—Watson Bosile's country residence near Columbus, was destroyed by fire. Family barely escaped with their lives.

—George H. Hopkins, of Clay Township, Carroll County, swallowed arsenic for quinine and is not expected to live.

—The Wabash Railroad Company has paid to Mrs. Freeling Fetters \$2,000. Her husband was killed while coupling cars.

—The first seal ever used by the Kosciusko County Commissioners was the reverse side of a silver ten-cent piece.

—Mrs. Tressie, aged 80, was burned to death by the overturning of a lamp, at the home of her son, in Tippecanoe County.

—A man at Crawfordsville, claims that he has a hen that lays two eggs per day, one in the morning and one in the evening.

—Indiana has a larger amount of water that is inhabited by the better class of indigenous fish than any State in the Union.

—A man was detected in Fort Wayne stealing a pair of shoes. In just forty-five minutes after he was serving a sentence in jail.

—Martin Baur, engineer in Lutz's stave factory, at Wabash, was badly mangled by the breaking of the fly-wheel of his engine.

—William Sherwin, a prominent young merchant of Point Isabel, Grant County, was kicked by a vicious horse and fatally injured.

—A company has been organized to boom Jonesboro, after the style of Elwood, having secured options on about 1,600 acres of land.

—John Walton, Coatesville, has been indicted for forgery. He paid Mrs. Bynum's taxes for her and is accused of raising the receipts.

—George Flemming, driving a bread-wagon at Marion, was thrown under the heels of the horses by the breaking of the king-bolt. The frightened horses kicked him a number of times, injuring him, it is feared, beyond recovery.

—P. N. Applegate, reputable Alaska citizen, says he planted watermelon seed around an old straw stack May 10 last. On Aug. 15 he ate ripe melons, and has been eating them off these vines ever since. Will have enough to last him 'till Pluto.

—Columbus Sheriff would not allow James Campbell, prisoner, to attend the funeral of his child. Campbell offered to go bound hand and foot.

—A flat-car loaded with stone was overturned on the White River bridge, Spencer, Monday. Wm. Gaskins, and Robert Boyd, were seriously injured.

—During a fight in a saloon at Logansport, Nich. O'Brien, a young man, was shot and killed instantly. The murderer is unknown and yet at large.

—Farmer Thompson hitched his horse at Vincennes close to the railroad. A train came along and scared the animal so badly that it dropped dead.

—A company has been organized in Crawfordsville to manufacture pottery from the fine clay discovered on Hence Coleman's farm, near the city.

—Mrs. Eliza Myers, 36, succumbed in Seymour, by taking rough on rats. Had been abandoned by her husband and didn't care to buff along alone.

—A laborer at the Bonney vice-works, at Marion, had an arm torn from the socket and otherwise seriously injured by being caught in the machinery.

—Timothy Hogan, Fort Branch, sued John Skipp for \$10,000, claiming he had skipped with his wife's affections. Skipp paid him \$3,000 and that settled it.

—"Bee" Eubanks got a life sentence at Bedford for murdering his sister last November. His father was his accomplice, and will probably get a like sentence.

—How cholera in the form of an epidemic; has struck Daviess County, and hundreds of porkers are dying. Farmers are much alarmed and fear to kill for meat.

—John Sherry has been convicted, in the Bluffton Circuit Court, of killing his wife, and sentenced to fifteen years in prison. Sherry claimed that the shooting was accidental.

—One hundred dollars of the \$360 stolen from T. C. Courtney at Way