

# CASH INCOME FROM FARMS

## Effect of Republican Policies in the Corn Belt and Wheat Growing States.

# VALUE OF LANDS GREATLY INCREASED

## Prices of Cereals in "Lean" and "Fat" Years—Market Demand Affected by Action of National Administration—Rise in Values.

It has been quite customary for democratic writers and speakers to attribute the extraordinary prosperity of the last eight years to Providence, and to deny that the Republican party could be especially allied with Providence.

In answer to this contention President Roosevelt, in one of his campaign speeches in 1900, made the witty remark that the Democratic party had "deed with about everything except Providence."

In relation to the remarkable increase in the agricultural prosperity of the United States during the years of Republican rule subsequent to the last Democratic administration (1893-1897), it is the Democratic policy to sneeringly ask if the Republican party produced the bountiful crops, or had anything to do with the droughts, the rust, or other business-bullying afflicting the price of commodities the farmer had to sell. Such sneering remarks, however, do not suppress the fact that while there have been many vicissitudes during the last eight years in crop conditions, yet there has all this time been a more or less steady and big increase in the cash income from American farms.

In 1901, for instance, owing to hot winds and drought, there was a lean year in corn, and yet the farmers of the United States got \$921,555,708 for their corn of that Republican year as against \$401,000,967 for their corn of the Democratic year 1896, which was a "fat year," as regards naturally splendid crop conditions, but a lean year indeed, as regards prices. The Republican year 1901 was thus a year in which prosperity for the Corn Belt farmers was preserved, despite a great natural disaster to the corn crop, while the Democratic year 1896 was a year in which there was no prosperity in the Corn Belt despite the especially bountiful size of the corn crop.

1903	.....	\$94,975,913	5.81
1904	.....	\$17,143,143	0.33

In this table it is significant to note that the lowest per capita of wheat consumption during the last fourteen years occurred during the Democratic period from 1893 to 1897, and that since the first election of William McKinley and the inauguration of Republican policies, up to the present time there has been AN INCREASE OF OVER ONE-THIRD IN PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION OF WHEAT.

### Increased Value of Farm Lands.

The farm lands of the United States represent the great portion of its real capital. When crop after crop is produced from the soil, the capital still remains practically intact, unless bad judgment is used in planting crops without rotation, or unless the cream of the soil is washed away by floods, or unless the productive value is otherwise destroyed through various kinds of improvidence like the interference with forest life at the headwaters of streams. The farm lands of the country are thus unlimited sources of wealth as compared with mines and forests the annual income from which represent not real income, but instead encroachments on real capital.

### How the Increase is Earned.

The value of the crops produced during a particular season tend to regulate the value of the capital (the soil) from which they are produced, just like the dividends which different securities which pay them. Henry George has spoken of the "unearned increment" that has arisen from the appreciation in land values. But while the agricultural history of the United States for the last eight years has shown an enormous amount of this "unearned," yet to say that it has been "unearned" is a rank injustice to the farmers who have cooperated with Providence to produce the crops on which not only land values, but the national prosperity is based from year to year.

There are some people who seem to think that it is only by speculation that wealth is acquired. These are other people who hold that hard industry is all that is needed for the accumulation of the riches of this earth. There are others who lay stress on smartness, on economy and on other traits of long headness. But while there are many different ways by which individuals of our country have grown wealthy, yet to trace out how the United States as a nation has grown to be a multi-billionaire, we must primarily consider the record of yield and prices on our crops.

It is a popular delusion that the size of the crops is the whole thing as regards agricultural prosperity. Providence and the farmer's individual fidelity are responsible for the size of his crops. But the financial appreciation of this great work of Providence and himself, which makes up the "supply," is determined by the market "demand," and this in turn, is affected largely by national economic policies.

Except for wheat the supply from this year's crops of the United States will probably be greater than for last year. In the aggregate as regards size, the crops will this year very likely be the most abundant in our history, unless the present bumper prospects in corn should, at the eleventh hour, be reduced by unlucky visitation of frost. And in the aggregate, as regards values, it looks as if our crops would this year bring greater wealth to the United States than ever before.

### Steady Gains in Value.

The following tables show how steady have been the gains in cash values of staple crops, despite fluctuations from year to year in size of crops:

CORN.		
Year	Production	Total Value
Totals—1903	2,244,176,925	\$52,968,801
1902	2,523,648,312	1,017,017,340
1901	1,522,519,891	921,555,708
1900	2,105,102,516	751,220,014
1899	2,078,113,933	629,210,110
1898	1,324,184,060	552,025,428
1897	1,902,967,323	501,072,952
1896	2,283,875,105	401,000,967
1895	2,151,128,580	544,985,534
1894	1,212,770,052	554,719,162
1893	1,619,496,131	591,025,627
1892	1,628,364,000	642,146,630

### OATS.

Year	Production	Total Value
Totals—1903	784,094,136	297,041,995
1902	987,842,712	363,584,852
1901	736,808,724	293,458,777
1900	736,808,724	293,458,777
1899	809,125,389	298,669,233
1898	796,177,713	198,167,975
1897	730,903,643	186,405,394
1896	498,767,800	147,974,719
1895	707,346,404	132,485,033
1894	824,443,537	163,055,098
1893	662,036,928	214,816,020
1892	638,854,850	187,570,932
1891	601,035,000	209,253,011

### RYE.

Year	Production	Total Value
Totals—1903	29,363,416	15,963,871
1902	33,593,592	17,080,793
1901	39,384,820	16,900,742
1900	23,905,927	12,295,417
1899	23,901,741	12,214,118
1898	25,457,522	11,875,350
1897	27,363,324	12,239,647
1896	24,280,047	9,969,769
1895	27,210,070	11,964,826

### HAY.

Year	Production	Total Value
Totals—1903	61,395,940	563,376,880
1902	59,857,076	542,636,304
1901	50,110,000	445,538,870
1900	56,985,756	411,926,187
1899	66,374,920	498,060,617
1898	69,614,876	401,390,728
1897	59,282,158	388,175,011
1896	47,078,541	303,185,916

The Republican policy of building up the manufacturers of the United States—of placing the factory beside the farm—accounts for the broader and better market the farmer during the last eight years has been steadily getting for his products. This is noticeable in the case of practically everything he has to sell—increasing consumption making prices relatively better no matter what the size of his crops.

Figures of the Bureau of Statistics show that the wheat consumption of the United States in the fiscal year 1904 was the largest in the history of the country. The table which follows shows the quantity of wheat retained for consumption in total and per capita in each fiscal year from 1880 to and including 1904:

Fiscal Year	Total Bushels	Per Capita Bushels
1880	381,129,533	6.09
1891	293,080,684	4.69
1892	386,767,724	5.94
1893	324,431,470	4.89
1894	232,815,041	3.44
1895	316,344,305	4.59
1896	340,658,979	4.85
1897	282,601,769	3.95
1898	313,021,235	4.79
1899	452,470,332	6.70
1900	361,229,920	4.74
1901	306,173,421	3.95
1902	513,762,741	6.69

Wheat and wheat flour retained for home consumption:

Year	Production	Total Value
Totals—1903	2,247,327,880	\$41,638,004
1902	2,281,032,787	134,111,436
1901	2,109,926,807	90,811,167
1899	2,228,783,232	89,328,832
1898	1,023,968,338	79,571,772
1897	1,619,539,944	89,443,030
1896	1,252,291,510	72,182,350
1895	1,207,237,470	78,981,901

### A Lesson in Potatoes.

The last annual report of Secretary Stone, of the Chicago Board of Trade, makes some significant remarks regarding these steady gains in the cash value of our crops. It says:

"Our production of wheat in 1903 aggregated 637,822,000 bushels of corn, 2,244,176,925 bushels of oats, 784,094,136 bushels of rye, 29,363,416 bushels of barley, 131,861,000 bushels, showing a total yield of the principal cereals of, in round numbers, 3,387,317,000 bushels, valued on the farm at \$1,739,715,476, grown on 172,065,117 acres. Our crop of hay aggregated 61,395,940 tons. The yield of potatoes aggregated 247,128,000 bushels, valued at \$151,638,000, produced on 2,916,855 acres; the yield was 37,506,000 bushels less than that of the preceding year, but the value was \$17,527,000 greater, showing the largest valuation recorded in any year, and MORE THAN TWICE THAT OF 1896."

"The farm value of the chief cereals of hay and of potatoes, raised in 1903, amounted to \$2,417,730,450. The crop of wheat was 32,241,000 bushels less than that of the preceding year, but its farm value was \$20,841,000 greater; its valuation was in excess of the value of the crop of any year excepting that of 1901."

### What Makes Prices Higher.

The purpose of this article has thus been to show that while crops may vary in size from year to year, the cash income from them seems in a general way to increase from year to year whatever the size of the crops. Last year (1903) the total farm value of the chief cereals and of hay and potatoes was nearly two billion and a half dollars, and this year it promises to be much greater than last.

So far as the mere size of the crops is alone concerned, it would seem unnecessary for the American people, and just so much more business for all our industries, and just so much more work, wages and profits for all our people anxious to better their condition of life. The causes that are at work to make farm products sell better from year to year are undoubtedly connected with the general policies of Republican administration.

When William McKinley, in 1896, said it was better to open American mills to American labor than to open the mints of the United States to the silver of the world, he expressed the policy that transformed bad times for the entire people under Democratic rule to good times for the entire people under Republican rule. With the people in the cities more prosperous, because of the policies of protection and of sound money, the people in the country were bound to be more prosperous, too, because there was an improved market for what they had to sell. This, in a nutshell, is the secret of the constantly increasing agricultural prosperity of the United States under Republican rule.

### NOT FIT TO BE PRESIDENT.

An "Evening Post" Opinion of Judge Parker.

(New York Evening Post, July 1, 1903.) We presume that Judge Parker's greetings in Georgia as "our next President" will not rattle his judicial calm. Like the rest of us, he has seen too many next Presidents a year before election.

They usually swarm like grasshoppers in July before the nominating convention. But the Judge will be subjected in his Georgia address to a pretty sharp test of his fitness for President, next time or ever. Will he have the courage to speak a direct and wholesome word to the people of the South on the question which is rapidly becoming the leading national issue?

We mean, of course, the whole matter of abridged suffrage, denied citizenship, refusal of equal treatment before the law, and the reestablishment of slavery, as affecting our negro population. The southern papers are full of it, and demanding that the South be "let alone" in its challenge of human rights and disregard of the constitution. Edward M. Shepard told the people of New Orleans that the South ought to be left to go its own way. But can a man named as "our next President" agree to such a local nullification of national laws? If he can, he is not fit to be President next year or any year.

### Of Course Not.

David B. Hill stated, in one of his speeches, that Mr. Roosevelt, on taking the oath of office after the death of President McKinley, said that he would not be a candidate for President in 1904. President Roosevelt has never made a promise as to his own personal ambition which he did not redeem. The President is outspoken, fair and square. These are characteristics of the man. He makes no promises he does not intend to keep, and he keeps such as he makes.

The silly story started by Hill had no foundation in fact, and it is really not worth the ink and paper that has been used in denying it, except that it once more marks the character of Hill.

"I have no words of abuse for Theodore Roosevelt. I believe him to be a brave, honest, conscientious man. I give him full credit for having a splendid courage of conviction."—Thomas E. Watson's speech accepting Populist nomination.

Liberal compensation for labor makes liberal customers for our products. The Republican policy of protection makes both.

# UNLIKE DEMOCRATS

## FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS OF REPUBLICANS NEVER SHADY.

### Sale of Philippine Bonds to a Western Bank, the Highest Bidder—Democratic Deal with the Belmont Syndicate Riddled.

The fourth installment of the \$3,000,000 of Philippine bonds was taken at 101.41 by the Western National Bank of Oklahoma City, whose bid for the bonds was the highest. The fact that a western bank should outbid leading institutions of Wall street for these bonds suggests how the West is rapidly gaining in financial power and importance. No western bank would have dared to bid for such a large issue of bonds without being perfectly satisfied that it could find a broad market for them amongst local investors. The old financial problem of the West was to get money from the East. The present problem of the West is to find good channels for the investment of its own money.

By a transaction such as this we find investors in the Southwest become creditors of the Philippine Islands. In other words, they are loaning some of the fruits of their own prosperity under Republican rule to help along the prosperity of our nation's wards in the Philippines. The security which United States government over the Philippines gives to lives and property, trade and industry, makes the credit of the islands good, so that investors are quite willing to pay a premium for Philippine bonds. If the United States government were not so cheerful over the Philippines, it is a question whether the islands would be able to float bonds even at a discount, hence many needed improvements for the islands could not be carried out. Were the Democratic party to be successful in the election this fall, the owners of Philippine bonds would doubtless see a quick slump in their market value.

### Notorious Democratic Deal.

It is the Republican policy in the case of necessary issues of bonds, like the war loan of 1898 and this Philippine bond issue, to sell the bonds by popular subscription or by public competitive bidding for them. This gives the whole people an equal chance, and all sections of the country an equal chance, to secure them for investment and to realize whatever profit their ultimate appreciation may bring. Under the Democratic plan, as followed out during the last Cleveland administration, the government ignored the small investors, and had no use for any financial institution west of Wall street.

For instance, on Feb. 18, 1895, the Democratic Secretary of the Treasury signed a contract with a New York syndicate for the selling of \$62,315,400 four per cent bonds. These bonds the syndicate sold to the public for \$65,116,244, clearing a profit for itself, out of the transaction, of nearly \$3,000,000. The price at which the bonds were sold to the syndicate was equivalent to 104 1/2 per cent, when the existing United States four per cent bonds, with less than half as long a time to run, were bringing 111 on the market. The syndicate dictated to the government the terms of the deal. ONE OF THE MEMBERS OF THAT SYNDICATE, AUGUST BELMONT, IS THE PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL ADVISER AND BACKER OF ALFONSO B. PARKER FOR PRESIDENT.

# WHY ALL'S WELL IN KANSAS.

## It Is Because of Sound Money and the Protective Policy.

Few people realize how or why the condition of Kansas is watched with such solicitude throughout the country—especially in the Western States.

The fact is indisputable that there is something about its climate, the mercantile disposition of its people and the conditions of life in Kansas that make it a sort of barometer for the rest of the republic. When there is anything serious the matter with Kansas it is certain that all is not exactly right with her neighbors. When there is a drought in Kansas there is apt to be a mighty thirst in all the region west of the Mississippi. When the rains and sunshine bless Kansas with bountiful harvests and the cyclone and grasshopper give her a wide berth, the fatness is apt to extend beyond her borders and fill the land with reason or rejoicings and content.

When Providence smiles on Kansas the heart of the nation is usually sorrowful for her—and for itself.

When Providence smiles on Kansas the rest of us generally bid an adieu to melancholy.

Therefore Senator Fairbanks did well in opening the Republican campaign at Marion, Kan., Sept. 1, to remind his auditors of the change that had come over their prospects since the days when the whole land rang with the cry, "What's the matter with Kansas?" Happily he was able to proclaim, if not from the house tops, at least to the telegraph operators for dissemination throughout the nation, that "All's well in Kansas."

Swiftly he drew the picture of the conditions as they existed eight years ago: "Kansas was suffering from the effects of Democratic administration. The interests of her agriculture languished. Her crops rotted in the field or were marketed at unremunerated prices." And much more to the same effect. Then he pointed to the prosperity of the present, without need to recapitulate the blessings that good crops, good prices, good government and sound money showered upon Kansas as from an exhausted urn.

"During the last seven years," he said, "no one has shared the prosperity which has come to the country in a fuller degree than the farmers of Kansas." And he illustrated the prosperity of the State by the increase in her bank deposits "from \$35,000,000 in 1895 to over \$80,000,000 in 1903." As a matter of exact record it might be well to say that the bank deposits in Kansas increased from \$30,529,487 in 1890 to \$84,055,110, or 180 per cent, while those of the whole country increased from \$231,828,339 to \$540,649,702, or slightly under 134 per cent.

Would the reader know how all this wonderful prosperity came to Kansas? It was through her own industry stimulated and protected by the sound economic and monetary policies of the Republican party.

In 1895 corn on the farms of Kansas was bringing 18 cents a bushel; last year, according to the report of the Depart-

ment of Agriculture, it brought 30 cents or exactly double as much.

In 1895 the price of wheat on the Kansas farm was 51 cents per bushel; last year, according to the same authority, it was 71 cents.

In 1895 the price of oats on the Kansas farm was 17 cents; last year it was 30—a case where 30 cents was a joke which the Kansas farmer appreciated clear down to his boots.

During this period freight rates on wheat per 100 pounds from Atchison, Kan., to Chicago were reduced from 24 to 19 cents, and on rice, barley, corn and oats from 20 to 16 cents.

In 1895 the revenue of the railways per passenger per mile in the territory of which Kansas is the center was 2.275 cents; in 1902 it had fallen to 2.235 cents. In the same period the railroad revenue from freight in the same territory had fallen from 1.161 cents per ton per mile to 0.978 cents.

There are good times in Kansas because of good government, good crops, good prices, increasing manufactures and declining rates for transporting the fruits of all kinds of industry to the markets of the world; and when there are good times in Kansas there is little occasion for discontent throughout the rest of the Union.

## FARM WAGES.

### Figures as to Rates Paid in England and the United States.

The August Labor Gazette, a government publication issued monthly by the British Board of Trade, gives an interesting account of the half-yearly agricultural hirings at Whitstable, 1904, for the counties of Cumberland, Westmoreland and North Lancashire, which affords an instructive view of the rates paid farm hands in England. The official report prepared for the department states that "the supply of male farm servants was fairly plentiful, owing partly to slackness of employment in other industries," but that "wages showed a downward tendency in the case of men, but women were scarce and their wages were well maintained."

The following were the rates generally agreed upon for the half year:

Category	Per six months
Best men	\$75.00 to \$100.00
Second class men	50.00 to 75.00
Youths and boys	25.00 to 50.00
Best women	50.00 to 75.00
Second class women and girls	20.00 to 60.00

These rates have been slightly increased in the transcription from English money into dollars and cents at the rate of 25 per cent, but they afford a clear and authoritative exhibit of what British farm hands are receiving by which every intelligent American farm hand can compare the wages he receives.

Without knowing the number of men employed in each class and at varying rates therein it is, of course, impossible to arrive at an average rate of compensation. But with \$100 per half year for the highest and \$50 for the lowest of the second-class men it is evident that the yearly average for male farm hands exclusive of youths and boys in Great Britain cannot be much, if any, above \$150 a year, while the average for women would be somewhere around \$100.

We have no similar figures for the United States, but in a recent bulletin entitled "Wages of Farm Labor in the United States," issued by the Department of Agriculture, the figures of the average monthly wages of farm laborers in this country are given. Multiplied by six, to arrive at the half yearly rate, they furnish the following:

Year	Average wages of farm laborers in the United States.
1890	\$75.00
1891	75.00
1892	75.00
1893	75.00
1894	75.00
1895	75.00
1896	75.00
1897	75.00
1898	75.00
1899	75.00
1900	75.00
1901	75.00
1902	75.00
1903	75.00

It will be perceived that the average rate paid in the United States in 1902 for six months is within \$100 of the maximum rate paid to the best farm hands in Great Britain in May, 1904, and almost double the minimum paid second class men.

The figures of our Department of Agriculture, moreover, apply only to those laborers hired by the year or season, the rates where the engagement is by the day are very much higher, being 80 cents per day, with board, and \$1.13 without, in 1902, against 65 cents with, and 81 cents without board, in 1894.

This would make the pay, with board, in 1894, average \$94.50 for a half year of 150 days, while the average compensation of the American farm laborer paid by the day in 1902 would be \$132.50 for the six months, with board.

But statistical averages, valuable as they are in reflecting the general conditions, are elusive and tantalizing things when they attempt to cover the rate of wages in an occupation like agriculture, which, including employers and employed, numbers at least 11,000,000 persons over 10 years of age and upwards of every age, color and sex. The American farm laborer knows what wages he receives, and he can compare it with what is paid in England, and greatly to his own satisfaction.

He also knows that the above averages in the United States for 1894 and 1902 fairly though faintly reflect the difference between his industrial condition during the last Democratic national administration and now. And in November he will not vote for any party whose success would foreshadow a return to the conditions of 1894 and 1895.

### Expansion a Blessing.

United States Consul General Gaueher, at Frankfurt, Germany, quotes a noted German professor as saying that expansion does not lessen a nation's inherent compactness and strength. On the contrary, a nation can only become great, he says, by having space in which to expand. Great Britain is cited as an example of what expansion has done for a nation that originally had little territory.