



THE



PROGRESSIVE



FARMER.

THE INDUSTRIAL AND EDUCATIONAL INTERESTS OF OUR PEOPLE PARAMOUNT TO ALL OTHER CONSIDERATIONS OF STATE POLICY.

Vol. 2.

RALEIGH, N. C., JANUARY 12, 1888.

No. 46.

DIRECTORY OF FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS.

FARMERS' NATIONAL ALLIANCE AND CO-OPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA.

President—C. W. Macune, Texas.
 First Vice-President—L. L. Polk, N. C.
 Vice-Pres't for Ala.—H. P. Bone.
 Vice-Pres't for Ark.—W. H. Moore.
 Vice-Pres't for Fla.—Oswald Wilson.
 Vice-Pres't for Ky.—S. B. Irwin.
 Vice-Pres't for La.—Linn Tanner.
 Vice-Pres't for Miss.—R. T. Love.
 Vice-Pres't for Mo.—A. B. Johnson.
 Vice-Pres't for N. C.—S. B. Alexander.
 Vice-Pres't for Tenn.—I. H. McDowell.
 Vice-Pres't for Tex.—M. D. K. Taylor.
 Secretary—E. B. Warren, Texas.
 Treasurer—A. E. Gardner, Tenn.
 Chaplain—Rev. J. C. Jones, La.
 Lecturer—Ben. Terrell, Tex.
 Asst. Lecturer—J. A. Tetts, La.
 Door Keeper—Newt. Gresham, Ala.
 Asst. Door Keeper—H. C. Brown, Ky.
 Serg't-at-Arms—T. E. Groom, Miss.

NORTH CAROLINA FARMERS' STATE ALLIANCE.

President—S. B. Alexander, Charlotte, N. C.
 Vice-President—T. Ivey, Ashpole, N. C.
 Secretary—L. L. Polk, Raleigh, N. C.
 Treasurer—J. D. Allen, Falls, N. C.
 Lecturer—Geo. Wilcox, Carbonate, N. C.
 Assistant Lecturer—D. D. McIntyre, Lenoir, N. C.
 Chaplain—Rev. E. J. Edwards, Cedar Creek, N. C.
 Door Keeper—W. H. Tomlinson, Fayetteville, N. C.
 Assistant Door Keeper—R. T. Rush, Mt. Gilead, N. C.
 Sergeant-at-Arms—J. S. Holt, Chalk Level, N. C.

THE NORTH CAROLINA FARMERS' ASSOCIATION.

President—Elias Carr, Old Sparta, Edgecombe county.
 B. F. Hester, Oxford, Secretary; S. Otho Wilson, Vineyard, and W. E. Benbow, Oak Ridge, Assistant Secretaries.

STATE GRANGE PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY.

W. R. Williams, Falkland, Pitt county, Master.
 H. T. J. Ludwig, Mt. Pleasant, Secretary.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE—OFFICERS.

John Robinson, Commissioner.
 T. K. Bruner, Acting Secretary.
 Dr. H. B. Battle, Chemist and Director of Experiment Station.
 John T. Patrick, General Agent Immigration.

N. C. AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

W. G. Upchurch, Raleigh, President; John Nichols, Raleigh, Secretary.

NORTH CAROLINA HORTICULTURAL SOCIETY.

President—J. Van Lindley, Pomona.
 Secretary—S. Otho Wilson, Vineyard.

THE FARMERS' CONGRESS.

Old Virginia Speaks.

We make some extracts from the address of Col. Beverly, of Virginia, President of the Farmers' Congress, and delivered before that body at its annual session in Chicago, November 10th, 1887:

We may well view with dismay the progress of "Monopoly" in every direction; the whole telegraph and telephone systems of the country are each under complete domination of single individuals. Experience has shown that this permits the employees and creatures of these persons to speed or stay the transmission and delivery of intelligence at the instance of these persons, which give to them undue advantages and dangerous powers over the business of the people, and the people themselves. No class of citizens are so deeply and vitally interested in putting proper, safe and effectual restraints upon the encroachments of corporate powers and the despotism of monopoly, as the rural population is indissolubly bound up by common interests and the necessity of mutual support with the agricultural class. The figures of the census, show that nearly 51 per cent. of our total population are engaged in agricultural pursuits; farmers, laborers, and their children, and add to them the local mechanics, clergymen, &c., &c., whose entire support is derived directly from the farmers in their vicinity, and you get 70 per cent. of the whole population of this grand country directly supported by agriculture; and yet what voice have we in

the councils of the nation? Silent as death in the executive arm of the government, in the legislative arm, not a voice in the Senate, and last session of Congress 23 members out of 320 in the House of Representatives. Is it strange that our calling is practically bankrupt while the nation is said to be prosperous? But I will not longer abuse your patience by discussing this section of our interest.

We are impudently told that it is true that no law of the United States ever created a monopoly. One instance only will prove its falsehood. A few years ago there were two persons in America manufacturing quinine. They had monopolized that business, and were so effectually protected in their monopoly by the laws of the United States that they effectually throttled all domestic competition and drove off all foreign interference by a prohibitive tariff. A movement was at last made to remove the prohibition duty and lower the price of this necessity of life to the poor. Answer was made by the prohibitionists, that foreigners would drive out domestic manufacture entirely, establish a monopoly, and put up the price to \$8 or \$10, the price then being \$5 per ounce. The tariff was taken off; the present price is from 90 cents to \$1 per ounce, and the domestic manufacturers are still working at a profit. Oh, no, there are no monopolies possible under the benign system under which this country has prospered beyond all precedent! Yet one person owns and controls the telegraphs, and one person owns and controls the telephones, whereas less than ten persons dominate the railway system of the country, and can and will, and do, wreck any railway properties which venture to make the least show of competition with their systems, or to enter upon their territories, and yet there are no monopolies!

This state of things, I repeat again, bears more heavily upon agriculture than on any and all the other classes combined, for their business is taxed by these monopolies and by local and State governments out of all proportion to its income producing power, and they are onerously, indirectly and insidiously taxed upon their incomes and their capital, by the Federal tariff, while at the same time thoroughly cut off from all banking facilities by a system framed by and for commercial interests exclusively.

It is for the representatives of the thirty millions of population who live by the plough in this country, so "marvellously free and great," to see to it, that the party in power and the present administration redeem their ante-election pledges by reducing this onerous, unnecessary burden of taxation, until the treasury is disburdened of this prodigious amount of surplus money, and the people are freed from the galling domination of monopolizing, greedy and dangerous corporate power, a power that has grown into a huge and hideous incubus upon the shoulders of the people. I have said, and here I repeat, that if we lie still and suffer these things, we can justly blame no one but ourselves, for we have had the power, and possibly yet have it, to change these things by a judicious and independent exercise of our suffrage. If we do not, this so-called free government of the people, will inevitably become an oligarchy in the hands of a few privileged persons, wielding the moneyed power to the enslavement of the people, especially the agricultural classes. Look to it today and let us avoid this catastrophe to our government.

I trust, gentlemen, that we shall neither fail nor falter in the work we have undertaken, viz.: The thorough organization of the agricultural classes throughout the entire country, the only safety to Republican government, and for the protection of civil and political influence and power, and the advancement of our social, intellectual and material status. Let me beg you to get up a thorough, independent and perfect system of organization of our classes for the protection of our interests, as well as for free government, before you adjourn.

ENSILAGA FOR FATTENING.

At the annual meeting of the Illinois Dairymen's Association, an entire day of the session was given to the question of silos and ensilage. Mr. Periam, of the *Farm, Field and Stockman*, in 1869, put up an earth silo at Chatsworth, Ill., with a view to discover, if possible, if green fodder could be thus economically preserved. The success was most gratifying. This was years before the subject of ensilage was thought of in America, or indeed generally in Europe. His readings and experience in pitting vegetables had, however, convinced him that the plan should be feasible. The whole subject was presented by him at the dairymen's meeting at Mount Carroll, and he was kept on the stand during the whole morning, after the lecture, answering questions, propounded by the audience. The afternoon was also entirely taken up in the discussion of the question by various experts. The various questions discussed at this important meeting will be printed immediately, in a neatly bound volume, for distribution to the members of the association and others interested who will remit the membership fee to the Secretary, R. Lespinasse, 183 South Water street, Illinois.

Gentlemen engaged in feeding cattle for the butcher, were present from distant parts of the State, anxious to learn the feeding value for growing and fattening stock. This was not touched upon except incidentally. So far as expressed, the testimony was decidedly in favor of ensilage for all kinds of stock, including hogs and even chickens, and the expression of satisfaction by visitors was general. The testimony of the value of ensilage seems general, not only in Europe and America, but also in England, a country where this means of preserving food would seem less necessary than in many others. The winter climate is mild. The cultivation of roots, necessary to the profitable agriculture there is universal. These are largely fed off in the fields, where they are grown, and the winter pasture is there often considerable during that season.

Testimony from competent authority in England, therefore, will be of great weight. The latest volume of the journal of the Royal Agricultural Society contains the record of a competent trial of ensilage by Dr. Voelcker, and in the direct line of feeding bullocks: On this we find that, from the same meadow, hay and silage were made, the grass for hay weighing fifteen tons seven hundred weight, and that for silage a few pounds under fourteen tons two and three-fourths hundred weight. [The English ton is 2,240 pounds, and the English hundred weight 112 pounds.—Ed.]

Twelve bullocks were divided into two equal lots, one to be fed on hay and the other on silage, with the addition of three pounds of cotton cake and five pounds of maize meal for each bullock per day in both lots, and water at will. After eighty-four days' feeding, all the hay having been consumed, the total increase in live weight of the six bullocks fed on hay was 989 pounds, or 1.96 pounds per head per day, while that of the six fed on silage was 999 pounds, or 1.98 pounds per head per day.

As there was originally about fifteen hundred weight more grass for the hay than for the silage, and enough of the latter remained after the hay had been consumed to feed the six bullocks for a few days, it appears that, with a considerably smaller consumption of grass, the animals fed on silage made a slightly greater gain in live weight. The silage in this case was sour, but of very good quality. Dr. Voelcker also gives the results of an experience witnessed by him in which silage was intended to be sweet, but containing nearly as much acid as that used in the other experiment, was tried against hay from the same meadow with equal quantities of other foods. In this case the gain in live weight was 1.6 pounds per head per day among four bullocks fed on maize, against 1.3 pounds among four fed on hay.

Reducing this to our weight of 2,000 pounds per ton, we find that there was in this experiment 34,752 pounds of grass made into hay and 31,680 pounds of ensilage fed, or 2,632 pounds more of the former as grass than of the latter as ensilage. This, in connection with the many others recorded, would seem to settle the question in favor of ensilage for fattening cattle, its value for winter feeding for dairy cattle and growing stock being now generally acknowledged.—*Farm, Field and Stockman*.

THE WAY THE MONEY GOES.

Mr. Editor, what is the estimated value of watered stock in railroads? Senator Coke, the champion of Texas democracy, said, some time since, that the watered stock amounted to \$3,500,000,000. I want to ask a question: How long would it take to count 3,500,000,000, counting one dollar every second, allowing eight hours for a day's work? It would take more than 330 years. Who has to pay the interest on this fictitious stock? The laboring people. How long have they been paying it? What would the interest amount to annually? It would be \$350,000,000, would it not? Now add the \$500,000,000 that we pay to the tariff ring, these two would make a grand total of \$850,000,000 that we pay on these two items.

Talmage says we pay to railroads \$300,000,000 over and above reasonable charges. Add this to the \$850,000,000 and we have \$1,050,000,000 that ought to be in the hands of the people. No wonder the laboring people are organizing. And this is not all; we have lost millions of dollars in land; paid out millions on Indians; paid out thousands on rich widows; paid out thousands to bury dead congressmen.

Now, Mr. Editor, is this not enough to arouse the people and cause them to organize? The Alliance platform is broad enough, strong enough and large enough to hold all mankind (farmers) if they will abide its teachings and be men, and not sluggards, drones, bug-hunters, sore-heads, dead beats, etc.—*G. Ligon, in Mercury*.

The whole matter of marketing crops does not begin to receive the attention it deserves. Many a man will study into the best way of producing his stuff, and will work hard on the crop all summer, and then sell it at the first opportunity, without making any efforts to ascertain the situation, so far as supply and market prices are concerned. The business end of farming needs to be studied even more than production. Many farmers do not put a sufficient value on reliable and comprehensive crop and market reports. The eagerness with which the dealers in produce utilize such information is an ever-present illustration of its value. The fact is, there are practically no sources of information about crops and markets to which the farmers may not have access quite as well as the dealers, if they are willing to pay for it. When the farmer makes the selling of his crops as much a business as does the buyer, he will find farming more profitable.—*Home and Farm*.

Two hundred years and more ago, the beds in England were bags filled with straw or leaves, but not upholstered or squared with modern neatness. The bag could be opened and the litter re-made daily. There were few bedrooms in the houses of ancient England. The master and mistress of the Anglo-Saxon house had a chamber or shed built against the wall that enclosed the mansion and its dependencies; their daughters had the same. Young men and guests sleep in the great hall, which was the only noticeable room in the house, on tables or benches. Woolen coverlids were provided for warmth; poles or hooks on which they could hang their clothes projected from the wall; perches were provided for their hawks. Attendants and servants slept upon the floor.

THE SUGAR TRUST.

One of the last of the mis-called trusts that are yearly accumulating to curse this country, is the Sugar Trust. It is causing distrust in the sugar trade, and is calculated to fleece buyers, to put still greater profits into the pockets of a syndicate of refiners, already many times millions from immense profits fleeced from the people in the past. Now these arrogant conspirators, by means of a closer corporation among themselves, seek to control the sugar refining interests of the United States, one part of the plan being to prevent outside parties from entering the business. The mode of operation is this: A refinery being about to start, the trust steps in and says: Undertake this and we will crush you by means every business man knows to be possible to a great, consolidated and unscrupulous corporation. The Standard Oil Trust, and various other so-called trusts, are examples of this fact.

Those who compose the sugar trust (?) refuse to give any information as to what they are doing or what they intend. Old and wealthy sugar houses are said to be in ignorance of any of the details of the organization. There is more than one remedy that Congress might apply if it should choose so to do. Will it? Probably not, until the people speak in tones that cannot fail to be understood. There is such a thing as "tinkering at legislation." Too many statesmen now-a-days seem more like tinkers than master workmen. Meanwhile, the unholy aggression of capitalistic monopolists, is making the poor poorer, and the rich richer. In regard to this latest of trust iniquities, the sugar trust, one of the oldest and best known sugar brokers in the business in New York is reported as saying:

This trust is a most iniquitous thing, but I don't see what can be done about it. Their plans can only be learned by watching the course of events in the sugar trade, and from many little things that have happened it looks to me as though there were danger ahead for many of us, and that we may ultimately have to go out of the business. This trust has become a powerful organization, and all the stories that have been circulated that it was going to fall through are merely bluffs to throw the public off the track. They fear publicity and are working in secret because they cannot stand the public gaze. They control now nearly all the refineries in the country, and pretty soon will be able to raise the price of raw sugars, thereby making a profit both ways. Already the price of refined sugar has gone up, and there is no telling what these people will do.

The statement is as interesting reading as it is true. It will apply to aggressive monopolies, syndicates and trusts generally. Until people wake up and move against them as one man, Legislature and Congress will let them alone. There is money therefrom to such legislators and congressmen as may be open to their influence. But the power that made can unmake, and the people are that power. Let them speak.—*Farm Field and Stockman*.

Three things farmers of the State ought to do at the beginning of this year: 1. See that your county is represented at Greensboro. 2. Take THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER. 3. Join Alliance.

OFFICIAL ORGANS OF FARMERS ALLIANCE.

National Alliance—*Southern Mercury*, Dallas, Texas.
 Alabama—*Alliance News*, Calera.
 Arkansas—*State Wheel Enterprise*, Little Rock.
 Mississippi—*The Farmer*, Winona.
 North Carolina—*THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER*, Raleigh.
 Louisiana—*The Union*, Choudrant.
 Tennessee and Kentucky—*The Toiler*, Union City, Tenn.
 Free Speech, Beaumont, Texas, of the counties of Jefferson, Orange, Tyler, Hardin, Chambers, Liberty.
 Florida—*Farmers' Florida Alliance*.