

PROGRESSIVE FARMER

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

Vol. 5.

RALEIGH, N. C., MARCH 25, 1890.

No. 7

THE NATIONAL FARMERS' ALLIANCE AND INDUSTRIAL UNION.

President—L. L. Polk, North Carolina. Address, 916 E. St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Vice-President—B. H. Clover, Cambridge, Kansas.
Secretary—J. H. Turner, Georgia. Address, 916 E. St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Treasurer—W. H. Hickman, Puxico, Missouri.
Lecturer—Ben Terrell, Texas.

State Library

to oppose any man in either party after the nominations are made as well as before, "who is an enemy to our order or to the principles of justice our people are contending for." Why stop when the nominations are made? If either or both of the parties place men of the character named in nomination, the fight should be increased rather than abated, and there should be no let up until all such men are sunk into everlasting oblivion. In the name of high heaven let us have a little consistency in our political suggestions.—*Kansas Advocate*.

The colony of Victoria, in Australia, owns its railroads, its postoffices, its telegraph lines and its express franchises. It works all these at a profit to the State. Its profits from railroads last year were \$16,000,000 and from its postal service, telegraph and express business \$1,140,000. Its surplus on last year's transactions of railroads, postoffices, telegraph and express offices was \$34,400,000. Victoria has a debt of \$165,000,000, but as all of this was contracted in building railroads, waterworks, etc., which pay a handsome profit, the colony is not worrying over its indebtedness. It is about the size of Kansas and has the same population.—*National Advocate*.

There is a growing sentiment in favor of government ownership or control of railroads. Those who are most responsible for that sentiment, are the railroad managers themselves. Railroads are public necessities and should be run in the interest of the public. When it costs \$173 to move \$93 worth of corn from Illinois to Michigan, it is argument furnished by the railroad for government ownership. When one man can buy a link of railroad, 45 miles in length, in Michigan, for \$650,000 and thus control the freight rates of the State, and in 60 days put that money back in his pocket, out of Michigan industry, it is another argument for nationalizing the railroads.—*Alliance Sentinel*.

Senator Plumb, of Kansas, has introduced a bill providing for the propagation of the American buffalo. The bill donates a strip of land and the usual amount of money, etc., etc. Now, if there is anything of a legislative character that would aid in paying off the mortgages from Kansas farms, it would be a national herd of fat, slick buffaloes. If anything would give courage to men who pass the long winter evenings reading by the light of a roaring corn fire, the beautiful and soul-inspiring provisions of a Kansas land mortgage, it would be the knowledge that the American bison would not become extinct. Let the bill pass at once; it bears directly upon the cause of all our troubles.—*Kansas Economist*.

The average circulation of bank notes for the past twenty years, has been about \$300,000,000. The interest rate at 10 per cent. would be \$30,000,000 per annum, making a total of \$600,000,000 paid by the people in the last 20 years to national banks in interest for the same money that the government lends to the banks at one per cent., leaving a profit of \$540,000,000 in the hands of banks, practically a free gift of the government from the hard earnings of the people.

Laborer Tribune, (Carthage, Mo.) improves as the weeks pass. It reports and comments:
It is an actual fact that cattle are selling in Cherokee county, Kansas, at one cent a pound. Just think of a 1,000 pound cow selling for \$10! How does this strike you, farmers? You could have sold these same cows in 1886 for \$50 to \$60. Feeders in Kansas say they can not pay over six cents a bushel for corn and feed to cattle at the present prices they are getting for them. Is it not about time you were doing a little thinking for yourself, if you have not heretofore done so?—*The Alliance Sentinel*.

WHY HESITATE OR WAIT?

Why hesitate or wait? We have silver enough and gold enough and nickel enough and copper enough and paper enough for all the purposes of money. The people are waiting for its issue. Let Congress give heed to these facts, and not worry them with unnecessary delay. Hurry up and strike for money while the iron is hot. The money metals are all ready. Gather them up and send them jingling through the marts of trade and down the corridors of time. Scatter the silver certificates, like olive leaves, broadcast. Like oil, they will give health and comfort to the people in whose hands they will fall.—*The National View*.

LETTER FROM FARMER'S A WIFE.

PERQUIMANS, CO., N. C., March 5, '90.
MR. EDITOR:—After quite a while spent in silence, we again knock at the door for admittance. The weather has been open and warm all winter, and our farmers have been taking advantage of it. They are preparing for a crop in real earnest. They have broken up land, mended fences, made compost, and some of them have been ditching. Well, it is good to be in time about everything, so we will say "hurrah for the farmers of old Perquimans, and three cheers for them the world over!" for they are waking up to their own interest and are going to stand up to their own, and demand their rights. There has been so much said about hard times, that I am almost ashamed of the words, but we must not complain, but be thankful to the Giver of all, that we are no worse off than we are. Some of us, it is true, could not pay up last year, for two reasons: First, we did not raise much to sell; and second, we could not get anything for what we did have to spare. "Every cloud has a silver lining," and there is a brighter side in the future that will certainly be turned toward us, the poor down-trodden sons and daughters of the tillers of the soil.

I read "Old Foggy's" reply to "A Unit," and think it a grand piece. By the way, who is he, anyway? I should like to take a peep at him.

Sisters, what are you doing? I don't believe you are asleep, for farmers' wives and daughters don't get time to sleep as much as they ought to, at least I don't, I am sure. There is work for us to do, and we shall not be found wanting. We can help in many ways, and we must do it.

Success to THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER and its noble editor.
Yours fraternally,
MRS. M. C. CARVER, Cor. Sec'y.

WHICH IS BEST?

A problem that is rapidly forcing itself upon the attention of the American people is whether corporations shall carry on the commercial transactions, including transportation as well as all other ramifications of business life, or whether the government shall gradually assume control and absorb the functions that are now carried on by corporations and are daily more and more passing into the control and management of incorporated companies.

Thomas W. Higginson in the *Nation* says: "There are a good many persons, I take it, who have reached just this point of conviction—namely, to hold that, if the government carries on the postoffice fairly well, as it certainly does, it may well undertake the telegraph also, as in England; that if it can conduct a bankrupt railroad, through a 'receiver,' it could also carry on a successful one; that if a city can supply its inhabitants with water, it might as well try the experiment of supplying them with gas. How far this tendency is to go, such persons do not undertake to say—and here stop short of Mr. Bellamy and his thorough supporters; but in the meantime they are willing and glad to put themselves on record as looking in that same direction. They find themselves confronted with a situation which has nowhere been better stated than by a strong opponent of State socialism, Prof. A. T. Hadley, of Yale University. He says in the *Political Science Quarterly* for December, 1888: "Modern life demands organized business action. There are two great organizations, either one of which can manage it—organized capital, or organized government." If this be the real alternative, there certainly is an increasing number of persons who would prefer to trust the government. This is, at any rate, the present writer's inclination.

In the consideration of this question there are salient and important points to consider. While Mr. Higginson emphatically places himself on record as in favor of government control, and perhaps the majority of the thinking, reasoning people will coincide with him in the opinion, quite a large number will take the other view, claiming that the State lacks the personal individuality incentive that still attaches to the corporation, no matter how large its numbers, power and influence; also, that the State at best is but inefficiently managed.

On the other hand the advocates of State control show the immense danger arising from the power of corporations, centered in the real individual continuity of management, and possessing all the selfish greed that can

be developed in an individual, while it cannot exert any of the generous and charitable instincts and practices that frequently rule even in the most wealthy individuals. While in the State, even with the corruption that is said to adhere thereto, the elements of continuous individual control can not exist in our government, and the selfishness akin to individual greed cannot rule, and as for the inefficiency of State management it is largely the bug-a-boo of political place-seekers, being their only shouting capital to use for personal advancement, for the government affairs are as skillfully carried on as any private or corporate affairs, the grumblers to the contrary, notwithstanding. Then to the enlargement and extension of government business would naturally create a closer and more systematic administration of its affairs.

By close inspection of the sources of argument pro and con it will be found that for government control originates from persons allied and in sympathy with the people, while those against government control and in favor of corporate management exclusively, are from persons whose interests and sympathies are predominated by the corporate and money powers of the land.

The question has many phases; however, and requires careful study and consideration, and movements for or against should be carefully weighed and judged before they are advocated or entered into.—*Farmers' Friend and Grange Advocate*.

DEACON SMITH'S PROTECTED RAM.

Near the town of C, in the State of Ohio, lives old Deacon Smith and his wife Betsy on a fifty-acre farm. It was a great grief to them when their only child went to the city to work, but the land was too poor to support all three, and John always eat Thanksgiving dinner at home. Last June when the deacon sheared his pet ram he put by the twelve pounds of fleece, thinking to buy John a suit of Sunday clothes. A little later a wool-buyer from Massachusetts purchased the fleece, making a deduction of one-third, however, for grease, so that the deacon only received \$2.40 for his wool. The wool-buyer took his purchase home with him and, adding two pounds of cotton at 8 cents per pound, for lining and wadding, he had the raw material for a complete suit of clothes into which it was accordingly made, and in the autumn returned in its new form to the clothing store at C.

The day after Thanksgiving the deacon and John started for the town, taking with them the farm produce, for which the following prices were obtained:

25 bushels oats, at 21c.	\$5.25
7 bushels wheat, at 78c.	5.46
65 pounds beef hide, at 2c.	1.30
140 pound quarter beef, at 25c.	3.50
3 dozen eggs, at 15c. per dozen.	.39
5 pounds butter, at 14c. per pound.	.70

Adding to this the \$2.40 he had got for the fleece and carefully saved, the deacon walked into the clothing store with \$22.50 in his pocketbook, enough he imagined to buy a suit of clothes and pay his taxes. But clothing was higher than he thought. The price of an imported suit was the amount contained in his pocketbook, and a similar grade of American goods cost exactly the same. "It is the duty that makes goods so high," remarked the clothier. "But Mr. McKinley told us last fall that the consumer did not pay the duty," objected the deacon. The storekeeper smiled and the deacon bought the suit, planning to pay his half-yearly tax of 17.50 by cutting thirty-five cords of wood. So that all the old man and Betsy have to winter on is McKinley's speeches, and there was more heat in them just before election than is to be found in mid-winter. Truly

American farmers are slaves,
American mill-men are knaves;
And politicians don't care a—
For Deacon Smith's protected ram.

RAIL FENCE.

When the masses of labor come to understand the value of an economic education, we will hear no more wrangles about the relative value of parties and candidates! Officers-elect, no matter who they are, will know what will be expected of them. The great work of the hour in which intelligent labor should engage is to educate the public mind on economic questions; point out the errors of the present system and unite with all who are willing to substitute a better. Labor must appeal to the virtue and intelligence of the people and not to their vices and their ignorance.—*Industrial Age*, (Minn.)

SUB-TREASURY BILL.

The Farmers' Alliance Method of Dealing With Public Questions.

[Old Foggy in the Washington Post.]

EDITOR POST: There is at present very much talk and discussion over a bill recently introduced in the United States Senate by Senator Vance, from North Carolina, and known as the sub-treasury bill. For introducing this bill by request the distinguished Senator has been unkindly criticised by some and highly complimented by others. The environments of those who have written and spoken on the subject have had very much to do with their conclusions. Newspapers, deriving their support from railroads, bankers and merchants, whose interests center in towns and cities, naturally sympathize with those from whom their support directly comes. On the other hand, papers that derive their support from the agricultural classes have long known the oppressed and deplorable condition of the tiller of the soil; and they gladly give their support to a measure that they honestly believe will benefit the farmer.

There are exceptions to both classes. We know of newspapers published in country towns that oppose the sub-treasury bill because they do not think it a wise one, and on the contrary we know city papers that will defend it when convinced that it is a wise and safe measure. Let us then, without prejudice against the bill, or sympathy for it, analyze the bill.

Briefly, the bill proposes to allow the producer to place in warehouses, to be erected or owned by the government, the products of the soil—such products as all must have—such products as are annually exported.

It further proposes that the government shall advance to the producer 80 per cent. of the local values of the products warehoused, and that the producers may retain ownership for any term less than one year, and that the government shall charge for such service enough to cover cost of insurance, handling, etc., and 1 per cent. on the 80 per cent. of the values advanced.

The objections against the bill are, first, that it is a new and untried scheme, and that it is visionary, and is the product of "Hayseeders," who are not accustomed to finance or legislation. When Fulton proposed "to navigate the rivers with a steamboat" similar objections were raised. When Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood no respectable physician over forty years of age accepted the discovery as a fact.

This is equally true of telegraphy and many other innovations in ideas prevailing at the time an important discovery is made. So that if these objections were founded in fact they would prove nothing. But when it is known that they are founded in ignorance of historical facts, then these objections appear ridiculous, and those who pose as encyclopedias of political knowledge must feel that at least one volume of facts, if swallowed, was not digested. Joseph, the secretary of state for Pharaoh, established warehouses in the cities against the time of need.

In 1763, Frederic II, of Prussia, opened the government warehouses for his people. He loaned money to the government, and the beneficial results are known to all students of history.

In 1848, the French Republic was forced to adopt a system of warehouses similar to the plan in the bill introduced by Senator Vance.

The warehousing of products enabled France to pay the indemnity forced by the Germans, and gave France the financial prosperity that is hers to-day.

The French plan is just the reverse of the English. They protect the poor, they encourage small holdings, and fewer French leave their country than any other nationality.

The "national monte de piedad" of Mexico is a modified form of the French plan for the benefit of those needing loans. If those who are so anxious to condemn this bill will examine the facts they will at least save themselves from appearing ridiculous.

The second objection urged is the cost of the warehouses. To this we reply, that the people who pay a large per cent. of the taxes of the country are asking for it. The farmer and laborer furnish a large per cent. of the defenders of our country they are asking for it.

Congress has appropriated from 1882 to 1889, \$82,000,000 for improving creeks, rivers and harbors. It has appropriated in the same time as much for Indian service as we ask for to build the warehouses. It has appro-

riated for the District of Columbia alone in ten years as much as the warehouses will cost. It gave the Pacific Railroad an empire of land, and appropriated more money for the railroad referred to than it would cost to build the warehouses.

Congress by law has collected in forms of tax from the people and paid in interest for these Pacific railroads thirty millions more than we ask for.

We have collected from the people in ten years, as shown by the treasurer's report, over \$2,000,000,000 in the tariff tax; we have collected from the people in ten years twelve hundred millions in internal revenue, and surely the farmers have paid some little of this enormous tax. Now we certainly think we are entitled to some consideration. We ask a respectful hearing, and really think if the principle of "the greatest good to the greatest number" is not obsolete, that if we can prove in Congress our system to be a good one, we are entitled to the expense without further argument in that line. There is no good reason why the "bed rock" of our country should be ignored.

Third, it is said by others that this is paternalism. Is it paternalism for us to be provident? Is it not wise to prepare for emergencies? Is it more paternal to issue money on products of value than to issue to banks evidences of debt? Is it more paternal for the government to look after food products than to look after whiskey in warehouses? Is it more paternal to aid the farmer than it is to aid the manufacturer? Is it more paternal to aid the farmer than to aid the Pacific railroads? If so call it paternalism and make the most of it.

Other plans are being offered. Show us a better plan and we will adopt it. We want relief and want it quickly. Most important of these is the plan for loaning money on land. We canvassed that plan in our convention in St. Louis. It was found that a large per cent. of the farmers in the South (mainly colored) and a very large per cent. in the North and West were renters and croppers, and if money was loaned on real property it would exclude those that were too poor to own farms of their own from the benefits of a low rate of interest.

The Alliance seeks to extend to the best tiller the same advantages that offers the largest planter. If professional politicians would let us alone we, through the Alliance, would quickly settle the race question. The Alliance has already done more for the colored man than all Congressional legislation from 1870 until now.

Again, it was said "that if money was issued on lands that much of it would go into the hands of the large holder, and that if those who were already in debt were desirous of availing themselves of the privilege they could not do so, for the government could not accept property as security that was not free from all forms of liens against it. Again, if a land-owner was in debt and the debts were due, there would be foreclosures on the part of the money-lenders with the view of getting the lands in at low rates, when there was a certainty that they could borrow money of the government on them at one per cent. Again, this would not give us a flexible volume of currency, which we claim is desirable. The press dispatches in reference to the California Senator's resolutions say that bankers are flooding the Senator with telegrams, saying: "This plan of yours would ruin banking."

Shall farmers be ruined to make the bankers prosperous? Is that to be the issue? Is it wrong to issue money on produce or lands and right to issue it to bankers at one per cent., and then loan millions more on no per cent. at all? Will you please tell us if our plan is not wise what the present plan is like unto?

OLD FOGGY.

Washington, March 12.

HOW SHE WON HIM.

"How did I come to fancy my wife?" repeated an old gentleman, one of the successful men of his age, whose wife was noted rather for her domestic virtues than social qualities. "Why, I saw her sewing, busy mending and repairing the clothes of her little brother. I had been meeting society girls, who sat idle and listless, or who stared hard at me, but I never felt drawn to them. When I saw Lucy, bending gracefully over a bit of plain sewing and repairing rears and sewing on buttons I thought of what she would be in her own home. It made me wish to have her in mine. I knew she would make a good wife, and she has."