404

FARMING AS IT IS!

AN

ORIGINAL TREATISE ON AGRICULTURE,

WITH THE

RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF FARMERS.

✓
BY T. J. PINKHAM,

114
—
“We will speak out, we will be heard,
Though all earth's systems crack;
We will not bate a single word,
Nor take a letter back.”
—

“AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM.”

BOSTON:
BRADLEY, DAYTON & COMPANY,
1860.

D 451
.M4 P6
1860

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1860, by
T. J. PINKHAM,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

Printed by
BAZIN & CHANDLER,
37 Cornhill.

TO

The Farmers of New England,

AND

ALL WORK-PEOPLE EVERYWHERE,

THIS WORK

IS

MOST CORDIALLY DEDICATED,

BY

YOUR FRIEND AND FELLOW CITIZEN,

THE AUTHOR.

PREPARE

For some time I have been thinking of the necessity of the people
to prepare for the future. It is not only the people who are
the foundation of the nation, but the people who are the
and the future of the nation. It is not only the people who are
upon the people, but the people who are the foundation of the
over-education of the people. It is not only the people who are
soon time and money. It is not only the people who are
which a better and more efficient system of education is
the fact a more efficient system of education is the fact
which is the fact. It is not only the people who are
which is the fact. It is not only the people who are
in education. It is not only the people who are
have shown a tendency to be more efficient. It is not only
suggesting that the people are more efficient. It is not only
and good.

It does not seem to me that the people are more efficient
in education. It is not only the people who are
more efficient. It is not only the people who are
which is the fact. It is not only the people who are
straight to the people. It is not only the people who are
and the people. It is not only the people who are
that the people are more efficient. It is not only
to be efficient.

Thinking of the people, I am reminded of the fact
that the people are more efficient. It is not only
that the people are more efficient. It is not only

P R E F A C E .

FOR some time it has been my firm conviction that the Agriculturalists in this country were laboring under many evils, and that the tendency of some of the institutions and laws of the States and the General Government, was to fasten these evils more firmly upon the people, that the non-producers may be benefited by the over-exertion of the laboring community. Thus I have spent some time and much thought, in coming at some conclusions by which a better and wiser system can be introduced among the people, that a more perfect equality may obtain. What I have committed to paper is but a fair reflex of the ideas that have long been fixed in my mind, and that although nearly all the views are original,—taking new grounds, and arriving at conclusions that are in antagonism with the ideas of most Agricultural writers, yet I have aimed at a truthful delineation of the facts as they exist,—suggesting such remedies as seemed to me wise and for the general good.

If those who have set themselves up as teachers of the people in Agricultural matters, shall discover that I have committed any errors in my facts or conclusions, or in the philosophy of my reasoning, there is no one who will be more ready than myself to be set right in the matter; as my only purpose is to disseminate correct principles, and entertaining no fears of a thorough investigation, where the object is that the people, and not individuals, are to be benefited.

Nothing would suit me better than to see the farmers of the *rural districts* wake up to a thorough investigation of all the mat-

ters pertaining to their rights and interests, yielding to all what is right, and submitting to nothing that is clearly wrong. If you believe that I have spoken truly, and suggested anything that is of value to yourselves and the people, then keep up the investigation, and frown down the idea that inquiry must be stifled, and your rights subverted.

And to the mechanic and laborer, let me enjoin upon you the importance, to you and your children, of a constant watchfulness of your rights; affording all the time that is necessary, to stay the insinuating grasp of the cunning, lest *capital* becomes the tyrant in this country, also, to oppress and dishonor LABOR.

If at any time my language has been such as to convey a different meaning from what I intended, or is capable of a double meaning, I regret it. I have endeavored to talk about *things*, using words only to convey ideas, preferring the substance to the shadow, believing that the true office of language is to express thoughts, rather than words.

I have considered this tampering by the State and National Government with the industrial institutions of the country, as involving important National interests and policy, the end of which seriously involves the best good of the people, and is not in harmony with a government obtaining all its powers from the governed. And as furnishing argument sustaining this position, I have frequently had recourse to public statements and declarations of individuals, looking upon them as public property; my only motive or referring to them was as furnishing the most intelligent and comprehensive arguments sustaining my position. Therefore, I desire all to take this view of the matter, as individual rights, in some degree, in all civilized communities, must succumb to the public good.

Individuals, being units, should never consent to become ciphers,—their aggregate, nations,—and although man's first duty is to himself, yet that self, if rightly understood, is in harmony with the whole.

Having spent some time and thought reflecting upon the expediency of any legislation in regard to the industry of our country,

and looking down into the long future, reasoning from analogy, from history, and the laws of a people, I am fully persuaded that it is highly pernicious, having a tendency to degrade us as a nation. Therefore, I have briefly, possibly too freely, written out these thoughts in connection with the influence this has had, and is having, upon the habits and livelihood of the American people, in these pages, and submit them with all deference to the verdict of my brother workers.

If the kind reader agrees with me, after giving this work a careful perusal, then it is his duty and privilege, as it is mine, to give currency and circulation to the principles here advocated; and touching this point, I am ready to hear any suggestions by letter or otherwise, in regard to the best means to place them generally among the people.

I shall retain the right to manufacture this work in my own hands, availing myself of fresh statistics as they come to hand, for subsequent editions; also, making from time to time such other additions, alterations and improvements, as a larger experience may suggest.

T. J. P.

INTRODUCTION.

TO THE READER.

IN presenting this little work to the public, the writer begs leave to say that he has for a long time thought that there was a positive necessity existing in New England, to arrest, if possible, the alarming and growing evils which pervade her Agricultural interests; and from these spreading out into society in general, permeating throughout all classes, and every year reducing the wages of unskilled and *honest* LABOR. Not that this class of labor, of which I speak and shall speak throughout these pages, receives fewer dollars and cents, nominally, but that the demands upon the laborer, by society and intercourse with men, are continually augmenting; making it more difficult to sustain their former position; consequently, every year widening the space between skilled and unskilled labor, concentrating more and more the wages of labor into the hands of the few, to inevitable poverty, with all its horrors, upon the masses. To arrest this in some measure, now that our country is comparatively in its infancy, by inducing thought among the people, and honest, healthy and correct sentiment among those who undertake to shape and mould public opinion, and give tone to society, and happiness, peace and prosperity among all classes, is the highest ambition of your humble servant.

I am not vain enough to suppose that I can accomplish much in this vast field which spreads out before me, but that some one who has talent, genius and intelligence, equal to the task of setting the ball in motion, will catch up the ideas here promulgated, and with enthusiasm and a love for his kind, waft them to the breeze, that they may permeate into the very dregs of society, and raise the

oppressed everywhere, and make them feel that they, too, are MEN.

Long years since, when the writer had not seen so much of men and things as now, — had had far less opportunity to know the workings of the human mind, — to study the impulses by which men are governed, — to look into the acts of man, reading his heart's desire, and his power over himself to persuade what he *thought* to be for *his interest*, to be right; he thought he saw a tendency to the same evils in society, which still exist, although less apparent then than now. He labored in conjunction with others, to establish certain institutions which were new and merely experimental, yet he and they have the satisfaction to see and know that those efforts which were thought to be visionary and impracticable, still exist, and have been the means of establishing prosperity and happiness into many a household, which is not bounded by either section or clique.

And, although I shall address myself in these pages mainly to farmers and their children, — their sons and daughters, who are far more deeply interested in the events which are now transpiring in the country, by the institutions, the laws and public sentiment, which are to give form and character to them and their children, when we shall have passed away: and believing that no community can be long prosperous whose interests are so extended and diversified as ours, without a free and independent yeomanry, and that in the success of these, all interests are blended, — when this interest suffers, all others must follow; and to show how it is that in the disposal of all Agricultural products, we are selling our labor, and if they yield no adequate return for the time bestowed and capital invested, we are crushing out of the business the poor — those who have no capital, and driving them out from amongst us to seek employment elsewhere, thereby virtually inflicting evils upon us as a people, which can never be remedied nor counteracted.

Of some of the statute laws, also, I shall speak, and endeavor to show how that they practically, although intended for good, but in

their workings they operate to the disadvantage of the farmer, and that they cannot be applied to other classes, and if they could, no other class would submit to them.

Also, I shall speak of the press in general, and the "Agricultural press" in particular, that the people may see how that these stand in a false position to the tillers of the soil, — that although they professedly claim to be the farmer's friend, and derive their support to a great extent from him, yet they do in fact work to his disadvantage.

The various Agricultural Societies, also, will be referred to, and think that I shall be able to show how that they in their practice, do the farmer much more evil than good. I shall show, also, that this interest needs no class or special legislation, — that the evils which these seek to remedy, are greatly augmented by them, and that the tendency is to fasten upon us a mercenary and aristocratic "Board," which will every year present new claims upon the treasury, that placemen may ride roughshod over the people.

Further, I think I shall be able to show, by statistics and other facts, that while this interest, for various causes which will be made to appear, should be far less productive of pauperism and its attendant evils, is greatly in excess of any and all other interests combined to produce them.

I shall introduce many figures and facts to prove the positive cost of most Agricultural products, showing that the whole cost has seldom been reckoned in estimating their value.

I shall also speak of the manner of disposing of the products of the soil, and show that the present system of marketing is full of evils to the farmer.

Further, I shall endeavor to explain some way by which the wrongs under which we labor can to some extent be remedied.

I shall also show that too large a proportion of the people are Agriculturalists, — that it is often owing to over-productiveness, that brings embarrassment upon the country. The material of which products are made, will come into the investigation, — the amount of labor to produce them, — the interest on the capital, — the general management of the farm, &c., &c.

The writer will introduce many facts, and what arguments his limits will admit, to show the absurdity of separating the mechanical from the Agricultural interest, — recommending the farmers to learn their sons some systematic and well-digested plan of earning a living in their own neighborhoods, by introducing trade and mechanical business that will afford constant employment, inciting remunerating industry among the people. Our true policy being to build up the country towns, allowing the cities to take care of themselves.

I shall also introduce many facts and statements to show the cost of whatever is produced upon the farm, and some plan by which a better recompense can be obtained. Hoping to introduce more mind into the business, and a better system of coming to correct conclusions. Believing that more time should be given by farmers to improvement, study, reflection, investigation, and less to drudgery. I shall avail myself of the statistics of the State and country, and the declarations of others, to prove, as I go along, the position taken.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES.....	15
-----------------------------	----

CHAPTER II.

HAPPINESS.....	26
----------------	----

CHAPTER III.

MASSACHUSETTS BOARD OF AGRICULTURE.....	4
Premiums by the State Board of Agriculture.	

CHAPTER IV.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, CONTINUED	81
The State Fair.	

CHAPTER V.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, CONTINUED.....	111
Scientific and Educational.	

CHAPTER VI.

THE AGRICULTURAL PRESS.....	146
How to Reckon the Cost of Farm Products— Cost of Farm Products— Is Farming Profitable?	

CHAPTER VII.

THE AGRICULTURAL PRESS, CONTINUED, AND IMPORTANT CORRESPONDENCE.....	172
Is Farming Profitable?— A Plain Question in Arithmetic— Subjects for Discussion for Farmers' Clubs— The Corn and Other Crops— Is Farming a Profitable Pursuit?— Concord River Meadows— The First Convert.	

CHAPTER VIII.

THE STATUTE LAWS, THE LAW OF CUSTOM, AND HOW THE FARMERS LIVE	221
How do Farmers Live? — Profit and Per Cent. — To Farmers.	

CHAPTER IX.

THE COST OF FARM PRODUCTS.....	242
Philosophy of Agriculture—Neat Stock — Milk Making—Pork Making—Cost of Beef — Cost of Wood — Farming in the West.	

CHAPTER X.

MARKETING	276
-----------------	-----

CHAPTER XI.

THE FARMERS' SONS.....	290
The Duty of Young Men.	

CHAPTER XII.

HIS EXCELLENCY GOV. BANKS.....	307
Legislation — The Cattle Disease — Agricultural College—Concord River Meadows — Inquiries.	

CHAPTER XIII.

THE FUTURE	338
The Farmers' Sons and Daughters — Foreign Degradation of Labor — Market Days — Cattle Disease — Conclusion—Questions.	

APPENDIX.

C. L. FLINT AND HIS LETTER.....	379
---------------------------------	-----

FARMING AS IT IS.

CHAPTER I.

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES.

Their influence upon the people and prosperity of the country — State Appropriations — Number of Societies in the country — Where the idea originated — What the farmers themselves think of the business — The opinion of the press and the Board — The farm at Westboro.

IN the latter part of the last century, it was thought to be wise, and for the general good, for the State, in some degree, to take the agricultural interest under her special control and care. In 1792, a Society was organized under the title of the "MASSACHUSETTS SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING AGRICULTURE," and John Hancock, then being Governor of the State, approved the act of incorporation. From that day to this, I believe this Society has had an existence, although a considerable proportion of the time it has been in a "chrysalis" state, yet at no time has it been so torpid as to be unable to reach out its hand treasury-ward, to receive its \$600, the annual stipend, which report says, has to a considerable extent been expended in good dinners, by "the old-fogy, aristocratic farmers of State street."

Long before this, it had been a part of the settled policy of many of the old European countries, to foster and encourage their system of agriculture, by making large awards in premiums, and establishing agricultural exhibitions, to encourage their famishing laborers to greater efforts in drawing from the soil the essentials of life, that the non-producers might enjoy, at a cheaper rate, the products of the earth. This, however, I do not intend to discuss in these pages ; but merely refer to it, that the reader can see where and by whom the idea originated ; and it is to be lamented that our ancestors after, having completely broken the chain which bound them to the mother country, had not sought out a more rational system or rather no system, but have left those things to regulate themselves ; as it is undoubtedly the part of wisdom, to regulate and establish those affairs, which under our policy of government, no legislation — certainly no class legislation — can change for good. It has been wisely said, “that those communities of people are governed the best which are governed the least.”

In 1816, Agricultural Exhibitions were commenced at Brighton, by the State Society to which I have referred, and were continued till they were found to conflict with the Exhibitions of the County Societies, which have extended throughout the State. Some of the counties have as many as three Societies, also in addition to these there are several Town Societies, besides a State Board of Agriculture — all, or nearly so, receiving the bounty of the State.

To examine these a little, and see what they are doing and have done for the people, will be a part of the object of this work. If they have and are doing good, or more good than evil, then it would seem to be the part of wisdom to continue them. But if not good, but evil — being a hobby by which certain men hold power and place, and live by the emoluments of their offices, drawn from the people, and the *tax* upon the citizens, being the smallest item in the list when compared with other and wide spread evils, then the sooner they are discontinued, or so modified as to be made serviceable, the better. There is an Italian proverb running in this wise, “*Acader va chi troppo alto salé.*” “*He who climbs too high, goes to fall.*” I am not going to say that this is all wrong and that there is no good coming out of it; it is not necessary for me to make this appear, but that there is a great preponderance of wrong, I firmly believe, and will with all fairness endeavor to make this appear to all unprejudiced minds.

In the first place, let me state what these men who move this machinery and absorb the funds, *claim* for the farmers and the farming interest. In their speeches, in their papers, in their transactions, they claim that the farmers have more happiness, have more health, have more means of supplying their wants, have more of the conveniences of life, have more opportunity for improvement, and have fewer reasons to seek out other callings or pursuits, than all, or any other classes of men.

Upon each and all of these I shall differ from, and take issue with, those who claim this position.

I presume it will not be necessary for me to go into any argument to show or prove what I have above said, because the record is before the world, in their publications, &c. Before going into the argument, I want to say that I have no honeyed words for the farmer—he ought not to be deceived. I do not intend to build up one party at the expense of another, but intend to speak truly and fearlessly, and let the consequences take care of themselves. I have always thought that truth was better than error, and that although it may be slow, and wrong may luxuriate for awhile, yet the “sober second thought” will eventually appear. And although it may *appear* to be for the interest—I say *interest*—of some, that the farmer should work at a loss, yet I expect to be able to show that this is short sighted, and if the reader will give these pages a careful perusal, without prejudice, I think he will find sufficient argument to establish the position taken. The success of one is the success of all, and if one suffers, all suffer with him. You ask an intelligent shoe-maker if his interest and that of his employer is identical, and he will say yes. Any other view of the matter is short sighted, and so it is. The State, neither in its corporate nor civil capacity, has ever undertaken to direct, control, foster, improve, or in any way interfere with this interest. Neither have any disinterested, humane, or philanthropic individuals undertaken the same thing, either for the public or any other good.

The genius of the American people, particularly the Yankees, their habits of industry, discriminating faculties, keenness of perception, with their proverbial shrewdness and love of gain, precludes all possibility of any business, occupation or trade, being left to suffer or neglect, that is useful, and for the general good, as long as the people are left free to prosecute it at pleasure. And how it happened that the people conceived the idea that the Agricultural interest stood in need of *Governmental or State aid*, is certainly an anomaly in the history of our country. It must be accounted for, I think, in this way, that the restlessness of a certain portion of the people, who exist in all communities, their love of notoriety, and the power to control others, coupled with the desire to live on the earnings of the masses, has induced it. No less an anomaly is it that the people submit to it, acquiesce in, and to some extent encourage it.

“Liberty is the price of eternal vigilance.”

Among no other class of the American people could such an idea for a moment prevail. I submit it then, if this is not a fit subject to engage the attention of those minds who are looking with some apprehension to the future of America.

As the kind reader follows me through these pages, and with an unprejudiced mind sees clearly what I expect to show him, that evils of no small magnitude have crept into the legislation and the social habits of our people, to the detriment of the masses and the

injury of all, ought we to look supinely on, and not even raise a finger to arrest it. "If these things are found in the green tree what can we expect in the dry."

There is an old adage which says, "In time of peace prepare for war."

Perhaps, however, before going more particularly into the various subjects under examination, and upon which I intend to speak, it will be well to state that I do not intend to pull down without building up; rearing the fabric that is now disjointed and out of proportion, into something more comely and better adapted to the capacities, habits, genius, and wants of the American people. Allowing to honest labor a recompense that will afford the useful things of life, by showing that it is not for the want or lack of the products of the earth that the people suffer, but because they are outwitted by the few who manage to appropriate the "lion's share," making the masses believe that they must dictate, while the people work. It is good for all men to work, but it is not good for any man, or class of men, to be excessively worked, yielding all the finer sensibilities of our nature to a mere physical development. And if at any time, when judicious labor fails to yield a suitable provision for the conveniences of life, it is then time to pause.

And that, although the reader may be led to infer that the object of this work is to raise the price of the necessaries and conveniences of life, yet, let me say, that it is not relatively so. It was not the *price* of the

potatoes, you know, that the Irishman complained of, but the difficulty of getting the shilling to buy them with. This is my position, and where I stand. Things are now disjointed and out of proportion, as I have above stated. And that there may be a more perfect union or harmony among all workers, that one class shall not constantly war against all other classes, but that their interest, being mutual, if rightly understood, shall be so blended, that a more just and perfect state of society shall exist. And that I do not intend to build up the agricultural interest at the expense of the mechanical or professional, but that they, and all other interests that are useful and for individual and the general good, shall find a more just reward. These, and these alone, are the objects for which I labor.

I have no enemies to lash, or friends to elevate, but am an honest foe to all hypocrisy, subserviency, and wrong; and that while I would see the condition of all improved, I cannot look tamely on and see the meager rewards of honest labor, grasped hold of by the cunning and crafty, that the few can luxuriate at the expense of the many, and ride rampant throughout the land. Therefore, entertaining these views, and believing that the soil, and the condition of the workers thereof, is the hinge upon which the success or adversity, — the elevation or degradation, of a people rests, and that as they are well or illy paid, — as goes agriculture, so goes all. If we inquire into the cause of the last panic, we are told that the Western farmers could not sell their products only at great sacrifices;

hence, they could not pay the merchant for his last year's supplies. The merchant finds his Eastern bills and notes to the manufacturer and middle men, accumulating and maturing, without the means to meet them; and although the farmer sees the difficulty in which all the parties are getting, in consequence of his inability to pay, yet there are the cattle, the pork, the grains, &c., which he is ready to pledge; but because he has been slow to make up his mind to meet extremities, a general mistrust has pervaded the business world, the banks are unyielding, the weaker parties have given way, and a general calamity is the result. This is attributed to all sorts of reasons but the right one; and that although great excitement and apparent distress is heard from one end of the country to the other, yet I ask, who have suffered, — who have retired to their rest at night cold and hungry, — who have witnessed and seen the many wants of families and innocent children, — who have been unable to lay in their weekly stores and daily bread, but the MECHANICS and LABORERS? Amid all the distress, they alone have suffered. So it is, and so it will be, till a more rational system is devised.

Go into the farming districts of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Massachusetts, and ask the mechanics, loafers, idlers, horse and watch jockeys, why they do not work upon the lands, and they will tell you "the soil is exhausted, — it does not produce as formerly, — they can buy their flour, corn, &c., cheaper than they can raise them!" Ask the farmers in these sev-

eral localities, where their sons and daughters are, and they will tell you "that they leave as soon as they get big enough to work, — the boys go West, and the girls to the factories ;" thereby making an excess of males in one section, and females in another. Ask them how they themselves are getting on, and they will tell you "bad enough, — they live and that is all."

Go to Lynn, Haverhill, and Natick, and ask the shoemakers there if their work is as regular and as well paid as it used to be, and they will tell you "it is greatly fluctuating, continually changing, up and down, from bad to worse !" Ask them the cause, and they will tell you "it is the country workmen, who are continually underbidding them in prices, and they are so numerous as to supply any demand in a few weeks, however great !"

Ask the agricultural press how the farmers are getting along, and they will tell you, "nobly, coining money hand over fist, at the rate of from fifty to some one or two hundred per cent. on their labor and capital invested." Ask them why three-fourths of all the young men leave the farming business, and they will tell you in rather a faltering voice, as though the interrogatory was somewhat presumptuous, "O, our young men don't like farming, — it is not popular enough !" Here the subject is changed.

Ask the "State Board of Agriculture" if farming is a good business, and they will tell you "that the farmers need to be encouraged and instructed, and it is the duty of the State to appropriate liberally for this

object. That we need an Agricultural College, an experimental farm, with a liberal distribution of county and town Societies over the State, to disseminate information on agricultural matters!" Ask if the farm under their care at Westboro' paid its way. "O, no, we labored under many disadvantages there." How is that? I thought you had a market in the State institution there for all you had to spare, and the boys done the most of the work, at your own price. "O, well, I see you don't understand agricultural matters." Very likely!

The above subjects will also furnish subject matter for consideration; and although they have been briefly alluded to here, I shall endeavor to consider them more in detail, as I proceed in presenting these thoughts to the public. Antagonistical and conflicting as these various interests are, yet they may be made one, and one only.

"That man to man, the world o'er,
Shall brothers be for a' that;
For a' that, and a' that,
Shall brothers be for a' that." — *Burns*.

The following table exhibits the number of the various Agricultural Societies and Boards of Agriculture, in the United States:

STATES AND TERRITORIES.

	Agricultural.	Horticultural.	Agricultural and Mechanical.	Total.
Alabama.....	7	..	..	7
Arizona Ter.....	..	..	..	..
Arkansas.....	2	..	..	2
California.....	6	2	..	8
Carson Ter.....	..	..	..	..
Columbia, District of.....	..	..	..	..
Connecticut.....	10	..	..	10
Dakota Ter.....	..	..	..	..
Delaware.....	3	1	..	4
Florida.....	..	..	..	..
Georgia.....	10	..	..	10
Illinois.....	86	2	6	94
Indiana.....	73	2	2	77
Indian Ter.....	..	..	..	..
Iowa.....	66	1	7	74
Kansas.....	1	..	..	1
Kentucky.....	6	2	6	14
Louisiana.....	2	2	..	4
Maine.....	17	..	..	17
Maryland.....	8	..	2	10
Massachusetts.....	34	7	2	43
Michigan.....	26	2	..	28
Minnesota.....	28	1	..	29
Mississippi.....	13	1	2	16
Missouri.....	16	..	16	32
Nebraska Ter.....	11	..	..	11
Nevada Ter.....	..	..	..	..
New Hampshire.....	7	..	..	7
New Jersey.....	13	..	3	16
New Mexico Ter.....	..	..	..	..
New York.....	79	9	9	97
North Carolina.....	8	..	..	8
Ohio.....	69	5	..	74
Oregon.....	2	..	..	2
Pennsylvania.....	65	3	3	71
Rhode Island.....	2	..	..	2
South Carolina.....	12	1	..	13
Tennessee.....	12	..	8	20
Texas.....	23	..	1	24
Utah Ter.....	1	..	..	1
Vermont.....	16	..	..	16
Virginia.....	23	..	3	26
Washington Ter.....	2	..	..	2
Wisconsin.....	33	2	..	35
Total.....	799	43	70	912

CHAPTER II.

HAPPINESS.

Definition of the term — Pauperism — Intemperance — Insanity — Idiocy — Mechanical Industry — Agriculture — Trade — Population — Comparative Analysis — Foreign Pauperism — Comparison — Emigration — Immigration, &c., &c.

I HAVE said in the preceding chapter, that the agricultural wire-pullers in this State who have or presume to have this interest under consideration, more particularly in their keeping and care, *claim* that the farmers have more of the above quality, viz., Happiness, than any or all other classes. Therefore, to examine this somewhat in detail and in general, and give an impartial view of the matter, it will be proper in the first place, to inquire what happiness is? What is it to be happy?

If I had been asked what I understood the term to mean, what language would briefly and comprehensively define the term, without looking to either Walker or Webster, I should have answered decisively, “*a consciousness of being and having been in the right, with a ‘pocket full of rocks!’*”

If the same question had been put to the State Board of Agriculture, and they had answered without premeditation, it is fair to presume, the answer would

have been expressed in these words: "*a smothered conscience and liberal State appropriations!*"

But the subject will not be examined by either of these tests. I shall look into Webster and see what he has to say, considering it fair that he should act as umpire. "HAPPINESS, *state of enjoyment ; unstudied grace ; good luck ; good fortune.*" This is Webster's definition, and he is authority in the matter. Although it in nowise conflicts with my own definition, yet, it is more full and expressive, certainly, in his day, if not now.

The reader will see, then, that a considerable proportion of the argument on the whole subject rests upon the disposal of this single word, HAPPINESS: "state of enjoyment." What is it to enjoy and what are the necessary requisites for supplying this condition? In the first place, health—good health is one of the essentials necessary to this condition of the mind; for without health a high state of neither mental nor physical enjoyment can exist.

The next requisite to the full development of this condition, is grace, "unstudied grace." To be graceful, is to be kind, to be polite, to be dignified; to be well adorned, well dressed, affable, courteous. "Good luck," comes next. What is good luck? To be fortunate in financial affairs—to sell above the cost—to make a good profit; circumstances that constantly have a favorable turn. A child may be said to have good luck when he escapes a chastisement or reprimand, and is a little indulged. A youth has good luck

when he is not compelled to over-exertion or labor, is well provided for in regard to an education, and a favorable position into society. The young man is said to be lucky when he meets with successes in his efforts to distinction, wealth and position; gets a good wife, &c. And the young woman, when she gets a good and kind husband, and is favorably established in society.

The last requisite, according to Webster, to complete HAPPINESS, is "good fortune." He defines fortune thus: "chance; lucky; position; riches; futurity; destiny." It must be evident to all that there are no tests upon which all of these requisites can be established, but the test of public opinion. And every one must judge of these in a measure for themselves. That the farmer *ought* to possess these to a greater extent than most other classes of people, all observing men must admit, and for these reasons: He is more prudent, more industrious, and less given to excesses, than other men. And these go far, I know, to establish the position claimed. But, also, he has less good luck, less enjoyment and less fortune. His enjoyment is less positive, and partakes largely, or may be expressed perhaps better, by the term negative — negative enjoyment.

I have thus briefly analyzed the word, in its positive, absolute or substantive sense. Evidently, however, the idea to be conveyed is better expressed by the comparative word, HAPPY, because no man is supposed to be supremely happy here. It is only by de-

grees that we use the term. Thus, we say a man is happy when compared with some other man or person. Yet, again, he may be very unhappy, when compared with some other man or person. The adjective HAPPY, Mr. Webster defines thus: "*Lucky; being in the enjoyment of good; prosperous; dextrous; blessed, harmonious, as a happy family.*"

Therefore, when we say a man, or a class of men, are favorably situated for a higher state of enjoyment than any other class of men, we mean either something or nothing. If we mean anything, then it is capable in some degree, of demonstration. If nothing but a mere subterfuge — a deception — a sham, then the quicker the facts in the case are known the better.

“The evil that men do, lives after them:
The good is oft interred with their bones.”

I come now, more particularly, to the examination of this part of the subject. If the farmers have a higher state of enjoyment than other classes, let us see in what they consist. To show this, they should have less pauperism, less intemperance, less insanity, less idiocy. If I should take the carefully prepared statistics, under authority of the State, and, by a careful and impartial examination of them, show that all of these are very much in excess in the agricultural districts then it would plainly appear, that this is not that lucrative and blissful state of society, that it is claimed to be.

Then it should be borne in mind, that almost all

farmers are men of more or less property, which they either inherited or earned in some other business ; and the income of this and their more than average industry and frugality, they ought to show less of these evils than we should expect to find in mechanical districts, where the people are more directly under the control of the monied power, and have little or no capital to work with. But the reverse is the fact ; and among others, for these reasons : All other classes of men expect to make a living out of their trade or profession, and act up to this principle, knowing what they are about. In other words, they do their own figuring and thinking. Not so with the farmer. They are content to let others think and figure for them. And how they have done this and to whose benefit, will appear in these pages.

I propose going through the State by Counties, showing the relative condition of each class, by comparison.

COUNTY OF BARNSTABLE.

PROVINCETOWN.

This town has the largest relative population of any in the county, engaged in other pursuits than agriculture.

Population	3,096
No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the town or State.....	29
No. of paupers unable to perform labor.....	5
“ Insane persons supported by the town.....	0
“ Idiots “ “ “.....	0
“ Paupers, made so by intemperance in themselves or others.....	0

BARNSTABLE.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the town or State.....	120
“ Paupers unable to perform labor.....	18
“ Insane persons supported by the town.....	8
“ Idiots “ “ “.....	4
“ Paupers made so by intemperance in themselves or others.....	48
“ Population of this town.....	4,998

Out of this population, there are 218 fishermen and mechanics.
This town is more purely agricultural than any other in the county.

BERKSHIRE COUNTY.

PITTSFIELD.

This town is engaged extensively in manufactures and trade. Out of a population of 6,501, there are 744 mechanics.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the town or \ State	84
“ Paupers unable to perform labor	0
“ Insane persons supported by the town.....	3
“ Idiots “ “ “.....	1

SHEFFIELD.

This town has a population of 2,624, and but 28 mechanics.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the town or State	53
“ Paupers unable to perform labor.....	5
“ Insane persons supported by the town.....	3
“ Idiots “ “ “.....	0

This is more purely agricultural than any other town in the county.

BRISTOL COUNTY.

FALL RIVER.

The city of Fall River has the largest relative population engaged in trade and manufactures, of any city or town in the county. It has a population of 12,680. But a very small proportion of these are engaged in agriculture.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the city or State, exclusive of foreigners	16
“ Insane relieved or supported by the city	3
“ Idiots “ “ “ “	0
“ Paupers made so by intemperance, including foreigners	44

BERKLEY.

This town has a population of 924, pretty much all agriculturists, —there being but 60 mechanics, according to the statistics.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the State, exclusive of foreigners	14
“ Insane persons relieved or supported by the town ..	1
“ Idiots “ “ “ “ ..	1
“ Paupers, made so by intemperance ..	5

COUNTY OF ESSEX.

LYNN.

The city of Lynn has a population of 15,713. Comparatively but little attention is paid to agriculture.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the city or State	404
“ Insane relieved or supported by the city	6
“ Idiots “ “ “ “	0
“ Paupers, made so by intemperance	550

BOXFORD.

This is a farming town again, and has a population of 1,034.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the town or State	9
“ Insane relieved or supported by the town	1
“ Idiots “ “ “ “	1
“ Paupers, made so by intemperance	3

The whole cost of supporting paupers in this town is \$700, or 67 cents to each person.

In Lynn the whole cost is \$7,560.00, or 47 cents to each person.

COUNTY OF FRANKLIN.

GREENFIELD.

This town has the largest relative proportion of trade and manufactures of any in the county. Population, 2,945.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the town or	
State.....	20
“ Insane persons relieved or supported by the town..	1
“ Idiots “ “ “ “ “... ”	0

Whole cost of supporting poor, \$800, or 27 cents to each person.

WARWICK.

This town has the largest relative proportion of farmers of any town in the county. It will be proper to state, however, that the females do much in this town by their work on palm-leaf hats, towards a support. This being introduced in almost every family. Population, 1,002.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the town or	
State.....	12
“ Insane persons relieved or supported by the town..	3
“ Idiots “ “ “ “ “... ”	1

Whole cost of supporting poor, \$950, or 95 cents to each person.

COUNTY OF HAMPDEN.

CHICOPEE.

This town has the largest relative proportion of manufactures of any town in the county. Population, 7,576.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the town or	
State ..	14
“ Insane persons relieved or supported by the town..	2
“ Idiots “ “ “ “ “... ”	0

Whole cost of supporting poor, \$1,200.54, or 15 cents to each person.

MONTGOMERY.

This town is almost purely agricultural. Population, 413.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the town or	
State ..	24

Cap manufactories, 1 ; value of caps made, \$413 ; capital, \$25 : employed, 1.

Boots of all kinds made, 570 pairs ; shoes of all kinds made, 1,281,295 pairs ; value of boots and shoes, \$1,163,808 : men employed, 1,070 : females employed, 497.

Firewood prepared for market, 1,001 cords ; value of firewood, \$4,246 ; employed, 3.

Sheep kept, 2 ; value, \$18 ; wool, 11 pounds.

Number horses, 256 ; value, \$28,160 ; oxen over three years old, 80 ; steers under three years old, 10 ; value of oxen and steers, \$5,878 ; milch cows, 291 ; heifers, 25 ; value of cows and heifers, \$9,975.

Butter, 18,159 pounds ; value of butter, \$4,539 ; cheese, 625 pounds ; value of cheese, \$62 ; honey, 92 pounds ; value of honey, \$19.

Indian corn, 271 acres ; Indian corn per acre, $31\frac{1}{2}$ bushels ; value, \$8,491.

Rye, 51 acres ; rye per acre, $17\frac{1}{4}$ bushels ; value, \$1,189.

Barley, $14\frac{1}{2}$ acres ; barley per acre, $18\frac{1}{2}$ bushels ; value, \$268.

Oats, 56 acres ; oats per acre, 24 bushels ; value, \$1,008.

Potatoes, 136 acres ; potatoes per acre, 91 bushels ; value, \$10,625.

Onions, $\frac{7}{8}$ acre ; onions per acre, 500 bushels ; value, \$217.

Turnips, 2 acres ; per acre, 295 bushels ; value, \$218.

Carrots, $3\frac{1}{4}$ acres ; per acre, 636 bushels ; value, \$689.

Beets and other esculent vegetables, 61 acres ; value, \$4,878.

All other grain and root crops, 2 acres ; value, \$31.

English mowing, 1,226 acres ; English hay, 1,312 tons ; value, \$25,580.

Wet meadow or swale hay, 375 tons ; value, \$3,715.

Apple trees, cultivated for their fruit, 5,580 ; value, \$2,830.

Pear trees, cultivated for their fruit, 310 ; value, \$428.

Cranberries, 810 bushels ; value, \$1,620.

Bakeries, 1 ; capital, \$1,100 ; flour consumed, 620 barrels ; value of bread made, \$9,110 ; employed, 4.

Establishments for manufacture of shoe boxes, 2 ; capital, \$5,500 ; value of boxes made, \$19,100 ; employed, 10.

Value of fruit, \$810.

White beans, 253 bushels ; value, \$525.

Milk, 50,380 gallons ; value, \$7,035.

Swine raised, 68 ; value, \$1,507.

Establishment for manufacture of pulp for paper, 1 ; stock used, 490 tons ; capital, \$16,500 ; value of pulp made, \$70,475 ; employed, 12.

Establishments for manufacture of shoe fillings, 2 ; capital, \$500 ; value, \$1,500 ; employed, 3.

Establishments for manufacture of clothing, 5 ; value of clothing made, \$30,800 ; capital, \$5,500 ; employed, 61.

Value of treenails or ship pins, \$4,136.

Value of ship timber, \$1,730.

Value of ship plank, \$260 : capital, \$1,250 ; employed, 5.

Population of this town, 4,138. Here follows the paupers' account.

No. of persons relieved or supported as paupers during the year.....	26
“ Paupers having a legal settlement in the town or State	6
“ State paupers.....	0
“ Almshouse.....	1
“ Acres attached to almshouse.....	70
Estimated value of almshouse establishment.....	\$2,500
No. of paupers relieved in almshouse during the year....	26
Average No. supported in almshouse.....	5
“ Weekly cost of supporting each pauper in almshouse.....	,42
No. of persons in almshouse unable to perform labor....	26
“ Insane relieved or supported.....	1
“ Idiots “ “	1
“ Paupers, made so by intemperance in themselves or others	26
Amt. received from the State for support of State paupers	0
Whole cost of supporting poor, \$642, or 15½ cents to each person in town.	

CARLISLE.

Boots of all kinds made, 250 pairs; shoes of all kinds made, 5000 pairs; value of boots and shoes made, \$4,500; men employed, 4; females employed, 4.

Lumber prepared for market, 112,000 feet; value, \$1,568; employed, 50.

Firewood prepared for market, 1,500 cords; value, \$5,625; employed, 40.

Horses, 83; value of horses, \$5,800; oxen over three years old, 126; steers under three years old, 70; value of oxen and steers, \$7,030; milch cows, 290; heifers, 72; value of cows and heifers, \$8,535.

Butter, 8,575 pounds; value of butter, \$1,715.

Indian corn, 175 acres; Indian corn per acre, 20 bushels; value of corn, \$3,500.

Rye, 28 acres; rye per acre, 12 bushels; value, \$380.

Oats, 20 acres; oats per acre, 25 bushels; value, \$250.

Potatoes, 121 acres; per acre, 66 bushels; value, \$7,986.

English mowing, 762 acres; English hay, 650 tons; value, \$13,000.

Wet meadow or swale hay, 600 tons; value, \$4,800.

Apple trees cultivated for their fruit, 1,300; value, \$2,000.

Cranberries, 32 acres; value, \$1,600.

Swine raised, 73; value, \$500.

Beans, 12 acres; 100 bushels; value, \$200.

Value of turnips, onions, carrots and beets, \$300.

Value of milk sold, \$800.

Value of hand-screws made, \$400.

Value of blacksmithing, \$2,000; capital, \$1,000; employed, 2.

Population, 630.

Pauper Account.

No. of persons relieved or supported as paupers, during the year.....	21
“ Persons having a legal settlement in the town or State	21
“ State paupers.....	0
“ Almshouses.....	1

No. of acres attached to Almshouse.....	160
Estimate value almshouse establishment.....	\$1,000
No. of paupers relieved in almshouse during the year....	18
Average No. supported in almshouse.....	13
“ Weekly cost of supporting each pauper in almshouse.....	.89
No. of persons in almshouse unable to perform labor.....	8
“ Insane relieved or supported.....	2
“ Idiots “ “.....	0
“ Paupers, made so by intemperance in themselves or others.....	5
Amount received from State for support of State paupers.	\$68,75
Whole cost of supporting poor, \$811, or \$1.28 to each person in town.	

It is not to be presumed that this gives every item of industry in either of the towns enumerated; but it is supposed to approximate as closely as could be ascertained.

COUNTY OF NORFOLK.

ROXBURY.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the city or State.....	50
“ Insane persons relieved or supported by the city....	4
Whole cost of supporting poor, \$7,484.68, or 40 cents to each person in the city. Population, 18,469.	

There is a greater variety of enterprise in this city than can be found in any other town or city in the Commonwealth, of the same population, or in proportion to population.

DOVER.

This town has the largest relative population engaged in agriculture of any in the county.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the town or State.....	16
“ Insane persons relieved or supported by the town..	1
Whole cost of supporting poor, \$593.00, or 79 cents to each person in town. Population, 745.	

PLYMOUTH COUNTY.

ABINGTON.

This town exceeds any other in the county in variety and magnitude of its mechanical industry, when compared with its agriculture. Something more than half of the people are engaged in the shoe business.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the town or State	41
Average No. supported in almshouse.....	9 $\frac{1}{4}$
No. of insane persons supported or relieved by the town..	3
“ Paupers, made so by intemperance in themselves or others.....	2
Whole cost of supporting poor, \$1,362.30, or 18 cents to each person in town. Population, 6,937.	

HALIFAX.

This town is principally engaged in agriculture, although there are considerable many shoes made, and many of the ladies are engaged in making gentlemen's clothing. But according to the best information I have, its agriculture has a larger relative proportion to its manufactures, than any town in the county.

In looking the county all over, I find that agricultural and mechanical industry is more evenly divided in each town, than any other county in the State; there being no town but what a considerable proportion of the people are engaged in agriculture; also, in manufactures. So that I should judge that if a farmer had any thing to sell, he would find a customer in his mechanic neighbor, and *vice versa*.

I shall have more to say about this in another place.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the town or State	8
“ Insane persons relieved or supported by the town..	2
Whole cost of supporting the poor, \$528.32, or 67 cents to each person. Population, 786.	

COUNTY OF WORCESTER.

WORCESTER.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the city or State.....	77
Average No. supported in almshouse.....	17
No. of persons in almshouse unable to perform labor.....	8
“ Foreign paupers who have come into the State within one year.....	16
Whole cost of supporting poor, \$7,184.44, or 32 cents for each person in the city. Population, 22,286.	

HARDWICK.

This town has the largest relative agricultural population in the county.

No. of paupers having a legal settlement in the town or State.....	39
Average No. supported in almshouse.....	11
No. of persons in almshouse unable to perform labor.....	4
“ Foreign paupers who have come into the State within one year.....	0
Whole cost of supporting poor, \$1,298.04, or 85 cents to each person in the town.	

It will be noticed that I have avoided the fractions of the cent in these estimates, as they are of no practical use.

Before going into an examination of the foregoing figures, it will be proper to state the source from which they have been derived. I have had before me three separate works, got up by authority of the State: viz., STATISTICAL INFORMATION *relating to certain BRANCHES OF INDUSTRY in Massachusetts, for the year ending June 1, 1855.* RETURNS RELATING TO THE POOR for 1856. Also, the CENSUS OF MASSACHUSETTS, for 1855.

Thus it will be seen that these statements are sup-

posed to be as accurate as anything of the kind can be estimated; for it is well known that all such statistics are nothing more than approximations to the true state of the case, and may be more or less erroneous, depending much upon the judgment of the parties having the matter in charge. I refer now, more particularly to the first named work, as the others undoubtedly are nearly correct; although in the *Returns relating to the Poor*, I found many omissions, which perhaps has varied the case a little. Then it will be observed in these returns that I have given, the foreign element has almost wholly gone into those estimates which have been given in the towns and cities which have been considered as mechanical; consequently have swelled the number and expense of the paupers, far beyond the true reasoning upon the subject. In these estimates the foreign element should not have gone into these calculations at all. For it is clear to see, that neither our institutions, nor our manner of industry, is in any way responsible for this class of paupers. They often come here with no means of a living, and by habit and education are wholly unprepared to earn a support, consequently are thrown upon those places for aid, where they mainly congregate. Consequently out of the thirty-eight paupers in Fall River, twenty-two are foreigners, while in Berkley, in the same county, there is but one of this description.

The same is true in regard to the cities of Lynn, Worcester, and most of the other places which have been considered as anti-agricultural. And as agricul-

ture is more or less practiced in all those towns and cities denominated mechanical, so is mechanical industry more or less established in the towns considered as agricultural, which goes far to reduce the pauper list of one, and increase it in the other.

While those towns and cities denominated as mechanical, and being the most purely so in the eleven counties considered, representing a population of 106,154, there are but 771 of that class of paupers referred to. On the other hand, the eleven towns in the same counties which are considered as farming towns, and representing a population of but 14,342, have the large number of 325 of the same class of paupers. While the population of the former is more than seven times that of the latter, the pauper list is but a little more than double. If then, the foreign element of pauperism should be divided *pro rata* between the two classes, as it should, to give a fair comparison, what a field for thought and investigation, it would open to the wise and good of all classes. For if these figures are correct, and the argument deduced therefrom is reliable, it plainly follows, that while our system of agriculture makes more than two per cent. of all her people paupers, and all other branches of industry and professions less than one-half of one per cent., certainly it must be apparent to the most obtuse mind, that great wrong exists somewhere, and somebody is responsible for it. But when I go further in my argument, and show why this is so, the reader will only be surprised that these evils are not more glaring than they are

shown to be. Verily, "the evil that men do, lives after them."

There is another view of the matter which it will be well to consider here. I have before said that a very large proportion of all the young men leave the farming towns and emigrate to some other State or country, or to some of the cities or large manufacturing towns of this State. The practical effect of this is to keep down the population of these towns and build up other towns, cities and States, at the expense of their native towns. For, I hold that the very worst thing that a town, State or country can do for itself, is, to export its young men and women. How infinitely more wise it would be to learn the people how to earn a living at home, rather than to compel them, by a false state of society, to abandon the place of their birth, that they may live; although we are often told that there is really no necessity for this, only in their own minds. But let any one go into the country towns as I have been, and see the people as I have seen them, and if they do not see sufficient cause for this, then their minds must be either wilfully blind, or their power of discernment unpardonably obtuse.

The people generally, do not want to leave their country homes, and only do so from necessity; that they may better their condition, which they have no hopes of doing there. Introduce into any country town, a business by which the masses of the people may earn a little more than a living, without making more than slaves of themselves, and you will find them

generally content. That farming is not this business, we have already seen; although we are frequently told that all other kinds of business and professions are overdone, yet, it is evident that the people do not believe it. "There is no fence against fortune." "After having praised their wine they sell us vinegar."

Perhaps it is not generally known to what extent the people of this State have emigrated to other States in the Union. According to the returns in the census of 1850, there were 199,582 natives of Massachusetts in other States, divided as follows :

In Maine,.....	16,535	In Mississippi,.....	330
New Hampshire, ..	18,495	Louisiana,.....	1,620
Vermont,.....	15,059	Texas,.....	414
Rhode Island,.....	11,888	Arkansas,.....	174
Connecticut.....	11,366	Tennessee,	331
New York,.....	55,773	Kentucky,.....	665
New Jersey,.....	1,494	Ohio,.....	18,763
Pennsylvania,....	7,330	Michigan,.....	8,167
Delaware,.....	113	Indiana,	2,678
Maryland,.....	1,421	Illinois,.....	9,230
Dist. Columbia,....	331	Missouri,...	1,103
Virginia,.....	1,193	Iowa,.....	1,251
North Carolina,....	261	Wisconsin,	6,285
South Carolina,....	407	California,	4,760
Georgia,.....	594	Territories,.....	653
Florida,....	235		
Alabama,.....	654	Total,.....	199,582

It must be recollected that this was ten years ago, and undoubtedly the census which is to be taken this year, will greatly increase these figures. Although, on the other hand, it will be argued that large numbers

of natives of other States have immigrated to this State, which is true, to the tune of 134,830. But the candid reader will see that this in nowise affects my argument, for not only is this immigration concentrated in the cities and manufacturing towns of the Commonwealth, but large numbers of the natives of the farming towns in the State, have also become citizens of these same localities.

Although much more might be said to substantiate the position I have taken, yet, I think the candid reader must admit, without going any further into the argument, that according to Mr. Webster's definition of the word HAPPINESS or HAPPY, it is perfectly apparent that the farmers are not that happy class they have been represented to be. Unless to work at a loss, — to waste their substance, — to see their sons depart to distant localities, and their daughters to be entombed within the brick walls of our city prisons; thereby paving the way to lower haunts of vice and crime, — making a large excess of females in some localities, and of males in others, — to see the products of the farm hawked about our cities, at prices that would not return the raw material to the soil, to reproduce them, — to people our work-houses, — to be taxed to support men to perambulate our country towns, who concoct measures to degrade them; who know little about the laws of vegetation and plant-food, and whose principal study is to make the products of the earth cheap in our cities and market places, to the advantage of none but the idle and vicious; except, perhaps, the money-

lender, who is willing to sacrifice the future of our country and their children, to present gains, — to see their farms cheapened in the market, and the soil robbed of plant life, without the means to reinstate them. If to the intelligent farmer, all this is happiness, then, and then only, is he happy.

To change a few words in a single verse, of “Hood’s Song of the Shirt,” it would be somewhat expressive of what has already been said, and quite as applicable as in the original.

O men with mothers dear!

O men with brothers and wives!

’Tis not only the earth you are wearing out,

But human creatures lives!

Hoe — hoe — hoe,

In poverty, hunger, and slop;

Digging at once, with spade and hoe,

A grave, as well as the “crop!”

CHAPTER III.

THE MASSACHUSETTS BOARD OF AGRICULTURE.

The State Farm — Agricultural Experiments — The Press — The Farmer's Interests — Degradation of Foreign Farm Laborers — The Object of the Board to Cheapen Agricultural Products — Raw Material — State Appropriations — Members of the Board — The Cost to the People to Support the Various Agricultural Societies — Experiments Through the County Societies — Statistics in Regard to the Board of Agriculture — Way the Board make money — Price of a Piggery.

IN the spring of 1854, the State Farm at West-boro' was transferred into the hands of the above Board, by the Legislature. The State having two objects in view: 1st. To give the children at the State Reform School an opportunity to work upon the Farm as heretofore; and 2d, To establish an "Experimental Farm," which was supposed to be of great value to the people of this and other States, to learn folks *how to produce large crops at small expense*.

This farm contains about 300 acres of land, and, in their own language, the Board says:

"Its location is beautiful, and it embraces great variety of soil and surface; is well adapted for the usual modes of cultivation, and for agricultural *experiments*, and may be made both attractive to the eye, and *very productive*."

Not only was this farm, which was so attractive to the "eye," and so valuable for "*agricultural experi-*

ments," placed in their hands, but the whole of the large stock of cattle, both "blood" and native, and all the tools and other conveniences to the value of nearly \$7,000. And although they had a head farmer, and nearly a hundred boys, who worked for ten cents per day upon the farm, yet they thought it wise, and for the *public good*, to ask of the State an appropriation of six thousand dollars, which was granted, to start with.

It will be admitted that this was a very fair fit-out for some twenty *practical* farmers to establish themselves in the business of learning common people how to do things. In the second Report which was submitted by the Secretary of the Board, to the Legislature, he took occasion to say, that

"The want of reliable and accurate *experiments* in agriculture is now very generally felt, and it has been the desire of the Board to have such conveniences as would enable them to conduct a *series of experiments* in such a manner as to secure the confidence of the community. Those made by individuals in various parts of the State, have been very valuable, and in some cases, *very costly*."

As much as to say, if we can have all these things noticed above, we will show the people how they can be done *cheaply*. We shall see. That they have great facilities for doing this, no one will deny. That a farm having the fertilizing material that might reasonably be expected from a family of five or six hundred persons, thirty to forty head of cattle and horses, and nearly a hundred swine, with a plenty of labor at a cheap rate, ought to do something a little extra, seems reasonable, with the State Treasury to back them up.

Those who have read the preceding chapter carefully, must be convinced, I think, that something is essentially wrong with our system of agriculture. My object in this chapter is to trace out some of the reasons why this state of things exists. Undoubtedly there are many reasons, and among others, the tinkering by the State; or perhaps it would be more in accordance with the facts in the case, if I were to say, by a few uneasy individuals, who for selfish purposes, or for a love of notoriety, or perhaps both, have grasped hold of this idea, to give character to their efforts, and thereby involve the whole people in the responsibility.

I have thought it well to lay out before the people such thoughts upon the subject as seem to me wise and for the general good. In the outset I want to say that I have nothing to do with any one's private affairs. It is only in their public capacity, in their acts that involve serious evils upon community, that I wish to consider them. As a citizen and a farmer, having interests and rights which cannot be separated, and I desire not to separate them if I could, from those of all true men, I think I have a right to speak and compare my thoughts with those of my fellow men, that truth and right may prevail.

I am perfectly aware that this "Board" are comparatively in their infancy, and are in no wise responsible for many of the evils which have been considered. But in this I can see a link in the chain which is to bind the working-men of this country, as it has done in the old countries of the earth, making the poor

poorer, and the rich richer. I hold that all tampering with *any* of the industrial interests of the country, either by the State or General Government, is to be lamented, and the sooner we wash our hands of this, and leave all these interests free, and the people free, to make their own selection, the better it will be for us and those who are to come after us, — the better it will be for the future of our people. The great principle of supply and demand is sure to find its level, and the law of equivalents will preclude all possibility of any interests suffering, where the people are left free to act for themselves. There may be temporary embarrassments, but this law to which I have just referred, will soon remedy the evil. Every effort by the State or nation to circumscribe this or any other interest, will be another step in the ladder to the more perfect degradation of the people.

I will now proceed to show how it is that the Board of Agriculture can never do anything to advance the interest of the farmer; and that although they can do him no good, they may do him much evil. Perhaps I may be asked, Why seek to disturb them before they have had an opportunity to make a fair trial? I answer, because in all countries where this idea has been long established, — where it has grown into a permanent and fixed law or institution, — it has universally degraded the laborer, and will do the same here. And through this universality of degradation of the farm laborer, it has permeated into all branches of industry, till labor and poverty are nearly synonymous. I see

in this country a tendency to these same evils. Then, again, I have never been able to learn that the farmers themselves have sought for, or desired any such thing ; although I do not intend to consider them entirely blameness, because they have been too much carried away by the show and tinsel with which they have been enveloped, and by their *passiveness*, it may have been thought pleasing to them. That some farmers have entered into this, is not to be denied ; but that they are a large minority, all must admit. There are in all communities certain individuals who are in affluent circumstances, and certain others who, perhaps, have not thought deeply upon the subject, and have not been able to see how it would in the end affect them, who have taken hold with those who have only sought to promote their own interest, by sacrificing the dearest rights of a nation.

That the object of the Board of Agriculture is to *cheapen* the value of all farm products in the market, thereby to return the smallest pittance possible for the labor bestowed, over the cost of the raw material, there is too much evidence on record for them to attempt a denial. I know that they will argue that they also intend to cheapen the cost of production, but they forget, in this, the law of supply and demand to which I have referred, and which no sophistry or cunning can abrogate. The moment a surplus is in the market, down goes the price, and labor, and the small capital of the laborer alone, have to suffer.

In the examination of the subject now under con-

templation, I shall be under the necessity of using the word *raw material*, and fearing all may not understand this alike, I have thought an explanation of it, as it is usually understood by manufacturers, and in commercial parlance, and as I wish to have it understood here by the reader, might avoid a complicity of opinion. For, what is the raw material to one, is the manufactured article to another. Thus, to the shoemaker the raw material is the leather, the cloth, the kid, threads, cottons, &c., — in fact, whatever his shoes are made of, are to him the raw material ; — while these are the manufactured articles to the tanner, the morocco dresser, the cloth and thread manufacturer, &c. And then, again, this raw material to the tanner, &c., becomes the manufactured article to the farmer, the butcher, the wool and cotton grower, &c. So the reader will see that it is the connection in which the word is used, that gives it its meaning.

There is one other difficulty that it will be well to notice, which meets us at the threshold of the argument, and which, perhaps, I cannot so easily explain, but is of vastly more importance than the preceding, and that is this : A shroud of mystery is thrown over all, or nearly all farm operations, by the supposition that whatever grows out of the soil comes of nothing, — that is, something is made or grown of nothing. We look upon a field of grain, grass, or any plant, and grasp hold of it, and tear it from the soil, with the faint hope of making it yield a return equal to the amount of labor bestowed upon it, without reflecting that the

raw material of which this crop is composed, is our capital, and every particle of the matter must be in some way returned to the soil, in order to obtain a similar crop. It is no more absurd to suppose that the merchant can sell his goods at the cost of clerk-hire, rents, &c., without regard to the first cost of the article sold, than to suppose the farmer can sell any farm product at the cost of the labor to produce it. That he has done this, and is now doing it, needs no other proof than is afforded in the second chapter of this work. This is one of my charges against the Board of Agriculture, for so mystifying the various processes of agriculture, by running one crop into another, attempting to make the farmer believe that if he loses on the corn crop, he will make it up on the grain or the grass, and if on neither of these, on his cattle, when every turn of the screw, as has been proved, reduces him lower and lower still.

In this connection let me say to the farmers, that you have no hopes in any supervisory head or Board, of whatever color or pretence; and, if possible, evade the whirlpool of destruction that has engulfed the agriculturists of all other countries who have instituted a tampering head, by doing your own thinking and figuring. Although the loafers and idlers of our cities may desire cheap bread, that their vocation may not be disturbed, yet let us institute no power to any class, whose object is to rob us of our rights. This may be plain talk, but, if it is untrue, it is easy to refute it, — if not untrue, but true, it will stand.

There is one other difficulty which might as well be settled here, and then, when we get into the argument, there will be less inclination to stop to explain. It is presumed by many that one industrial interest is in antagonism to all other industrial interests. Thus, all those who consume the products of the farm, without producing them, are apt to suppose it to be for their advantage to cheapen whatever the farmer has to dispose of. This is short-sighted, as we soon shall see, yet such is the fact. And these non-producing classes being composed of many true, and highly useful classes of men, are yet composed, also, to a great extent, of the idle, the vicious, the cunning, and the scheming, who are up to anything but honest work, in order to live by their wits. The truth is, that among all true men there is but one interest, although separate as the States, we are one as the Union.

Although capital may get a temporary advantage of labor, when coupled with the various combinations to which I have just referred, and degrade it, yet, in the end, that also becomes degraded, and yields a small return, crushing out, in time, the smaller capitalists and building up an aristocracy of capital, that has been the bane of most of the older nations of the earth. I know very well that self-interest is apt to warp the judgment even of good men, and that there seems to be some inducement for our city friends to institute such measures as will bring to them the largest amount of the essentials of life, at the lowest possible rate; yet, when they claim to be the *friends* of those whom they

seek to destroy, it is time to ask them to pause a moment, that a better reckoning can be had.

It must be perfectly amusing to all thinking men to see what means they resort to, to effect the various objects to which I have referred. A few of the many reasons, as they occur to me, I will stop a moment to notice. Perhaps as effective as any is this: They say that all other kinds of business is "over-done," and therefore advise all young men, indiscriminately, to stick to the farm. If they were honest in this, and believed what they say to be true, and it was for the public good, they would make farmers of their own boys, or advise them to be such, would they not? Certainly, that is a fair inference. I refer now more particularly to our city friends and others, who are mainly influential in moving the various machinery by which a public opinion is created, that the people are led to submit to the gross injustice that is heaped upon them. The Board of Agriculture at this time seem to be the most prominent, although other classes of individuals and corporations are acting in conjunction with them, to mould and shape this condition of thought among the people, to which I refer. Well, then, if farming is the desirable business which they claim it to be, and fit for all young men to engage in, how is it that the sons of these very men so universally shun it, and seek out some other way to obtain the conveniences of life? While many of these individuals have large families of children, yet some of the trades or professions monopolize the whole, as far as I know. And although they

may be very fond of all the "goodies" that come from the farm, yet they, like the cat, you know, that was fond of fish, prefer not to *wet their paws*. If all other kinds of business is "*over-done*" but farming, how is it that the wages of most of the professional laborers have nearly doubled within the last ten or twelve years, and farms have depreciated, where there is no prospective value aside from farming purposes, in about the same ratio! The Board, with all its genius, will find it difficult to answer this; and that the assumption is strictly correct, the record is too plain for them to deny!

The pay of the judges in most of our courts has been very much increased; the per diem of our congressmen has also more than doubled; the same is true in regard to the pay of the members of our Legislature; clergymen, lawyers, and doctors, get more pay than formerly, and even the Board of Agriculture had a couple of thousand or so granted last year, that was entirely additional to everything they had ever before had.

It seems that by an act of the last Legislature (1859) that all of the Agricultural Societies of the State are, to a great extent, to be placed under the care and control of the Board of Agriculture.

Sec. 4 (chap. 232,) reads thus: "The Board of Agriculture shall have power to *require* the several Agricultural Societies receiving the bounty of the State, to offer premiums from time to time for Agricultural *experiments*, to be conducted in such manner as said Board may direct."

It now seems that the Board, after having failed in establishing any successful experiments on the farm in their charge at Westboro', and having given up the idea of putting in successful practice their vague theories, have got an act through the Legislature, giving them the power to control the County Societies, thereby throwing the responsibility upon them, and in this way expecting to evade the censure which they so justly deserve. Any practical farmer could have told them this before they commenced. Upon most all subjects men may theorize, with some degree of success, but agriculture. Here it will not answer, but must off coat and go to work.

I am perfectly aware that the Board is a child of the State, and were it not for the treasury thereof, would be perfectly harmless of evil; and as long as the State follows the delusive idea of oppressing one class of the people to the supposed advantage of other classes, and the oppressed class remain perfectly passive, so long men can be found to put in practice any measures however absurd, without any thought of the future of the people.

Perhaps all are not aware of the cost to the people, even now, to support the several branches of machinery to which I refer. These institutions are called by the act of the Legislature, "*scientific and educational.*" The following are some of the appropriations for this purpose :

For bounties to Agricultural Societies,.....	\$12,800 00
“ Salary of the Secretary of the Board,.....	2,000 00
“ Travelling expenses of members of the Board,....	2,200 00
“ Travelling expenses of the Secretary of the Board,	250 00
“ Other Incidental Expenses,.:.....	150 00
“ The Salary of the Clerk of the Sec’y of said Board,	600 00
“ Collecting Information on Agricultural Subjects,	1,000 00
“ Printing Abstracts of the Reports,.....	1,000 00
“ Ten thousand of the Report of the Board of Agri- culture,.....	5,500 00
	<hr/>
	\$25,500 00

This twenty-five thousand five hundred dollars is drawn directly from the people by taxation, and for the several purposes named above, annually, and will be increased every year.

It costs to support the State Government, including the County taxes, nearly one million dollars, of which about eight hundred thousand is raised by direct taxation. Therefore, the sum which goes to maintain the various Agricultural branches of the government seems but small. Comparatively it is so. But the reader must remember that the whole of this great sum is made up of various small items, whether wise or not, is not our purpose now to consider, only as far as relates to the subject under consideration. It must be borne in mind that the amount drawn directly from the people by taxation, is but a very small item in the sum total, to the people, of the whole expense to keep up this deceptive and delusive

idea, which in so brief a space of time has taken such a strong hold of community. We have some twenty-five or thirty public exhibitions each year, which, if the cost could be estimated, would without doubt, supercede the amount raised by taxation, more than a hundred thousand dollars. I very well know that a very considerable proportion of this comes from that class of men who are not, by their position, sensibly affected by this, only as communities of people are made up of individuals, and what injuriously affects the working classes, will in the end affect all classes, since the rich of to-day may be the poor to-morrow, and *vice versa*.

I have before said, and I repeat it here, that the mere money cost of the thing is nothing, comparatively, in the present ; but in the long future, when we become the greatest people of the earth, as the present seems to indicate, then we shall see that we have followed a phantom, a delusion, by entangling our various States and the National Government, with the industrial institutions of the country, till the people are compelled to look to the treasury and not to their own right arms for support. When our poor rates, as in England to-day, are more than our whole National expenditure, then we shall say, why could not we have profited by the experience of past ages, and left our industry free. The natural law of supply and demand will preclude all possibility of any interest suffering as long as the people are left free to rely on their own efforts for support. Mix this up with certain conditions and contingencies, building up an aristocracy of feeling

and sentiment, and labor becomes degraded, and the country is paralyzed, and we fail, as a nation, to fulfil our destiny. Far better would it be for the people to-day, to erect a sort of privileged hospital, or *loafer's institute*, wherein all this class of men could resort at pleasure, to enjoy to an unlimited degree the droppings of the treasury, if they would keep aloof from those interests about which they know but little, and save untarnished those institutions which are best cared for, when left entirely to themselves.

Perhaps many of my readers may have a curiosity to know who these individuals are, constituting this "Board," and possibly the best argument that could be given in favor of my position would be to name them, as farming, like everything else, is a trade, and can be best prosecuted by those who best understand it, unless such are above the practical part of their business, and choose to dictate, while others do the work. How this is, the reader must judge for himself. First in the list stands the

Ex-Officiis.

His Excellency, NATHANIEL P. BANKS.

His Honor ELIPHALET TRASK,

HON. OLIVER WARNER, Secretary of State.

Appointed by the Governor and Council.

EPHRAIM W. BULL, MARSHALL P. WILDER, WILLIAM S. CLARK.

Chosen by the Societies.

RICHARD S. FAY,	GEORGE B. LORING,	SIMON BROWN,
HENRY H. PETERS,	JOHN C. BARTLETT,	JOHN BROOKS,
FREEMAN WALKER,	JABEZ FISHER,	OLIVER C. FELTON,
PAUL LATHROP,	LEVI STOCKBRIDGE,	GEO. M. ATWATER,
CYRUS KNOX,	JAMES S. GRINNELL,	CHAS. K. TRACY,
SAM. H. BUSHNELL,	CHAS. C. SEWALL,	NATHAN DUFFEE,
CHAS. G. DAVIS,	GEORGE MARSTON,	EDW. W. GARNER,
CHAS. B. ALLEN,	MATHEW SMITH,	
	CHAS. L. FLINT, Secretary.	

With these men, individually, as citizens, I have nothing to do ; but as the Board of Agriculture, acting in this capacity, I claim I have a right in common with all other citizens, to speak.

At the commencement of this chapter I made a few quotations from the Secretary's report, showing that they expected to render the farmers much service by instituting a course of experiments at the farm. At the expiration of five years, having failed in this, they have given it up, and now expect to act through the county Societies, to effect this object. In this, also, they will fail, and for these reasons. In farming, what seems reasonable and practical in theory, will seldom stand the test of actual experiment. For instance, when they agreed to pay those boys ten cents per day, for six hours work, without doubt it seemed to them, as they say, "low," hardly enough to clothe them in the most economical manner. Yet, Mr. Flint now says, in his report that the old adage among a certain class of farmers is literally true, "one boy is a boy, two boys half a boy, and three boys no boy at all." This is practice, and from the fact of their not having known this before, shows they did not understand what they were about. I think it grossly wrong to saddle any considerable proportion of their errors upon those unfortunate boys ; for this is among the smallest of their mistakes. Again Mr. Flint says :

"The estimates on a preceding page of the amount *earned* by the boys on the farm are based on the rate of ten cents a day, which is the amount agreed upon

between the Board of Agriculture and the Trustees of the school, by the original contract made in 1854. That amount seems at first sight to be small, but in point of fact, as already intimated, it was far more than double what the labor, under all the circumstances, was worth to the farm."

Here is a large farm, as we have seen, with a plenty of men to oversee these boys, of from 14 to 18 years of age, and the Secretary of the Board says, that they cannot earn anything like five cents a day, and board themselves. Yet these men claim that farming is a good business, and fit for everybody's sons to engage in, but their own. In fact all other business but this is "overdone," and at this a well-grown boy can earn hardly enough to salt his porridge. All this occurs after half a century of effort to establish the business upon a solid foundation. The Secretary further says that "a systematic debt and credit account was to be kept between the farm and the school, the Board crediting the school with the labor of the boys, at ten cents a day, of six hours each, and with the sum of three hundred and fifty dollars a year for the offal, and charging it with the produce of the farm, at the usual prices in the neighborhood, with labor performed for the institution," &c. Here is a ready market for everything that the farm produces, at the door, with all the labor they can possibly use, at rates scarcely sufficient to half pay the board of the operatives, and yet the reason assigned for the losses to the State is, the labor bill was more than double what it should have been. The amount the Board received from the State in estimate

of farm, stock, tools and funds, from the treasury, according to this report, is \$29,081. The simple interest on this sum would be \$1,744.86. This is what every farmer should look to,—the simple interest on his investment; and the Board should so consider it; yet I can nowhere find a single word said about it, although they think they have cleared \$1,000 a year for the State.

Here is another item which is rather amusing, as it shows what close calculators these economical farmers are, who can calculate so accurately on the wages of the boys, when making up their account, but forget some other items, perhaps, that would interest the people quite as much.

“The operations at the farm (this was 1856) have been continued as heretofore, though embarrassment has been occasioned by the *insufficient appropriations* made, on account, it is presumed, of a want of a full understanding of the circumstances of the case. From this cause the Board has labored under disadvantages of various kinds. Thus they have had only old and unsuitable farm implements, in many cases, to put into the hands of one hundred and fifty boys worked daily on the farm, and have *lost an exceedingly valuable fertilizer* in a liquid manure, which has run in such abundance that a man, boy and horse, would have been constantly occupied in distributing it over the farm, had the appropriation been sufficient to allow of their employment. This liquid manure, thus applied, would give the Board the power of increasing the productions of the farm *many fold*, and of improving, if not enriching, the lands, which were in comparatively poor condition when its operations commenced, while its removal would be a sanitary measure of great im-

portance to the comfort and well-being of the institution."

Thus, it seems, they lost, or had run to waste, manure enough to keep a man, boy and horse constantly at work, which if it had been applied would increase the "*productions of the farm many fold.*"

In order to get at, as near as may be, what they lost, we shall have to see what they raised, because the Secretary tells us, they lost enough to have produced many times more than what they raised. Here is what they raised this year, (1856.)

Corn, Oats, Rye, Peas, Beans . . .	1,639½ bushels.
Root Crops	4,370 "
Hay	103 tons.

I think that no observing farmer would estimate the value of sufficient manure to produce these crops without exhausting the soil, much less than \$1,000. Mr. Flint says, "the amount lost exceeded that applied many fold," or in his own words, "the manure thus applied, would give the Board the power of increasing the productions of the farm many fold," besides being a great "sanitary measure." If I am right on the value, and we interpret "many fold" to mean three fold, it would seem that in this little item of manure, for one year, they lost the snug sum of \$3,000. And these are the men that claim their competency to show folks how to farm. It is said that "the world is full of wonders." In this same paragraph, from which I have just quoted, is other important matter.

“Moreover,” says Mr. Flint, “five or six milch cows, in addition to the present number, might be wintered without difficulty on the hay raised upon the farm; and these cows are even now greatly needed to enable the Board to supply the school with milk, while this additional number would considerably increase the facilities for the economical management of the farm the coming year; but the want of the *means to purchase them* has compelled the committee having charge of that department to defer it to a more favorable time. Judicious expenditure is true economy, but the committee did not feel authorized to incur a debt.”

With farmers generally, manure is money, but money is not always manure. How it is at Westboro', I do not know, but down here in Chelmsford, it would not have taken a very smart man if he was troubled with the “shorts,” as farmers sometimes are, to have found some neighbor who would have been willing to exchange a few cows for this manure, to have saved a friend from such a loss of plant-food, as we have just seen. And if our unfortunate friend had any friends, I think they might have been seen inquiring for one of those institutions, where the inmates are apt to think everybody “crazy” but themselves. “Judicious expenditure is true economy.” A better motto is seldom written, and with the first word “*judicious*” italicized, I am willing to leave it, and would be glad to see it placed in gold letters over the Speaker's desk at the State House, to stand forth as a warning to all this class of pleaders for the people's money, who are willing to do anything for a living but honest work. Although, as I have before said, the money-cost to the

people is comparatively nothing, even if the Board took to themselves the whole of the \$40,000 appropriated by the State to the institution, in addition to those sums already named. This is nothing. Three-fourths of the people have to rely on their own right arms for support, and any tampering with those industrial institutions, building up monopolies to circumvent the freedom of labor, and forestalling the poor man's capital, by the institution of a central power to dictate to labor its price, is mischievous and paralyzing.

Sections 4 and 5 of the Act of 1859, chapter 232, reads thus :

“The Board of Agriculture shall have power to require the several Agricultural Societies receiving the bounty of the State, to offer premiums from time to time for Agricultural experiments, to be conducted in such manner as said Board may direct. A Society which shall neglect, in any year, to comply with the several general laws concerning Agricultural Societies, or with such regulations of the Board of Agriculture, shall not be entitled to the bounty of the State, the year next succeeding.”

In accordance with the provision of this law, the Secretary of the Board issued the following mandate :

AN EXPERIMENT FOR THE COUNTY SOCIETIES.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS — AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

Boston, December 5, 1859.

At a meeting of the State Board of Agriculture, held on the 1st inst., it was

“*Voted*, That the several Agricultural Societies receiving the bounty of the State, be required to offer three premiums for the most thorough, exact, and reliable experiments, upon the proper depth of applying manures, payable in the fall of 1862, as follows :

“Select a level piece of land, of any convenient size, from twenty square rods up to as many acres or more, which should be as nearly equal in its character and conditions as possible. Divide it into five equal parts, numbering them 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, for a rotation of three years.

“Divide the manure which it is proposed to apply, and which should be of a uniform character, into four equal parts. At the time of first plowing in the spring, spread evenly one fourth of the manure upon plot No. 1, and then plow the whole field of an equal depth. Apply another fourth of the manure to plot No. 2, and then cross plow the whole field to about half the depth of the first plowing. Spread another fourth of the manure upon plot No. 3, and harrow or cultivate the whole field; after which sow or plant the whole evenly with any crop preferred. Finally, spread the remaining quarter-part of the manure upon plot No. 4.

“Observe that by pursuing this course, each of the five lots will receive equally a deep plowing, a shallow plowing, and a harrowing or cultivating, the only difference in them being that in No. 1 the manure is buried deep, in No. 2 shallow, in No. 3 buried only slightly, but coated with loam, and in No. 4 left exposed upon the surface, while No. 5 gets no manure. The manure is to be spread broadcast, and as evenly as possible. The after cultivation should be the same on each of the lots, and the harvest of each should take place at the same time.

“Let a statement of the character of the soil, whether light or heavy, dry or moist, leachy or retentive of manures, the crop of 1859, kind and amount and mode of application of manure in 1859, size of field covered by the experiment, depth of first plowing, kind and amount of manure used in 1860, kind of crop, when and how sown, number of times and manner cultivated, and weight of product on an average rod of each plot, be made in 1860, and returned in the annual report of each Society.

"If there is a double product, as grain and straw, corn and stover, let the weight of the secondary product be given on each plot.

"If the competitor weigh the whole crop, instead of estimating it by an average rod, there will be no objection to such a course.

"A brief synopsis of the weather for each of the following months, by dividing each month into three parts, and using the terms dry, moist, and wet, to indicate the general character of the weather, will also be expected:

FIRST THIRD.	MIDDLE THIRD.	LAST THIRD.
May.		
June.		
July.		
August.		
September.		

"A similar report of all the above items, except the nature of the soil, will be made in 1861, and in 1862, when the premiums will be awarded. No manure is to be applied to the second and third crops."

"*Voted*, That the Secretary of the Board be requested to offer premiums which will secure an adequate compensation for the time and labor consumed in the experiment."

I hereby notify your Society of the above vote. Evidence of a compliance with it will be required, before I shall be authorized to draw a certificate for the bounty to any Society.

One of the greatest obstacles in the way of agricultural progress is the difficulty of obtaining reliable facts and statistics, as a basis upon which to establish principles and construct theories. As a general rule, theories are first advanced, and then isolated facts are brought forward for the purpose of proving their truthfulness. It is true that agriculture is not, in the usual sense of the term, and probably never will become, one of the exact sciences; yet there are many things in connection with it which ought to be taken out of the region of conjecture, and placed, by repeat-

ed and multiplied experiments, upon a more substantial basis. A single fact or experiment may be of only trifling value in itself considered, but when added to scores or hundreds of others, the whole collectively may elucidate a doubtful point, or settle a vexed question.

With these considerations in view, the Board asks and requires the attention of every Society in the State to render any aid in the solution of the question here considered, and to act in concert with it and with each other, in such a way as to give to the result the greatest possible practical and scientific value. I would suggest that the rotation be limited to corn, grain, and grass.

Allow me to call your attention to the Act of 1859, chapter 232, sections 1, 2, and 3, and especially to sections 4 and 5, authorizing the Board to make the above requirement, and the penalty of a disregard of, or a failure to comply with it.

I would simply suggest that premiums of \$25, \$20, and \$15, have been offered by some of the Societies, and that it is desirable that no offers should be smaller than these amounts, as the object above indicated is to induce a multiplicity of experiments.

CHARLES L. FLINT,
Sec. State Board of Agriculture.

This speaks for itself, and clearly shows the incompetency of the Board to comprehend the subject upon which they are engaged. Any observing farmer will see at once that to experiment upon the cultivation of the soil according to this programme, is totally impracticable, as far as any beneficial results would occur. For instance, the idea of Mr. Flint is, to deposit the manure at the bottom of the furrow over plot No. 1 and No. 2. Now every farmer knows that if manure is

spread upon the land, that in plowing, some of it will go to the bottom and some will not. Then in harrowing much of it is brought to the surface, which renders this part of the experiment not only of no use, but positively injurious, as nothing has been learned, and the whole experiment fails, because there is no comparison.

Then again, after the manure is spread upon the land, and before it is possible to plow it, suppose a storm of a week's duration sets in, how does that affect the experiment, Mr. Secretary Flint?

“Select a level piece of land, of any convenient size, from twenty square rods up to as many acres or more, which should be as nearly equal in its character and conditions as possible.” How many pieces of land can be found in Massachusetts, containing even ten acres, which will come up to those requirements, so as to make the experiment tolerably conclusive? There may be some, but they are not very plenty.

The five years that the Board had charge of the farm at Westborough, was the most favorable opportunity to experiment upon agriculture that can well be imagined. Yet if they could do nothing there to either satisfy themselves or the public, it is not to be supposed that they can institute any through the County Societies. In farming, we cannot calculate even for a day. A neighbor told me that he sent his men to hoeing potatoes one morning, and started for the city. When the men got on to the piece, they found the potatoes several inches under water. An-

other told his men to mow till nine o'clock, then spread it out, and have the hay all raked and cocked up by sunset. At ten o'clock it commenced raining, and continued dull for several days. In England, manure spread upon the land, and there left for several weeks, exposed to the elements, is said to produce the best results. Climate and the nature of the soil evidently have much to do with the best mode of cultivation. I hold that neither this Board nor any other Board that can be instituted, can sit down in their office at the State House, and devise any plans, or recommend any measures, that will be of any practical use to themselves or any body else, in regard to agriculture; and the longer the effort is continued, the more they will be convinced of the truth of what I say. Of course, as long as the people quietly submit to being fleeced, and the cupidity of man is such as it is, men enough will be found to engage in this or any other movement, that their own individual interests may be subserved, even though a nation be led to mourn.

I came across an article in an agricultural journal on the above subject, written by a practical farmer, which had many good points in it, and I saw but little but what I could endorse, and will here insert it:

PREMIUMS BY THE STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE.

I have seen the vote of the State Board of Agriculture, requiring the different county societies to offer premiums for the best experiments in applying manures at different depths.

This is a subject of much importance to the farmers of this Commonwealth, and any experiments which

will give us reliable instruction upon this subject will be a public good.

In looking over this offer, and the plan marked out by the Board, it appears to me that we may strictly comply with the letter of the instructions, and yet not get any reliable information upon the proper depth of applying manures.

They do not tell us whether it is to be sward land, or land that has been cultivated one or more years. If we take sward land, and plow the manure for lot No. 1, underneath the sward, how shall we know whether it was the fact of its being beneath the sward, or the depth at which it was applied, that caused the different results?

When we come to lot No. 2, and try to cross plow it, and get the manure at half the depth, we infer the Board intended the experiment should be tried upon old land.

We will take a piece of mellow ground, and spread the manure upon lot No. 1, and plow ten inches deep, and if the manure is fine and well composted, as the furrow slice rises and cracks, the manure falls in, and gets well mixed with the soil, instead of being buried at the bottom of the furrow; if the manure is coarse, much of it will be left where the plow will draw it up, when we come to cross plow at half the depth: thus we may follow the directions, and yet not furnish any reliable instruction upon this subject. The only way in which I could get the manure at a uniform depth when plowing it into mellow land, would be to follow the plow with a hoe, and draw the manure into the furrow, and then turn the next furrow upon it. If the Board had required this, the experiment might have been useful.

I will now go upon lot No. 2. It has been plowed deep, according to the directions. I will try to spread the manure upon the rough furrows, for, according to the directions, I must not put the harrow upon it yet; much of the manure falls into the holes; I then cross

plow it five inches deep ; at what depth does any one suppose the manure is covered ? To test it fairly, I think that No. 2 should have been rolled down smooth, and the manure placed in the bottom of the furrow, at half the depth of No. 1.

I next spread the manure upon No. 3, and then I am told to take a harrow or cultivator, and go over the whole lot. What is the effect of this upon No. 2 ? Does not the harrow move much of the manure, and mix it with the soil, and may not the result be affected by the mixing as much as by the depth ? I think there should have been nothing but a bush harrow upon it after it was plowed.

I am now to plant the whole lot, and then take the team and cart the manure upon No. 4. This looks some like book farming, to drive over the corn after it is planted I have always been taught to think a planted cornfield as almost sacred. We have all read of the honest English farmer, who complained of the hounds treading down his wheat in the spring, and was paid for the injury done ; but at the harvest time he found that the trampling had been an advantage to him ; so if No. 4 does the best, who can tell whether it was owing to the trampling and beating it got after it was planted, or the manner in which the manure was applied ?

I think there will be but little practical difference in the condition of the manure upon lots No. 3 and 4, except for the first three or four weeks. I begin to run the cultivator through the corn about the 1st of June ; then the manure will be mixed with the soil the same as on No. 3. They tell us that the after cultivation must be the same upon each lot. But they do not tell us what that shall be. By using the plow, or Sawyer's improved cultivator, we may hill it up so as to spoil the whole experiment, and yet be entitled to the premium, according to the offer.

An experiment conducted in so loose a manner is worse than none. They say nothing about how we

shall plow it the second year. If the manure has been where they supposed it to be, when we plow No. 1, it will bring the manure to the surface for the second year, and the others will be buried. What instruction can we derive from such an experiment?

I have endeavored to take a practical view of this subject, feeling that when the Board hold the rod of state over the backs of the county societies, and say, thus shalt thou do, the public have the right to ask, what will be the practical benefit?

I submit at the close of this chapter, a schedule of the property at the farm at the time it came into the hands of the Board, also at the time it went back into the hands of the Trustees, or as they have taken it, in December.

Further I submit the account of the Board with the Commonwealth for the year 1858.

These statistics speak in stronger language than any thing that I can say, of the absurdity of the position that farming is a paying business, and fit for young men to engage in, when with all this capital to begin with, all the labor they want, at a less price than any farmer can clothe his boys, to say nothing of their board, and some five thousand dollars yearly in cash besides, and a market at the door for everything they raise — when with all these unprecedented advantages, they claim, as a reason for their short-coming, that the labor bill was too high, and the *appropriations insignificant*. Study and ponder.

Schedule and Appraisal of the Stock, Tools, and Implements, together with the estimated value of the Land and Buildings referred to in the agreement between the Trustees of the State Reform School at Westboro' and the State Board of Agriculture, received April 1, 1854 :—

1 Pair Fat Oxen.....	\$170 00	8 Ox Yokes.....	10 00
3 Pairs Oxen—Red, \$150; Brindle, \$100; Bay, \$150	460 00	8 Draft Chains.....	8 00
25 Cows, at \$32 each	800 00	4 Trace Chains.....	3 00
2 Heifers, at \$15 each....	30 00	4 Stake Chains.....	3 00
1 Grade Devon Bull.....	50 00	2 Ox Sleds.....	10 00
2 Horses—Charley, \$150; Kate, \$125.....	275 00	2 Horse Sleds.....	12 00
35 Swine.....	575 00	1 Buggy.....	50 00
12 Tons English Hay, at \$17..	\$204 00	1 Sleigh	25 00
8 Tons Meadow Hay, at \$8... ..	64 00	Harness	65 00
1 Ton English Hay, at \$17.. ..	17 00	Stable Furniture, Buffa- lo Robes, &c.....	15 00
$\frac{1}{2}$ Ton Straw.....	5 00	Articles in the Tool Room	10 00
4 Tons Corn Fod- der	24 00	1 Iron Roller.....	20 00
500 Bushels Corn, at \$1... ..	500 00	1 Fanning Mill and Corn Sheller.....	12 00
40 Bushels Oats, at 50 cts. ..	20 00	Seed Corn.....	4 00
500 Bushels Carrots, at 20 cts.....	100 00	5 Bushels Beans.....	10 00
160 Bushels Turnips, at 20 cts.....	32 00	8 Door Chains.....	2 00
4 Straw Cutters.....	50 00	1 Seed Sower.....	5 00
1 Feed Trough.....	4 00	2 Pairs Steelyards.....	3 00
12 Hay Forks.....	3 00	54 Bushels Potatoes.....	40 00
6 Rakes.....	1 00	150 Pounds Guano.....	4 00
12 Manure Forks.....	12 00	Superphosphate.....	48 00
20 Shovels.....	5 00	150 Strawberry Boxes.....	4 00
9 Spades.....	5 00	17 Hoes.....	3 00
12 Picks.....	12 00	1 Drill	2 00
Manure Troll.....	1 00	10 Wheelbarrows	6 00
7 Iron Bars.....	7 00	Beetle and Wedges.....	2 00
3 Stone Hammers.....	5 00	Lot of Measures.....	1 00
1 Ox Wagon.....	40 00	Grass Shears.....	1 00
1 Horse Wagon.....	20 00	Iron Rakes.....	1 00
3 Carts	70 00	4 Water Cans.....	4 00
2 Horse Carts.....	35 00	3 Bog Hooks.....	4 00
3 Stone Drags.....	5 00	9 Axes.....	8 00
6 Ploughs	30 00	3 Saws	3 00
3 Harrows	12 00	3 Ice Hooks.....	1 00
2 Cultivators.....	4 00	Tongs	2 00
2 Hand Cultivators.....	4 00	2 Cross-cut Saws.....	7 00
		2 Hand Saws.....	1 00
		12 Baskets	6 00
		6 Scythes	2 00
		12 Snaths	6 00
		Grindstone.....	7 00
			<hr/>
			\$4,081 00

REAL ESTATE.

Land, supposed about 285 acres.....	\$8,400 00		
Farm Barn.....	1,600 00		
Two Dwelling-houses.....	2,000 00	\$12,000 00	
Total.....			<hr/>
			\$16,081 00

I N V E N T O R Y

Of Personal Property on the State Farm, Westboro', Dec. I, 1858.

6 Oxen.....\$530 00	100 Shovels 50 00
17 Cows..... 850 00	22 Spades 18 00
2 Hereford Cows..... 300 00	61 Picks..... 61 00
1 Hereford Bull..... 200 00	2 Manure Hooks..... 1 00
1 Hereford two yearling Heifer..... 100 00	15 Iron Bars..... 15 00
1 Hereford Bull Calf.... 75 00	3 Stone Hammers..... 5 00
1 Jersey Cow, (diseased in udder)..... 40 00	1 Ox Wagon..... 35 00
1 Jersey Heifer..... 100 00	1 Two-Horse Wagon.... 20 00
1 Devon Cow..... 100 00	1 One-Horse Wagon.... 15 00
1 Devon Heifer two years old..... 50 00	1 Lumber Wagon..... 50 00
1 Devon Heifer one year old..... 30 00	1 Job Wagon..... 60 00
1 Devon Heifer Calf.. . 20 00	3 Ox Carts..... 60 00
1 Durham Cow..... 200 00	4 Horse Carts..... 140 00
1 Durham Bull Calf... 100 00	3 Stone Drags..... 6 00
1 Durham Heifer Calf... 50 00	10 Ploughs..... 90 00
1 Grade Devón Heifer... 25 00	4 Harrows 20 00
1 Grade Jersey Heifer... 25 00	1 Cultivator..... 3 00
1 Grade Ayshire Calf.... 20 00	2 Horse Hoes..... 12 00
1 Ayshire Bull..... 75 00	2 Hand Cultivators.... 2 00
5 Horses 500 00	2 Horse Harrow..... 4 00
2 Fat Hogs.....\$30 00	5 Ox Yokes..... 12 00
4 Breeding Sows.. 60 00	9 Draft Chains..... 12 00
1 Boar..... 25 00	2 Derrick Chains..... 10 00
52 Shotcs 300 00	6 Stake Chains..... 4 00
14 Sucking Pigs... 25 00 440 00	1 Ox Sled..... 4 00
81 tons English Hay.... 1,215 00	1 Horse Sled..... 5 00
4 tons Rowen 60 00	1 Two-Horse Double-run- ner Sled..... 10 00
36 tons Meadow Hay.. . 250 00	1 Pleasure Sleigh..... 10 00
2 tons Millet 24 00	1 lot of old Harnesses... 32 00
6 tons Straw Hay.... . 48 00	1 Harness..... 10 00
15 tons Corn Stover..... 120 00	4 Horse-Cart Harnesses. 32 00
536 bushels Shelled Indian Corn..... 536 00	4 Trace Chains..... 3 00
590 bushels Ruta-Bagas... 118 00	Stable Furniture..... 10 00
1520 bushels Turnips..... 304 00	Furniture in Scale Room 5 00
1076 bushels Carrots..... 269 00	1 Iron Roller..... 20 00
117 bushels Seed Potatoes. 58 50	Fanning Mill and Corn Sheller..... 12 00
50 bushels Oats..... 27 50	1 Stone Elevator..... 165 00
2 bushels Buckwheat..... 1 50	2 bushels Seed Corn.... 4 00
30 bushels Wheat..... 45 00	1 bushel Seed Beans..... 2 00
8 bushels Barley..... 8 00	1 Seed Sower..... 3 00
3 bushels Rye..... 3 00	1 Platform Scale..... 7 00
670 bushels Beets..... 167 50	20 Strawberry Boxes.... 1 00
400 bushels Parsnips, by es- timation..... 100 00	60 Hand Hoes..... 20 00
4 Hay Cutters..... 40 00	10 Hand Drills..... 6 00
1 Feed Trough..... 4 00	2 Hand Hammers. 3 00
10 Hay Forks 4 00	20 Wheelbarrows.... . 40 00
30 Hay Rakes..... 5 00	1 Beetle, with Wedges.. 2 00
26 Manure Forks..... 32 50	2 Grindstones..... 10 00
	4 Water Cans..... 2 00
	6 Bog Hoes 5 00
	8 Axes..... 5 00
	6 Wood Saws..... 5 00

6 Ice Hooks.....	2 00	8 Iron-Toothed Rakes...	3 00
1 pair Ice Tongs.....	2 00	3 Wheel Hoes.....	3 00
2 Cross-cut Saws.....	6 00	1 Wheel Stone Drag.....	8 00
Carpenters' Tools.....	18 00	6 Stone Boat Plank.....	5 00
6 Seythes and Snaiths...	3 00	Plank for six Sled Run-	
20 Baskets.....	6 00	ners.....	6 00
18 Milk Cans.....	10 00	Furniture in Black-	
500 feet Pine Lumber....	7 00	smith's Shop.....	30 00
4 Buckets.....	1 00	Gate Hangings.....	5 00
3 Milk Pails.....	60	20 Weeding Trowels....	1 20
1 Surveyor's Chain.....	2 00	1 Corn Fork.....	1 50
1 Ox Shovel.....	6 00	Carboy Sulphuric Acid	6 51
1 Spirit Level.....	2 00	1 Prun'g Saw and Chisel	1 00
1 Swill Cart.....	40 00	8 Corn Bags.....	1 00
1 Refrigerator.....	10 00	4 Sack Bags.....	50
2 Derricks.....	75 00	15 Acres of Winter Rye on	
Household Furniture..	100 00	the Ground.....	75 00
1 Garden Ru'e.....	75		
15 Corn Cutters.....	2 00		\$8,870 56
1 Root Cutter.....	10 00	Cash on hand Dec. 1, 1858,	373 48
1 Saddle.....	4 00		
		Total.....	\$9,244 04

C. L. FLINT IN ACCOUNT WITH

THE STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE.

1854.	Dr.		
April 13,	To cash received from State Treasurer,.....	\$500 00	
" 18,	" cash received from State Treasurer,.....	500 00	
May 23,	" cash received from State Treasurer,.....	300 00	
June 20,	" cash received from State Treasurer,.....	900 00	
" 25,	" cash received from State Treasurer,.....	200 00	
July 1,	" cash received from State Treasurer,.....	500 00	
" 3,	" cash received from State Treasurer,.....	100 00	
Aug. 3,	" cash received from State Treasurer,.....	750 00	
Sept. 4,	" cash received from State Treasurer,.....	850 00	
Oct. 5,	" cash received from State Treasurer,.....	800 00	
" 7,	" cash received from State Treasurer,.....	200 00	
Nov. 4,	" cash received from State Treasurer,.....	400 00	
" 27,	" cash received from Treas. State Ref. School,...	500 90	
			\$6,500 00

1854.	Cr.		
April 13,	By cash paid for two yoke of oxen at \$100.....	\$320 00	
" 13,	" cash paid S. N. White for expenses on the farm	153 00	
" 19,	" cash paid Ruggles, Nourse and Mason for tools,		
	guano, &c.....	328 92	
May 17,	" cash paid Davenport for superphosphate	23 97	
" 17,	" cash paid Stearns for potash to be used on the		
	farm	31 76	
" 19,	" cash paid Morrill for ground bone.....	12 50	
" 20,	" cash paid J. Newell for farm-horse.....	170 00	
" 23,	" cash paid Hammond for nails, posts, &c., for		
	piggery	200 00	
June 20,	" cash paid Eaton for lumber for piggery, &c....	827 29	
" 28,	" cash paid Hammond for shingles, labor, &c....	209 00	

July	1,	"	cash paid S. N. White to pay laborers on farm	650 00
"	13,	"	cash paid Stevens for scales for the farm.....	17 81
Aug.	3,	"	cash paid Hammond for labor, lumber, &c., for piggery,.....	550 00
"	3,	"	S. N. White to pay for hay	212 00
Sept.	7,	"	cash paid S. N. White for expenses on the farm	135 60
"	16,	"	cash paid Hammond for labor on piggery and tool house	594 00
Oct.	5,	"	cash paid S. N. White for laborers on the farm	828 12
"	7,	"	cash paid S. N. White for expenses on the farm	240 00
Nov.	3,	"	cash paid S. Brown for mounting map of survey	1 50
"	7,	"	cash paid Hammond for labor on tool house...	300 00
"	15,	"	cash paid Hammond for labor on tool house...	175 00
"	28,	"	cash paid S. N. White for labor on the farm....	125 00
				<hr/>
				\$6,095 87
By cash on hand Dec. 1, 1854,.....				404 18
				<hr/>
				\$6,500 00

Boston, Dec. 1, 1854.

I have examined the foregoing account, and find it correctly cast and properly vouched.

J. H. W. PAGE,

Chairman of Auditing Committee.

In presenting these estimates I want the reader to distinctly understand, that the object is not to find fault, but a desire to place things truly before the people ; for the Board of Agriculture claim that they can benefit the farmer, by instructing him to farm in a way that will be lucrative and pleasant. And of course if they can show other folks how to farm profitably and pleasantly, they can do so themselves, for they cannot impart to others what they do not know.

This is where I take issue with them, for I believe that they do not know how to farm profitably themselves, and if they undertook to do so, it could not be done pleasantly. Also, that they do *not intend* to benefit the farmer, and if they did so, the State, with existing public policy, would not appropriate a single

dollar to aid them, and they (the Board) would be the last men in the world to ask it. For they practice upon the belief that their interest, and the interest of their aiders and abettors, is in antagonism with the interest and good of the farmer. The power behind the throne being more potent than the throne itself.

Therefore, I again call attention to the schedules here presented, as a part of my argument against them. In their estimate of the property when it came into their possession, April 1, 1854, they appraised 36 head of neat cattle at \$1,510.00, or $\$41\frac{2}{3}$ a piece. On Dec. 1, 1858, they make their 41 head of cattle worth \$2,810.00, or $\$68\frac{2}{3}$ a head. Making cattle worth some 50 per cent. more in the fall of the year than in the spring, after being wintered through. This is not all, for every intelligent farmer knows that, all things being equal, the sale value of cattle in the fall of 1858, was some 50 per cent. less than it was in the spring of 1854.

There are many other items in these inventories that I do not care to notice, but are worthy of a moment's attention to the reader in passing. And then, in view of all these facts, and the many others I shall notice in these pages, with what claim of fairness can they say they have cleared or saved money for the State, unless in their definition of the term ("State") they mean a few speculators, stock jobbers, and State House farmers.

And then the idea of Mr. Flint, that they required a special "appropriation" by the State, to possess them-

selves of a simple contrivance to cart liquid manure to the field, to be used by a "man and boy," and for the lack of which, they lost some \$3,000 worth a year, of a "valuable" fertilizer, and run the risk of breeding a disease among the people that might have depopulated the whole village; and according to his account of the matter, they should have been indicted as a common nuisance. A simple contrivance of a half hogshead rigged upon a pair of horse cart wheels, that might have cost 50 or 60 cents, would have answered very well as a temporary affair, till they could have got an "act" through the Legislature making a *special* appropriation for the purpose, as follows:

AN ACT to protect the olfactory nerves of the Board in their peregrinations at Westboro', from the effluvium escaping from liquid ammoniacal destruction.

Just think of it, two dwelling-houses, \$2,000; 1 pig-gery, \$2,500! And let me say that Westboro' is not the only place where the pig-sty is the most costly of the two, for this is the "poetry" of the Board, (if I understand it,) reduced to plain "prose." Human farm cattle is but the adjunct to improved "Durhams" and grunting "Berkshires."

CHAPTER IV.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, CONTINUED.

Public Meeting at the State House—Resolutions—Massachusetts Society—A New Society—The labor of the Old Countries—We have as yet done nothing for Agriculture—Price of Products—Glut the Markets—Keep your Heifer Calves—Plant one acre more—The price of Farms—Agricultural Fairs—Calf Raising—Cost of Raising—Net loss—No funds of their own—Another State Fair—Three thousand dollars—Mr. Fay and the Hay Crop—Profit—The Price of Cattle—Auction—50,000 Paupers—Legislators—City Property—Fancy Farming—Fast Horses—Distress in the West—Farm Products not Remunerating—No. of Agricultural Societies—Currency.

IN the early part of 1857, a public meeting was called at the State House for the purpose of deliberating upon the expediency of establishing a new State Agricultural Society. This was in addition to the Massachusetts Society and the Board of Agriculture.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Marston, of Barnstable, and on motion, Col. J. H. W. Paige, of Boston, was called on to preside, and Benj. F. Mills, of Williamstown, was appointed Secretary.

Mr. Comstock, of Springfield, introduced the following resolution:—

Resolved—That a Committee, to consist of one member from each County here represented, be appointed by the Chair, to consider and report on the propriety of organizing a State Agricul-

tural Society, and if deemed proper by them, to report a plan of organization for such Society.

This resolution was discussed by Hon. M. P. Wilder, Mr. Proctor, of Danvers, Hon. Simon Brown, and others.

Mr. Lewis, of Framingham, said "he was a member of the old chrysalis society, and of the Board of Agriculture. He found great ignorance among the people concerning the State Agricultural Society; many knew nothing about it. It had a respectable existence, he believed, in State street, and was likely to be a money making concern. The State paid it \$600 per annum, and some said it was spent in good dinners; and he was glad that the Western people had come here and demanded to know what was really done with the money. The result of this meeting would probably be to bring out the State Society to the doing of some good, as it ought to do, and it would not be a bad thing that the incorporation of some Young American blood should speedily take place among the old-fogy, aristocratic, but respectable members of the Society."

It came out in the discussion of the above resolution, that the Massachusetts Society had done some good, according to the interpretation given by the various speakers, who seem to be, as far as reported, mainly composed of the old Massachusetts Society and the Board of Agriculture. They had imported some blood stock, had appropriated \$1000 for the best mowing machine, and had also appropriated another thousand to be distributed in premiums by the United States Agricultural Society.

Mr. Copeland, of Lexington, "complained that nothing yet had been said in favor of establishing a new

society. And no one had stated, in describing the advantages held out by the old society, that these advantages were such as the farmers in the State demanded.

“He thought that, as compared with the associations of other countries, the labors of agricultural societies were as nothing. They have never had, in the first place, a sufficient *support from the State*, and they were not able to penetrate below the crust of information which the farmer demanded. They had never encouraged the talent of such men as Liebig, Bous-singault, or Johnson, or had a literature that was as *respectable* as it ought to be. The agricultural newspapers of the country,” Mr. Copeland said, “were much below the standard of those of other countries; and he would not be satisfied that the literary duties of our agricultural societies were properly done, until they established a quarterly journal of agriculture, as other countries had. Agricultural professorships in our colleges should also be established, and the farmer *made* to know that wearing a green jacket and blue overalls and driving a team, was not all that designated a farmer—but that he was a man of mind, and should impart it to his occupation. He moved that a committee of five be appointed to take into consideration whether anything can be done to benefit the cause of agriculture in this Commonwealth in a permanent shape.”

•

The above, among others, are the things that were said and done at this meeting. And I place them in these pages, because they foreshadow what I have all along said, that we have just commenced, as it were, to tamper with the agricultural interests of this country. Not a word has been said about the cost and market price of a single article produced upon the farm. Their whole object seems to be to glut the market with all the goodies of the farm, at the lowest pos-

sible price. They are fond of nice roasts, porter-house steaks, and plum pudding, and they know that the way to get them cheap is to keep the supply in excess of the demand. Therefore all manner of plans are instituted to deceive the farmer, professing great friendship for him, till his crops are well started and the largest breadth possible is appropriated, and twice as many cattle are raised as are needed, and then they turn round and laugh at them for their stupidity. Thus in 1855 and 1856, the hue and cry went round the country, — “keep your heifer calves.” At this time cattle had been selling at prices nearly remunerating. That is, a prudent farmer could get some pay for his labor and some per cent. on his capital, by producing milk, beef, cattle, butter, &c. But this did not suit our city friends.

To elucidate what I have said, I will give a statement which is published in the Secretary’s Report of the Board of Agriculture. I shall suppress the name, because I presume the owner is not very anxious to have it in this connection made any more notorious.

“The ten calves which I have entered for premium, do not come under the rules for premium, as they are not over four months and ten days old. They are ten, taken from eighty-six, that I have raised since the 1st of November, 1856. I then began to raise calves by getting them from milk farms, where they could be obtained at one dollar per head, thinking that I might raise eight or ten heifers for cows, but they did not want to part with heifers and not males, so I took both, and continued through the winter to the 20th of May, 1857.

“I then had sixty three living, and had lost seven by

the scours and cold weather. The herd had become so large that I then turned them to pasture in New Hampshire, about ninety miles off. I lost three by having to leave them out over night, in a cold rain, snow and hail storm, on the journey. They became chilled and died after they were turned to pasture. I lost two by scours and one by getting mired. The rest, fifty-seven in number, are doing well. I have continued to raise all that I could get since the 20th of May. There are now twenty-nine calves, at home, of which these ten are the oldest.

"I have tried to raise them as cheap as I could, and in order to do this I have tried various ways, as milk has been high and sells well on account of the high price of cows; and many families are not willing to pay for fodder and cows the money asked, choosing to buy their milk. The price for milk is four cents per quart at the house, in Beverly, and six cents delivered. I tried oil cake boiled and mixed with milk, which does well if too much is not given at a time, as in most cases it will give calves the scours. I have used scalded Indian meal and milk, and scalded flour and milk, all of which does very well if care is taken not to over-feed, so as to bring on the scours. This disease is bad, for it takes a long time for the calves to recover from it, and if over-fed it will come on again.

"The cost of raising is about \$2.50 per head, until weaned. The last twenty-nine have been turned to pasture as soon as taken from the cows, at one, two and three days old; there they learned to eat grass and drink water while young. When from three to four weeks old they would eat sufficient to wean, and were left to graze for themselves. No meal has been given the last twenty-nine; scalded meal and flour, milk and grass, has been their keeping."

Thus it seems, our friend went into the calf-business quite extensively, and I suppose then had full faith in

the judgment of the fancy, and thought their philanthropy unbounded, as they had *calved* out an expeditious way to those blissful days when a man can sit down under his own "vine and fig tree," and enjoy the well-earned fruits of a successful speculation. I propose to bring those calves up to the present time and see what they have cost, — what they will bring in the market, and count the profits; as this is the time to sell them when they are just coming into use. The steers it would be well to let them run another summer, but the heifers we will suppose all to come in this spring, (1860,) and although they must be small, and what would be termed ordinary, if the same process was continued in feeding, that was commenced. Yet, it costs less to bring cattle up in this way than it does on better keeping. But, I suppose our friend had an eye to the *profits*, rather than the fancy of the article. I shall have to make an average thing of it, and if I deviate at all, it shall be in favor of my ambitious friend.

If I understand my friend correctly, he bought in all, 86, and lost in various ways, 10, leaving 76. If I do not understand him correctly, he will please excuse me, for if he had a larger number than this, his profits will be greater, and if less, less. But, as I shall reckon them by the head, it will not make any essential difference.

Calves Dr.

To first cost.....	\$86 00
“ keeping till weaned, at \$2.50 per head.....	190.00
“ two men, horse and wagon 8 days, to drive to pasture 90 miles.....	24.00
“ expense on the road.....	40.00
“ pasturing and salt, at \$1.50 per head, 1857.....	114.00
“ expense returning from pasture.....	50.00
“ wintering 76 calves, at \$8.00 per head.....	608.00
“ driving to pasture, pasturing, and return, at \$3.00 per head, 1858.....	228.00
“ wintering, at \$9.00 per head..	684.00
“ pasturing, driving, &c., 1859, at \$3.50 per head....	266.00
“ wintering, at \$11.00 per head, 1860.....	836.00
“ interest on investment.....	120.00
Total expenditure.....	<u>\$3,246.00</u>

Cr.

By 76 three year old steers and heifers, at \$25.00 per head.....	<u>\$1,900.00</u>
Nett loss.....	\$1,346.00

All the explanation this needs, is this. The cattle must be pretty nice to bring these prices this spring, and the keeping has been such as would make only ordinary cattle, as every farmer can testify. Coarse meadow hay and a little meal the first winter, (1857,) and the last part of this winter, (1860,) is all that could be allowed. It would take a man but a few years to spend a fortune in this business. How this man managed with his cattle, I do not know; perhaps some died the first winter, if so, it would seem to be fortunate, as far as profits are concerned. But this I know, that there has been no time they could be sold without a loss, and the sooner the smaller. Perhaps my friend did not think when commencing the business, it would be so general. But he must recollect that a

very large part of the farmers have no other way for means to pay their taxes, store bills, and the thousand other things they must have, but to sell their stock.

It seems that it cost to raise these cattle, to reckon as closely as I have reckoned, $\$42,71\frac{4}{6}$ each. I have made no allowance for accidents or mishaps, which undoubtedly there must have been many; and yet a loss of $\$17,71\frac{4}{6}$ has been sustained on each creature. If it should be claimed that the sale price is too low, let me say that I have this month, Feb. 1860, bought of a cattle trader, second handed, from a member of the Board of Agriculture, a three year old heifer, forward in calf, and in all particulars, as far as I could judge, having the requisites of a good cow, for $\$22,00$, or three dollars less than these are appraised at. One fact in agriculture is worth a bushel of theories, and, that truth and right may be established, ought to be a satisfactory reason to all, for this reference. I know of my own knowledge, that no man can make moderate wages, and a small per cent. on his investment, by raising medium cattle at a less price than $\$20$ for the first year, $\$15$ for the second, the same for the third, and then the price must be increased, unless we get either milk or work from them. I also presume that few farmers need be told that generally it is better to sell cattle from the farm than cattle food; but, if this does not pay for the labor bestowed, every farmer ought to know that it is better to cease cropping the land, as the crop of this year is the very best material to make succeeding crops that can be devised, and to remove them without sufficient

compensation for the labor bestowed to do this, and also pay for labor and expense to return to the soil the fertilizing material taken off, is idle, and wasting one's energies to no good to himself, and a positive injury to others.

In another part of this work I shall explain more particularly how this is, and how it is that the farmers live, and how that, by the sale of their products below the cost, they are putting their capital and labor combined against the poor man's labor, thereby crushing the poor to the condition of the serfs of the old countries, and hastening those "halcyon days" that has been so eloquently and graphically elaborated upon, by those particular friends of the farmer, in the resolutions and remarks which are partially introduced at the commencement of this chapter.

Any one to read over carefully the report of the meeting to which I have referred, also the speeches of the various individuals who compose the Board of Agriculture, and many others, who are at work through the press and in other ways, cannot help seeing that a strong effort is being made to establish in this country similar institutions that exist in the old countries, to keep down the price of labor. I class all working farmers with all other working men, and think they all should be tenacious of their rights, and look sharp to their interests. It does not follow that because a man has a farm he should continue to crop it, unless the crops yield a return equal to a small per cent. as profit

after paying for the labor, over the value of the raw material composing the article produced.

For as long as the farmers sell their products below the cost of production, a man would be a fool to buy a farm. And this is the reason why farms are continually growing cheaper. When the population and wealth of the State are rapidly increasing, this class of property is going the other way. And to this cause may be attributed nearly all of the revolutions in trade and manufactures, which are so common of late, and so alarming in their extent and influence upon the people. The farmer's sons throughout this and other New England States, as soon as they come to years of discretion and obtain their majority, become disgusted with the rewards of their toil upon the farm, seeing that they have no means of supplying many of the most common and reasonable wants of life, rush into anything and everything, having no previous culture or training, hoping to strike a favorable vein, but soon learn to their horror that they have not only made a mistake, and lost their time, but in too many instances, the funds of some kind friend has been sacrificed. They then either return to the farm, or if too proud for this, choose rather to become the "hewers of wood and drawers of water" in some city, and too often bring disgrace and pain upon their friends when they are least able to bear it. This is a brief but too true a picture of every day life in "farming as it is;" and shows conclusively the absurdity of supposing that our sons can do, what we never have done, earn a living at farming. It is true we live,

but not by our trade. And that farmer who does not often make success outside of his calling, has got to either half live, waste his acres, or sell for a price what little plant-food yet remains in the soil, without the means to reinstate it.

This is New England farming, and although this and other States spend large sums, and stop at no means to create a large surplus in the market, seldom do anything to ascertain the prime cost of a single article produced.

What they denominate good farming, that is, overstocking the market with farm products, is to the farmer the worst kind of farming, for when we fail to get the cost of our products, not only is our labor in the same proportion lost, but our past earnings has to be sacrificed, that the non-producers may eat the bread of plenty at a small cost.

If the Board of Agriculture really wanted to benefit the farmer, as they profess, it would be the simplest thing in the world to institute measures to do it. Not that the farmers desire to have them do this, for I am very sure that if they cannot do their own cyphering, no body of men that can be instituted, will do it to their advantage for them.

But supposing this, supposing that the State in her corporate capacity, acting through the Board of Agriculture, desired the elevation, remuneration and positive good of the farmer, and this Board were the exponents of this idea, what then would the Board do?

Would they say that farming was the most profitable

business in the world, paying a profit of several hundred per cent., and at the same time healthy, respectable and honorable? Would they not, in the first place, go to work and ascertain if such was the fact? After having tried it for five years under the most favorable circumstances that any man or body of men ever went to farming, and there ascertained that they could not make the farm pay the labor bill, to say nothing about any per cent. on a capital of some \$30,000, when this labor, much of it, was to them comparatively of no cost at all. For if those boys were bad, that is no evidence that they were not good to work, and many of them were capable of doing more than half a man's labor.

If they were really honest, and meant to return to the farmer information that would be some compensation for the cost to the farmer of their support, would they in their next report, after having failed in their experiment at Westboro', cited as evidence of the monstrous profits of farming, the fact of a man who in order to obtain a premium, reported that he made nearly 200 per cent. profit on a crop of oats, when to do this he had sold to a neighbor straw enough to fill a bed, and charged him a cent per pound for it, and then called his 4,500 pounds worth \$45,00. Is that "publishing only what is useful," or is it deceiving the people? Every farmer knows that ordinarily oat straw is worth but little for the purpose to which it is usually put. And this is the purpose which the Board recommend the farmers to put it to, viz., feeding to stock.

For the last few years, nearly all the straw, and most other food, that has been fed to cattle has been a total loss to the farmer, as the value increase has been hardly enough to pay the labor bill. Perhaps my friend will pardon a single suggestion if he should think of competing for the society's premium another year on the oat crop, as the *straw bed* invention may possibly be overdone, as most original ideas that are made to pay, soon are, from coming in contact with a ruinous competition that most inventive geniuses have to meet; therefore, he will please excuse this intimation: that the straw, after being well threshed, might be arranged into *hen's nests*, and a smart pedler would soon dispose of enough to *establish* the price, even though the "hen fever" did not rage to much extent, at possibly some \$40 or \$50 per ton, as most people are not very particular about what they pay, when purchasing an article in homœopathic doses, thus putting an end to *all* controversy in regard to the profits of agriculture.

If the Board had desired the farmers benefit, would they have recommended some four years ago for them to keep their heifer calves, when stock was at the prices then obtained, hardly a day-wages business. Or did they all, like Mr. Fay, think that the crops might be increased five-fold and not decrease the value. Either their honesty or their simplicity is here at fault! Either or both positions prove that however valuable they may be to the speculators and loafers, they are of no benefit to the farmer.

THE STATE FAIR.

At the meeting called at the State House to form a new State Society, to which I have referred at the commencement of this chapter, in order to stave off the object of those who called it, the Board of Agriculture voted to hold an exhibition in conjunction with the Massachusetts Society. The Massachusetts Society have some three hundred members, is in an annual receipt of \$600 from the State, besides gifts and bequests from other sources, and have a fund of some \$34,000, mostly in banks. You have seen what one of its members says in regard to how it spends its income, &c.

In due time, the Board issued what may be termed a manifesto to the public, containing a declaration of their intentions. The following is taken from its pages.

“FIRST STATE EXHIBITION BY THE MASSACHUSETTS BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, with the patronage of the MASSACHUSETTS SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF AGRICULTURE, to be held in Boston, October, 1857.”

Eight thousand dollars was offered in premiums, and some one or two thousand in discretionary premiums.

The list of officers was as follows, all taken from the Board :—

President—MARSHALL P. WILDER.

Secretary—CHAS. L. FLINT.

Treasurer—WILLIAM G. LEWIS.

Committee of Arrangements.

MARSHALL P. WILDER,	SAMUEL CHANDLER,
JOHN BROOKS,	GEORGE MARSTON,
WILLIAM G. LEWIS,	MOSES NEWELL,
THOMAS J. FIELD.	

“Premiums,” (our) [their] manifesto says, “will be paid in *silver plate or money*, at the option of successful competitors.”

Mr. Flint says, in his report, page 15, 1858: —

“The trustees of the Massachusetts Society for the Promotion of Agriculture, with their characteristic liberality, very generously volunteered to contribute two thousand dollars towards defraying the expenses of the Fair. In addition to this, a guarantee fund of *fifteen thousand dollars* was immediately raised, with the understanding that the Fair should be held in Boston.”

Our Secretary further says, on the page above referred to: —

“These preliminaries arranged, no pains were spared to make the preparations for the Fair as complete as possible. The schedule of premiums was extensively distributed, and ample and liberal encouragement offered for all classes of farm stock, farm products, farm implements, domestic manufactures, and the mechanic arts.”

The “schedule of premiums” covered about twenty pages of their manifesto, and embraced about everything that can be thought of in connection with fancy farming. The premiums had a wide range of from five to fifty dollars, although some small articles run as low as two dollars.

In this same report the Secretary further says —

“Exhibitors appeared in great numbers, and with spirited emulation, and the judges being nearly all present, proceeded promptly with their examinations.”

Thus it would seem, according to our Secretary’s

account, that nearly all things were favorable for a successful operation.

There were two things, however, which operated against them. One was, it was hard times in the business world, and the lateness of the season, (Oct. 20th, 21st, 22d, and 23d,) was another reason why a failure was the result. This is the reasoning of the Board, according to their published account.

To make a short story of it, the "fifteen thousand dollars" came up missing. When the facts came out, that the farmers went there with their cattle, &c., after the forty and fifty dollar premiums, and not to spend money, but chose rather to sleep in the stalls with their stock, as they had no money to spend at the hotels and grog shops of the city, finding that they were badly sold, and the best they could do, the larger premiums would hardly make them whole, even at the most prudent rates, yet judge of their surprise, when after a long delay, it was announced that not even the money they paid, as an entrance fee, could be returned, but must be paid off in twenty-five cent pictures, at the rate of five and ten dollars apiece. The farmers think this was paying rather dearly for the autographs of H. J. Gardner and C. L. Flint. At any rate, it is not what they bargained for. Although, if it sets them to thinking, as perhaps it will, it may prove the best investment they could possibly make.

It seems that when these cunning fellows, the Boston speculators, got into a "sled," they thought to make a "cat's paw" of the Board, and some of them

being on the Board as members, thereby controlling the country members, and they even hoping to make a good thing of it, readily subscribed, as Mr. Flint says, to a guarantee fund of fifteen thousand dollars to have it in their city. But when the time came and went, and brought them little in the way of "cash," they concluded to "knock under," withhold the subscriptions, for as the farmers had brought them no cash, and in their anticipations had failed, therefore they left the Board to reconcile the matter to suit themselves. The ten thousand dollars that was offered by the Board to be distributed in premiums, dwindled down to some four thousand, paying about forty per cent. on their declaration, after taking nearly one thousand dollars as entrance fees, and the total receipts amounting to the snug little sum of \$11,571.82, making the expenses \$7,485.32. How a part of this was expended, will be seen by the following, taken from the fourth page of the manifesto before alluded to:—

"The Judges, Marshals, Superintendents, and Invited Guests, will dine with the officers of the Society, daily, at 1 o'clock."

Straws sometimes tell which way the wind blows.

It seems by the above that \$4,086.50 was actually paid in premiums, or perhaps it would be nearer the truth to say "awarded," as a part of it never has been paid, only as the Jockey paid for his hundred dollar nag, in puppies at twenty-five dollars each. Then it will be seen by the report, that a large amount that actually was paid, went to the owners of *fast horses*,

&c. And the whole show was more of a race-course, where the fast "nags" were brought out by still "faster" men. Such is the Board of Agriculture, and for this the people must be taxed, that the fancy may dine at one, and pay off in autographs at ten dollars a pair.

I know that the Board claim that they have no funds of their own, and I am thinking that they are not alone in this particular, and if these things continue, they will be growing less so every day; but the Massachusetts Society have a fund, as we have seen, of \$34,000, and *some* of the members of the Board are not closely pinched for means; therefore, looking at the subject in any light you may, the conclusion is inevitable, that they are not the men to hold to such an extent the interests of the people.

But we are told that this fall (1860) the thing is to be repeated. At a distant city from the metropolis, if a "*sufficient guarantee fund*" can be raised, the scenes of '47 are to be repeated, and to further this object, and make the thing sure, in gaining the *confidence* of the people, the State Treasury, to the tune of \$3,000, is to be taxed. I submit it to the best judgment of all good citizens, if it would not be wise to submit at some State election the question to the people, if they desire these things? If a few uneasy individuals, who know little about agriculture, and nothing about it as a means of living, are to trifle with the dearest rights of a people, that the sharpers of our cities may be benefitted at their expense, is it not time to pause?

I do not wish to be understood as saying that any other number of men that could be selected, as a Board of Agriculture, could do any better than this Board have done, and meet the expectations of those who control them. The idea with me is that the whole thing is wrong; wrong in principle, wrong in policy, wrong in practice, and cannot be made useful to the people.

For, if I understand them, their policy is to cheapen the price of farm products in the country. This is what those men who are instrumental in making appropriations for their support, expect of them. They mainly have no sympathy with, nor care nothing for, the interests of the farmer. All that part of the system is the veriest humbug. They would have the farmer live on browse, and work himself into an "Egyptian mummy," if that would make farm products cheap in the market. There is not one particle of soul in the matter, and if any of the "Board" believe there is, their simplicity is their best plea for the wrong they commit.

If any one doubts one word that I say, let them spend a brief period among the sympathizers of the "Board" in Boston or any other city, and if they cannot see through the crust of the "crocodile tears" that are shed for the farmer, without a more practical illustration, let them take to market some of their products, and tell those men the amount of labor it took to produce them, and see if a price can be obtained that will pay day wages, all things reckoned. Very likely you will be told that the market is over-stocked, and this is the fact.

For this purpose they are anxious to be taxed, for this purpose they subscribe to the "guarantee funds," for this purpose a public sentiment is created, and the people's money is sacrificed.

To show how little they know or care upon the subject, allow me to spend a few moments by way of illustration. At one of the Legislative Agricultural Meetings at the State House, Hon. Richard S. Fay, of Lynn, presiding, he took occasion to say, in discussing the question of Agricultural education, that "the hay crop of Massachusetts which he estimated to be worth \$20,000,000 per annum," saying that we could produce "five times as much without decreasing the value of the article!"

This Mr. Fay is one of the most wealthy and influential members of the Board of Agriculture. He estimates the hay crop of Massachusetts to be worth \$20,000,000. At the last census, when the crop was estimated, it was declared to be 648,610 tons, being less than a ton to the acre. At ten dollars per ton, the value would be \$6,486,100, not one-third of the value, according to Mr. Fay. So much for Mr. Fay's figures. When it is recollected that one-third of the hay crop of this State is meadow hay, usually reckoned by farmers to be worth five dollars per ton, it will be seen that the estimate on the whole crop at ten dollars per ton, is sufficiently high. At the same census the number of cattle and horses in the State was 340,842, giving nearly two tons of hay to each creature.

Absurd as his statement is shown to be in this esti-

mate, it is not a tenth part so absurd as his (Fay's) other statement, viz., that this crop could be multiplied five times and not decrease the value of the article. The whole hay and grass crop of the country at the census of 1850, was estimated to be worth \$300,000,000. Calling the grass crop one-third of the amount in value, then our cipherer, (Mr. Fay) thinks that Massachusetts could produce half of the whole amount, and still keep the price up. Increase the hay crop this year 20 per cent. over last year, and you decrease the market value in nearly as great a proportion. Hay now sells in Boston market for from 22 to 24 dollars per ton. Last year it sold for from 17 to 20 dollars per ton. Why this variation in the price, Mr. Fay? Because the crop last year (1859,) was the lightest crop we have had for several years. Double the hay crop this year (1860) from last year, and the market price would not give a man a dollar per day to harvest and team it 15 miles to market. This is what I believe, and further, it is what the facts in past years will demonstrate in regard to this and most other crops. What we farmers want to know is this. We want to know how to earn a dollar per day when we work on our own farms, after allowing a fair per cent. on the investment, aside from the dwelling or house we occupy. All out-buildings, such as barns, sheds, &c., fences, drains, lands, &c., with stock, tools, and everything of that kind, are our stock in trade, and if we have got to combine these with our labor, and the labor of our wives and children, for an ordinary living, such as any mechanic in

our villages and cities would be ashamed of, how is a poor man who has no capital going to live by his labor alone? This, Mr. Fay, is the problem I am trying to solve. We farmers do not care to trouble ourselves about your affairs, neither do we care anything about your wild and vague speculations in regard to the hay crop or any other crop; all that we ask is, that you stop professing to be our friends, and keep your hands out of the people's treasury for the means to keep us poor. This is where we stand. We ask to be let alone. I think all the farmers of Massachusetts to-day, who have to look to their labor mainly for a support, will ask nothing more than this,—let us alone. Our crops are our labor and our capital, and when these sell for half the cost to produce them, it either makes work for the sheriff, or our children have to suffer. You have seen what has been said in regard to the law of supply and demand. This every man of the most common intelligence ought to understand. Fancy farming, and fancy farmers, without the State treasury to back them up, would be perfectly harmless of evil. Continue this tampering for another fifty years, and labor in this country is on a level with the labor of the old countries.

This gentleman to whom I have just referred is full of laudation to the institutions and the various processes which he has seen over the water. Cheap or half-paid labor enables them there to do this, and I hope never to see such in this country. There are other than four-legged cattle, both male and female, that have

peculiar charms for this class of travellers, and whose condition they desire to see established here. Their motto is, take care of the rich, and let the rich take care of the poor. How infinitely more wise it would be to leave each and every of our industrial institutions *free*, relying on the great law of supply and demand to regulate, as it surely will, better than any legislation can, all these interests where free thought and free labor is left untrammelled and uncontrolled. It is no disgrace to be born poor, — over this we have no control. Then how monstrous is the idea that inherited wealth should leave no stone unturned to make more glaring the line, and strengthen the wall, to crush the one and elevate the other.

To illustrate the position. Suppose a shoemaker could realize, over the cost of the raw material, a sufficient sum to support his family, at a cost of one dollar per day, by making five pairs shoes each day. This was when he was young, full of health, life and vigor. He neither gains nor loses anything. This is all very well as long as these conditions exist. But when old age or other calamities comes upon him, then cast him off to the poor house, which is all ready to receive him. These, in brief, are the institutions of the countries on the other side of the water, carried to their finality.

Then, again, suppose any shoemaker, by doing the same amount of work, could support his family, and lay by fifty cents per day. This would give him about $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pair more than by the other arrangement. The surplus, $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents, is to pay for the extra cost of living. Because if the shoemaker is better paid, all

other classes will be, if all labor is left free ; hence the extra cost.

Now then, it is seen that we have but little use for poor-houses, as our mechanic can take care of himself in case of adversity. This is what we want. We want when young, to be so conditioned as to be independent of the money power, and at the same time be always prepared for a "rainy day," as the saying is. Allow me to say here that these figures and calculations are just as applicable to agriculture as to shoe-making. And the reason that I did not illustrate the idea by this was that agriculture has been so mystified and distorted, that but few understand it, or any process of reasoning in regard to it. In another place, I am in hopes to be able to so simplify it, as to make it intelligible, even to the Board of Agriculture.

Who, now let me inquire, are to be the losers by the last calculation ? Suppose the same reasoning is applied to farming, viz: the farmer is getting his dollar per day for his labor, and six per cent. on his farm capital ? What will be the effect of this, and who are to be the losers ? This is the question ; and the sooner all make up their minds to meet it, the better. It will be claimed that this will raise the price of provisions. Granted. Then it will cost the poor in our cities more to live. Certainly. The rich, also, will have to share in the extra cost. That also is granted. Recollect that it was not the *price* of the potatoes that the Irishman complained of in in his own country, but the difficulty of getting the shilling to buy them with. The most important

object for us to consider now is, to stop the drain of young men from the country towns to the cities and market places. Therefore, as long as most of the conveniences of life are cheaper in the cities than in the country, a strong inducement is held out to continue this evil. But to effect this, all these difficulties that we have been considering are to be overcome. The most important of which is the idea that has got into the minds of many men, to cheapen all in their power the products of the farm. The word cheap is a comparative word. So is the word dear. Anything may with propriety be said to be cheap when it is below the cost of production. The cost of any article is the labor to produce it over the cost of the raw material. If we apply certain conditions to the soil to produce a plant, those conditions are the raw material, the cost of which is just as important for us to know, as it was for the shoe-maker to know the cost of the leather, &c., of which his shoes were made ; for without such knowledge he could not have known what his wages were. If it is argued that these conditions were in the soil and cost nothing, then let me say that that is the great fundamental error of agriculture. The word *growth* is but another word for *manufacture*, and *vice versa*. A plant is as much a manufactured article as a shoe. Each is composed of certain component parts, the one as much as the other. And it is just as absurd to suppose that you can remove the plant from the soil without detriment and compensation, as it would be to suppose that if you let the shoe go without being re-

compensated, another would take its place, and you would be none the poorer. Therefore, if we take those plants from the soil and lug them to the cities, without sufficient compensation for our labor, expenses, and to supply the raw material to make more of, we are selling our labor and capital at such prices, the tendency of which is in the end to the poor-house. If the evil stopped with us, the system would not be so deplorable. But in doing this, we are saying to our neighbor and fellow-laborer, who perhaps desires to better his condition, You have got to compete with us, and unless you have more capital or more bone and muscle, we both shall find the same end. Therefore, it seems to me that the farmer has no moral right to follow a losing business, and that this conclusion is inevitable, that because he has capital he can live even if he does work at a loss, while his poor neighbor, who has nothing, but his needs are equally as great and imperative, must suffer and die.

I say here, then, that any man or body of men who have this object in view, to cheapen any article below the cost to produce it, reckoning fairly for the labor, &c., are enemies to labor and the best interests of our country. Suppose that by a close and systematic process of reasoning some articles are found to cost double or more than the price they have usually been sold for. What of that. All those who cannot afford them, or do not desire to do so, can do without them. This is what the farmers have always done. How many farmers ever drew the cork of a champagne bottle, in

Massachusetts? Yet these are as common in some localities as the cider mug is to the farmer. A pound of good, nice rump steak, costing a shilling, and never had ought to be sold for less than twenty-five cents, has a hundred times more nutriment at per cent. cost and value.

There are more than forty bushels of grain raised in the United States to each person every year. This is more than double what they need. Beef, pork, and many kinds of vegetables are produced in excess of the demand. My position is that the supply has been forced beyond the demand to such an extent that the labor to produce them yields no return, or the capital no per cent. Hence the constant depreciation in the value of farms, and the increase of pauperism in our country towns. The system or policy that the Board of Agriculture seek to fasten upon the people, has the tendency to populate the cities and large towns at the expense of the rural districts. What the producers want is to get the largest possible amount of money for the smallest possible amount of products. If we can manage to make a profit in our business, our farms will rise in value as the general prosperity of the country advances, our aged fathers and mothers and the unfortunates generally will have something to provide for their necessities, we shall be in a condition to consume more of those articles that we do not produce, thereby giving a larger amount of employment to our brothers in other professions and trades; our poor rates will be less, and we shall take the position in society

that all good men everywhere should desire and try to hasten. Now it is plainly evident that the Board and I are at issue with each other. They say that our interests are only advanced by "increasing the crops." I say that the reverse is true. Mr. Fay says, "Increase the hay crop five times and the market price keeps up." If this is true in regard to the hay crop, it is also true in regard of all other crops. Within the last five years the cattle crop of the country has been increased by one quarter, and the coming census, I think, will show it, unless some fatality takes them off. How is it in regard to the price? I attended an auction sale last fall (1859) of a fancy farmer, and saw blood cows sold under favorable circumstances for the seller, that he said cost two years before one hundred dollars a head, for one-fourth of that sum. Native cows sold at the same time for about twenty dollars apiece, that he paid about three times that amount for. In the fall of 1856 and 1857, two year old heifers were sold in Cambridge and Brighton market for from \$30 to \$40 apiece. Last fall (1859) they were sold for from \$15 to \$20. In the spring of 1857, I sold fair cows for about \$60 apiece. I will sell as good cows now for \$30.

Mr. Fay and the Board of Agriculture know that this position is true. Increase the crops of the country five-fold and you make 50,000 paupers. The country people to-day are groaning under the oppression caused by the excess of cattle over the demand. They are literally eating the farmers up. I know that it makes beef cheap in the cities, and who does not

know that the laborers are cut short of the means to buy even at these rates, to a greater extent than usual?

I can see very well how it is that wealthy and short-sighted men, having large investments in city property, can persuade themselves to believe it to be to their advantage to keep down the laborers by inducing them to produce an excess of products, thereby rendering their labor nearly valueless. But how it is that legislators, whose duty it is to look to the interests of the whole people, should be induced to vote appropriations to effect this purpose, is a little beyond my understanding. I know it is seldom that a working man is elected to the legislature, but is there no virtue in men? has humanity and honesty all been crushed out? All fancy farmers farm at a loss. They will tell you this in private conversation. Farming to them is a mere pastime — a pleasure — a gratification — same as the bloods in our cities delight in keeping fast horses. They like to out-trot their neighbors. It draws hard on the pocket, but then they think it a harmless way to spend their money, and nobody cares anything about it. They do not ask others to engage in it, neither do they go to the legislature for means to indulge. Now if these men (the fancy) can show that they can live on the resources of their own farms, without spending what would be to a poor man a fortune, every year, then they might talk with some degree of honesty.

If I were asked the cause of the distress at the present time in the great West, I should answer the interrogatory by saying that they have for a long time sold

their farm products at much less than remunerating prices. They have not reckoned the cost, consequently they are left without the means to return to the soil the plant food of which it has been robbed. Their labor is lost, the soil is impoverished, and they have no money in the pocket. Consequently they are embarrassed, distressed, and are getting discouraged. Their Eastern friends are suffering in consequence of their inability to pay, and being obliged to compete in the market with them. If I were again asked the reason for this state of things, I should answer by referring you to the 912 Agricultural Societies in the States, embracing every State in the Union but one (Florida.) When it is known that farm products have been sold all over the country for a price insufficient to return to the soil the raw material of which they were made, (as I intend to prove in another place,) some clue to the cause of this state of things will be furnished.

If again I were asked who had been benefited by those facts, I should emphatically answer, none. The idlers and loafers in our cities undoubtedly have by this been enabled to hold their position, as they could not afford to work when the conveniences of life could be obtained at so low a rate. Although the currency of the country has nearly doubled within a few years, and most all salaried or government men have kept pace with it, yet labor has been growing cheaper. Foreign influences are at work in the country, and unless the laborers pause awhile and establish a landmark, it will be all day with them.

CHAPTER V.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, CONTINUED.

Secretary Flint—The Law—Wheat Raising Paying 200 Per Cent—Analysis of Wheat—Analysis of Manure—The Amount of Manure it Takes to Make a Bushel of Wheat—Two Acres of Rye—Oats—Corn—Commerce and Manufactures—Earnings of Wisconsin and Massachusetts—Combination of Capital and Labor—The Raw Material of which Crops are Made—Average Earnings of Farmers and Mechanics in Wisconsin—Mechanics and Farmers Earnings—A Supposition—Butter and Flour—Mr. Minus—Mrs. Minus—John and Jim—Catching a Weasel—High Prices—Peace and Prosperity.

IN his preface, page 3d, Secretary's Report, 1855, Mr. Flint says, "The plan adapted at the outset was to *exclude* from this volume all matter which was not of some general interest or value. This was evidently the contemplation of the law which required the *annual* publication of an *abstract* of the returns."

This is what the Secretary says at the commencement of the report. He thinks this was the meaning of the law. And he should exclude every thing "which was not of some general interest or value." Let us see.

On page 264 Secretary's Report, 1857, there is a statement of a man who made more than 200 per cent. on raising wheat. No wonder farmers get rich. Here is the statement.

"The land on which my wheat was raised is a clayey

FARMING AS IT IS.

loam ; it was in potatoes last year, yielding 308 bushels of the large 'Woods,' potatoes, so called, without any manure except a small handful of plaster in the hill. This spring I put on twenty loads of compost, made by stabling my cows nights, last fall ; ploughed the land twice, ploughing in the manure the last time ; sowed two bushels of red flint wheat that had been soaked in a preparation of air slacked lime and salt, for twenty-four hours. It was sown April 25th, and harvested August 11th and 12th."

Expenses of Crop.

Ploughing.....	2.00
Harrowing.....	1.00
Sowing seed and rolling.....	1.00
Half of manure to crop.....	10.00
Seed	6.00
Threshing.....	3.62
Interest on Land at \$50 per acre.....	3.00
	\$26.62

Value of Crop.

29 bushels of Wheat, at \$2.50.....	72.50
Straw estimated at.....	8.00
	\$80.50
Deduct expenses.....	26.62
Balance in favor of crop.....	\$53.88
Sept. 15, 1856. Cost per bushel, 91 $\frac{23}{100}$ cents.	

I do not intend to make any extended comments on the above statement. I introduce it here so that the reader may see for himself and judge for himself, if such statements are reliable, how they are to be reconciled with what has already been said in the preceding pages.

I now propose, after an explanation of the philosophy of fertilizers, as I understand them, and the composition of the grain of wheat, to estimate the cost of this acre of grain.

Wheat contains about 15 per cent. of water, varying a little as it has had an opportunity to dry, and 85 per cent. of solid matter.

(Dried at the temperature of 230° F.) that is, the water dried out of it, it contains :

Carbon.....	46.1 per cent.
Hydrogen	5.8 “
Oxygen.....	43.4 “
Nitrogen.....	2.3 “
Ashes.....	2.4 “
	<hr/>
	100

Now, as I understand it, these substances are the raw material out of which the wheat is manufactured. This being so, the intelligent reader will see at once the absurdity of estimating the cost of a crop by the amount of manure or plant-food applied to the soil. This has nothing to do with the cost. For a given quantity of grain or any other crop is always composed of nearly the same constituent parts, and whether we apply the fertilizer to the soil, or make the crop of the nitrogen, &c., that is already in the soil, the cost is the same. Therefore, it will be seen that all bushel measure products should be reckoned by the bushel without any regard to the amount applied as a fertilizer. For if we apply much and take little, then more remains for succeeding crops ; but if we apply little and take

much, the reverse is the case. Now all who understand this reasoning, will see the propriety of my remarks in the last chapter, in regard to the difficulties of the Western people.

This leads us to the inquiry of the cost of sufficient fertilizing material to make a bushel of grain. When this is ascertained, the cost of the crop is perfectly simple, and no one need to seriously err in the matter.

About one-seventh part of fresh excrements of a cow in milk, is solid matter, the balance water. If the water is dried out of it, it will then be composed of

Carbon.....	42.8
Hydrogen.....	5.2
Oxygen.....	37.7
Nitrogen.....	2.3
Ashes	12.0

Now if these figures are reliable, and the reasoning is correct, the mystery is solved, the road is plain, and we are already to figure up the cost of our crop. Before doing this, however, I want to say, what all successful business men know, that a margin must always be left for contingencies, somewhat proportionate to the hazardness of the business. The more risky the business, the larger the margin. The merchant whose ships plough the mighty deep, makes a larger margin for contingencies than the home dealer. Then if his ships come home safe, and are well laden, he finds on making out the balance sheet that his anticipations have been more than realized, and he sleeps all the sounder for it. But, if the storms and winds have blown adversely, he

hunts up his policies of insurance, looks over the books, drops his eye upon the margin, and congratulates himself that whoever may have been deceived, it is not No. 1.

The next thing to consider is this: what will it cost to make seven bushels of the fresh excrements of a cow? Late years I have based all my calculations upon this principle, that the manure of all animals of this class, after they are one year old, will pay for the labor to take care of them. Dr. Dana tells us that a well-fed cow will void one bushel of solid matter per day. I think that most observing farmers will agree with me in saying that this is a little too high. And as there is always some loss attending these operations, and as the farmers are just beginning to do their own figuring, and desire to keep an eye on the balance sheet, and not be deceived in the final estimate, suppose we say that all that can be saved of this material is equal to one bushel of both solid and liquid manure per day. Then the question comes up, how many cows can a man take care of to the best advantage? If this number is fixed at twenty, and a man's wages at one dollar and twenty-five cents per day, it would give us $6\frac{1}{4}$ cents for each bushel, or $6\frac{1}{4}$ times $7 = 43\frac{3}{4}$ cents as the cost of the raw material that is necessary to apply to the soil to produce a bushel of wheat.

If I am told that the plant receives a part of its nutriment from the gasses that float in the atmosphere, I should reply, whence comes these gasses. Are they

not composed and made up of the ammonia that escapes from the soil and the manure? That the philosophy of this mode of reasoning is correct, it seems to me there is no doubt. The figures can be made to vary according to circumstances. They seem to me to be nearly correct. At any rate, all farmers want some data to establish a principle with some degree of unanimity, and practice up to that, for if this looseness continues, it will not take much of a philosopher to see the end.

Dr. The Cost of a Bushel of Wheat.

One acre of land.....	
To interest.....	3.00
“ one man, one yoke oxen and plough, two days.....	4.50
“ “ boy, horse and harrow $\frac{1}{2}$ day.....	1.25
“ sowing seed and rolling.....	1.00
“ seed	6.00
“ preparing seed.....	.25
“ fencing	1.00
“ harvesting	3.00
“ threshing and winnowing.....	4.00
“ barn rent.....	1.00
“ fertilizer, at $43\frac{3}{4}$ cents per bushel of grain.....	12.69
	<hr/>
	\$37.69

Cost per bushel, $\$1.29\frac{28}{9}$ cents.

If this man got his 29 bushels of wheat, the above figures approximate pretty nearly to the cost. I have said nothing about the straw neither way. But desire to have it understood that this cannot be made of nothing any more than the grain. I have introduced the above figures more to establish a correct way of calcu-

lating the cost of crops, than for any other purpose. A crop of 29 bushels of wheat to the acre is possible, but it is more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ times above the average in this State or in the country.

RYE.

On page 186 in Mr. Flint's report, (1854,) is a statement of Mr. —, on a crop of this kind of grain.

"The land on which this crop was raised contains two acres. In 1853, it was planted with corn, and manured at the rate of twenty loads to the acre, spread on and harrowed in. After my corn was harvested, I sowed my rye, at the rate of one bushel to the acre. I harvested in July. The land was ploughed deep, and thoroughly harrowed.

Value of Crop.

50 bushels, at \$1.25.....	62.50	
Straw, by estimate.....	15.48	
	<hr/>	\$77.98

Expenses.

Seed	2.25	
Ploughing, harrowing, and sowing.....	3.50	
Harvesting and threshing.....	8.00	
Interest on land.....	12.00	
	<hr/>	\$25.75
Net profit		\$52.23

It seems that this grain cost $51\frac{1}{2}$ cents per bushel, affording a *net* profit of more than 200 per cent.

If I were to reckon the cost of this crop, I should make the figures in this way :

<i>Dr.</i>	<i>Two Acres of Rye.</i>	
To interest.	12.00	
“ one man, yoke oxen and plough, two days...	4.50	

To	one man, horse and harrow, one day.....	2.25
"	seed.....	2.25
"	sowing seed.....	.50
"	cradling.....	1.75
"	taking up and stooking.....	1.25
"	carting to barn, &c.....	.75
"	fencing.....	1.00
"	threshing and winnowing.....	6.00
"	barn rent.....	1.00
"	fertilizer, at 40 cents per bushel grain.....	20.00
		———— \$53.25

The average quantity of rye in this State is about 10 bushels to the acre of grain, and perhaps $\frac{1}{2}$ ton of straw, worth from six to ten dollars per ton, depending on locality.

OATS.

On page 93 of Mr. Secretary Flint's Report for 1855, a statement by Mr. ———, will be found in regard to this crop.

"I offer for premium a crop of oats, raised upon a piece of rather *ordinary* land, which was broken up in the fall of 1852, sown with oats in the spring of '53; the crop was fair for sward ground. It was ploughed in August following, the stubble well covered, and manured in the spring of '54 with thirty cart loads, of about fifty-five bushels each, of compost manure, twenty of which were ploughed in, the remainder put in hills and planted to corn. The crop, in consequence of droughth, was rather a light one. This spring it was well ploughed, the last of April, and sown the first day of May with four bushels of oats, well harrowed, seeded to grass and rolled. The oats were cut with a cradle the 4th of August, threshed and winnowed the 10th, and found to measure seventy-eight bushels, two of which were weighed, and found to weigh thirty-two pounds each.

Value of crop at 66 cents per bushel, 45 of which I sold for that price, in August last.....	\$51 68
Thirty hundred of straw, at least.....	10 00

Total.....	\$61 68
------------	---------

The cost of raising said crop was as follows : —

To one day's work of myself and yoke of oxen.....	\$3 00
Cost of seed, at 80 cents per bushel.....	3 20
To one day's work of myself, man and one yoke of oxen, sowing, harrowing, and rolling.... ..	3 00
To cradling, binding, getting in.....	3 00
To threshing, cleaning, etc.....	3 00
	<hr/>
	\$15 20

Profit of crop.....	\$46 48
---------------------	---------

Thus it seems, according to our friend's figures, his oats cost him $6\frac{5}{8}$ cents per bushel, taking out the straw according to his estimate; and as he can sell them, and did sell part of them at the price named, making a comfortable little *profit* of about *one thousand* per cent. If he did not get the premium, it was not because he did not deserve it, for if they have got any smarter men down there in old Essex, I pity the honest ones.

I believe I shall not make any figures in this place on the cost of this crop, as the reader must understand pretty well how they would stand, and I do not wish to weary him. I would say, however, that oats contain about 20 per cent. of water, rye 16, wheat 15.

The analysis of this grain, according to Boussingault, is :

Carbon.....	50.7
Hydrogen.....	6.4
Oxygen.....	36.7
Nitrogen.....	2.2
Ashes.....	4.0

A bushel of oats weighs 32 pounds, and it takes about 25 cents' worth of fertilizing matter, according to this theory, to make them.

CORN.

On page 176, Report of 1854, will be found the following statement :

“ Having entered my name as a competitor for the premium offered by you for the best field of Indian corn of not less than three acres, I now proceed to give an account of my management and expenses. The field upon which the corn grew contains about three and one-fourth acres of land ; it was ploughed from green sward in the fall of 1853, it then having been in grass about five years, without any manure after it was laid down. The soil is a sandy loam. I commenced drawing manure about the first of May, and drew on thirty-nine cart loads, of thirty-five bushels each, which I put in the hill. I then furrowed it three feet six inches apart, and on the 10th, planted it with flesh-colored and yellow corn, putting five kernels in the hill ; it was cultivated and weeded out about the 20th of June, and then cultivated twice after.

Expenses.

Manure, thirty-nine cart loads.....	\$40 00
Drawing the same.....	7 00
Ploughing, \$2 per acre.....	6 50
One and one-fourth bushels.....	1 50
Planting	10 00
Hoeing and cultivating for the season.....	10 00
	<hr/>
	\$75 00
Deduct half of the expense of manure for future crops...	20 00
	<hr/>
Profit	\$55 00

How this man arrives at the conclusion that he has made a profit of \$55, is the greatest puzzle I have

come to yet. He does not say that he got any corn at all, not so much as a pig ear, yet he is very sure that he has made a profit, as above stated. And I presume he got the premium. Any man that can cultivate and produce $3\frac{1}{4}$ acres of corn "for the season," for the sum of \$23.50, a little more than \$7 per acre, ought to have a premium, (over the left) if he did not get so much as a husk.

Mr. Flint says that he did not intend to use the people's money to crowd upon the community a worthless article, and he thinks the law so construes it; yet we find the people taxed to the tune of more than \$6,500 to forestall public opinion, by issuing such documents in profusion among the people, the contents of which would make even "Sinbad the sailor" blush in his palmiest days. I know Mr. Flint does not say these things himself, but he publishes many thousand copies, and sends them all over the State, and perhaps the country, circulating them among all classes of people, year after year, thereby inducing people to engage in a business which is not sufficiently remunerative to afford to pay boys of various ages from 12 to 21 years, "anything like five cents per day," when they board and clothe themselves. Now I want in candor to ask Mr. Flint how this is, admitting that those boys were bad, and knew but little about the business, when he had help enough to control them, plenty of land to work upon, and a variety of soil, crops and labor to engage in, with a ready market at the door for all that was or could be produced, and yet they could earn

nothing, or so near it that a five cent piece would have to be divided to settle with them? If these boys could earn nothing, I do not see how other folks' boys, who are less favorably circumstanced, can do so well as the above figures indicate. I have no doubt, myself, that what Mr. Flint said about the boys was nearly correct, and refer to it in this connection merely that the reader may see at a single glance the gross exaggeration of the figures which are here instituted in regard to the estimates on the various crops.

I know of my own knowledge, that I have seldom been able to earn anything, on either the grain, the cattle, or the root crops, and for the reason that there is most always a surplus in the market, sufficiently large that the competition keeps them down, nearly to the per cent. on the capital and the cost of the raw material of which they are made. Farming is full of pleasures to those who have money to spend; so is horse-racing, and many other amusements, such as theatres, dancing, and the like; but the question which ought to interest us is, how are the poor going to live by it?

A large majority of the business of Massachusetts pays an annual dividend of less than fifteen per cent.; some, perhaps more than that, but comparatively but little of this. Yet we find that thousands of men, with millions of capital, are ready to embark in it at these rates, while farming, according to these reports, often pays a dividend of several hundred per cent., and yet the business needs to be propped up at an expense of more than a hundred thousand dollars every

year in this State alone, to keep it from languishing and dying. If farming is more profitable than other kinds of business, then the farming States would earn more than the commercial and manufacturing; would they not? This must be conclusive. Then Vermont would earn more than Massachusetts, Wisconsin more than Vermont. Certainly. According to the last census reports, the latter State (Wisconsin) earned forty-six dollars to each person, Vermont seventy, and Massachusetts seventy-two. Now it is well known that Massachusetts has a much larger relative population who earn nothing than either of the other States. Therefore, if the earnings could be divided among the workers as it should be in a comparison of this kind, (but we have no data for this) undoubtedly Massachusetts would exceed Wisconsin three-fold, and Vermont very considerably more than these figures make it.

According to the last census, the following table will give a condensed view of the population and earnings of the States to which I have referred:

WISCONSIN.

Population, 305,391. Products and value of industry:

4,286,131 bushels wheat, at \$1 00....	\$4,286,131
3,414,672 " oats, at 30 cents.....	1,034,401
1,988,979 " corn, at 50 cents.....	994,489
1,402,956 " potatoes, at 25 cents.....	350,739
278,662 tons hay, at \$6 00.....	1,659,972
3,633,750 pounds butter, at 15 cents.....	545,061
400,283 " cheese, at 7 cents.....	28,019
253,963 " wool, at 40 cents.....	101,585
Slaughtered animals valued at.....	920,178

Garden and orchard products.....	36,965
Other agricultural products not specified.....	357,076
	<hr/>
Home manufactures.....	\$10,314,616
	43,624
Products of manufactures, the arts, &c., exclusive of the raw material.....	3,878,137
	<hr/>
Total products.....	\$14,236,377

VERMONT.

Population, 314,120. Products and value of industry:

535,955 bushels wheat, at \$1 50....	\$803,932
2,307,734 " oats, at 40 cents.....	923,093
2,032,396 " corn, at \$1 00.....	2,032,396
4,951,014 " potatoes, at 40 cents..	1,980,405
866,153 tons hay, at \$10 00.....	8,661,530
12,137,980 pounds butter, at 20 cents.....	2,437,596
8,720,834 " cheese, at 8 cents.....	697,666
6,349,357 " maple sugar, at 10 cents.....	634,935
3,400,717 " wool, at 40 cents.....	1,360,286
104,649 bushels peas and beans, at \$1 50..	156,973
Slaughtered animals valued at.....	1,861,336
Garden and orchard products.....	34,108
Other agricultural products not specified.....	457,567
	<hr/>
	\$22,341,823
Home manufactures	267,710
Products of manufactures, the arts, &c., exclusive of the raw material.....	3,569,543
	<hr/>
Total product	\$26,179,076

MASSACHUSETTS.

Population, 994,514. Products and value of industry:

3,585,384 bushels potatoes, at 50 cents.....	\$1,792,692
481,021 " rye, at \$1 00.....	481,021
1,165,146 " oats, at 50 cents.....	582,573

2,345,490 bushels corn, at \$1 00.....	2,345,490
112,385 " barley, at 70 cents.....	78,669
43,709 " peas and beans, at \$1 50.....	65,563
665,807 tons hay, at 10 00	6,518,070
8,071,370 pounds butter, at 20 cents.....	1,614,274
7,088,142 " cheese, at 9 cents.....	637,932
795,525 " maple sugar, at 10 cents.....	79,552
138,246 " tobacco, at 12½ cents	16,589
585,136 " wool, at 40 cents.....	234,054
Slaughtered animals valued at.....	2,500,924
Garden and orchard products.....	1,064,015
Other agricultural products not specified.....	153,953
	<hr/>
	\$18,165,371
Home manufactures	205,333
Products of manufactures, the arts, &c., exclusive of the raw material.....	65,280,374
	<hr/>
Total products.....	\$83,651,078

I think that by a careful examination of these figures, we shall be able to get at a more comprehensive view of the great and fundamental errors existing in regard to agriculture, than what has heretofore been made to appear.

My object is to show, taking the figures of the last census as above, that while trade and manufactures pays a living profit over a reasonable per cent. on the capital invested, agriculture yields scarce a living profit, when these (capital and labor) are combined, proving conclusively that no man can live by agriculture alone, only at the great sacrifice of the reasonable conveniences of life. Therefore, nearly all farmers must take one of these positions : either yield all per cent. on his

capital, bring in to his aid the labor and capital of others, or fail. These are the reasons. All trades but the farmers, in estimating the cost of their products, in the first place estimate the cost of the raw material, and over this, either by their own labor, or the profits of the labor of others, live, or accumulate. Whereas, the farmers in their estimates, reckon nothing for the raw material, only expecting pay for the labor performed, till their farms become exhausted, and then labor and the raw material which they are obliged to supply comes in direct competition with the *labor alone* of all who act upon the principle of cropping the soil, without returning to it the elements of plant life, and to their horror, in a few short years find that their soil refuses to yield but a scanty return, and they are without the means of supplying them.

All those who have studied these statistics carefully will see that all their estimates are based upon these principles. The labor alone of one class is reckoned over the cost of the base of that labor, while it is presumed that the base of all agricultural products is supplied by some magic power, a miracle having been wrought, and something is made of nothing. Infinite Wisdom has nowhere taught this. By means all His purposes are effected. A miracle is no more performed in the production of a grain crop, than in a shoe crop. If by the manufacture of one, a man can subsist, why not by the other? If by estimating the cost of a pair of shoes, a part is made to go to the cost of the raw material, equally so should it be with

a bushel of grain, or anything that comes out of the ground.

In these calculations, I think I can afford to be generous, and then leave a large margin, which my friends on the other side will find some difficulty in supplying.

WISCONSIN.

Total agricultural products, 1850, \$10,314,616. Total manufacturing, mining, and the mechanic arts, exclusive of raw material, \$3,921,761. If we double this sum, we should then have a total value of all the manufacturing, mining, and the mechanic arts in the State, supposing the value of the raw material to be equal to the labor applied, making \$7,843,522. Now the two estimates stand equal, making a grand total of \$18,158,138, as the whole value of her industry, raw material included. But the intelligent reader will see that this is giving about double what it ought to as the earnings of a single year. For this raw material in each of the estimates is capital, or past earnings, and ought to be so divided in all census returns, in order to form a correct estimate of the yearly industry of the State. I have placed it in this form in order that a true parallel may be drawn, as the census has the estimate in regard to manufactures, &c., correctly given, and not, as I think, in regard to agriculture, inasmuch as it has made no allowance for the raw material of which those articles are composed. If we allow thirty per cent. only on the agricultural estimates as properly belonging to the farmers' capital, and not

to the earnings of the year, we should then have \$3,094,384 to return to the soil that which we have taken from it, out of which another crop can be made ; and by practicing upon this principle, we keep up the fertility of the soil, and represent truly this branch of the industry of the State.

Now then, we come to a correct estimate of the yearly earnings of the agriculturists of the State, viz : \$7,220,232.

Now if we suppose that $\frac{5}{6}$ of all the people of the State get their support mainly from the soil, and $\frac{1}{6}$ from other pursuits, we can then easily arrive at the average earnings of each class. The population would then stand, agriculturists, 254,493 ; all others, 50,898. This would give to each person, other than agriculturists, \$77.22, or to each family of six persons, \$463.32, as a yearly support.

Assuming these figures to be correct, the farmers would earn \$28.37 to each person, or \$170.22 to each family of six persons. Giving to the traders, manufacturers, mechanics, &c., nearly three times as much as to the agriculturists. Proving conclusively, that in the West as in the East, the farmers get but a meagre support by their earnings.

The valuation of all the property of the State in 1850, was \$42,056,595. If we suppose that \$36,000,000 of this sum to be property yielding revenue, and consequently ought to pay a per cent., and that \$6,000,000 is invested in manufactures, and \$30,000,000 in farms and farm property, and we charge interest to each of

these interests, pro rata, it would give us as the average earnings of each class: farmers, \$20.12, to each person, or \$120.72 to each family of six persons; mechanics, &c., \$68.81, or \$412.86 to each family of six persons. Interest reckoned at 7 per cent.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Continuing the same process in this State, we have total Agricultural products, \$18,165,371. In regard to slaughtered animals, it must be borne in mind that a large per cent. of these are the products of other States, and ought not to be credited to this account. If we allow to other States and Provinces of this sum, \$2,000,000, we should then have as the Agricultural products of this State, \$16,165,371. Now if we allow thirty per cent. of this as capital, or past earnings, we should then have as the earnings of the year, exclusive of the raw material, \$11,315,760. The statistics give us as a total value of all the farms and farm property in the State, the sum of \$120,000,000, in round numbers. This was in 1850. The last ten years has reduced the sale value of this property at least \$10,000,000. If any one thinks differently in regard to this, I have no objection. I prefer to look at things as they are, and stand upon that. Statistics are the exponents of individual opinion, to a great degree, although they are valuable, and should be studied more than they are.

Now we have as interest on this sum, \$6,600,000, taken from the gross earnings, would leave \$4,715,760,

as the true earnings of the farmers of the State in one year for labor. In 1855, there were 57,031 farmers and gardeners in the State over 15 years old. This sum would give to each, \$82.60, or \$20.65 to each individual, calling this 57,031 one-fourth part of all the population depending on Agriculture for a support. Being 53 cents only, more than the average earnings to each person of this class in Wisconsin.

MANUFACTURES.

By the same census it seems that all the earnings of this class over and above the raw material used, was \$35,485,707. Total capital invested, \$83,357,642. Hands employed, 165,938. Deduct interest from capital invested, it would leave \$364.00 to each hand, or \$91.00 to each member of the family, calling this 165,938 mechanics one-fourth part of all who depend upon this kind of business for a support.

Thus it seems that poorly as the trades fare in this State, they earn more than four times as much as the farmers, and proving conclusively by figures and facts, which seem to me to be impregnable, that it is only by counting capital with labor in this branch of human industry, that we can subsist. Thereby driving from the farm all who have little or no capital, into the service of those who have money to spend. Whatever view we take of the subject, either by plain figures or by comparative reasoning, the same results appear. I want here to fully impress it upon the minds of all farmers, if they cannot see in these two considerations

which I have been examining, viz., the raw material and per cent. on the capital invested, a sufficient reason for the state of things that exists.

I know the great difficulty of seeing what seems to be against our interests. We all have to buy of others more or less, those things which we do not produce. Therefore there seems to be some reason to try to keep down the price, because we have our minds so fixed upon the cost of all articles of consumption which we do not produce, not thinking that if others sell cheap we must sell cheaper. If a man bought more than he sold, and had outside means, and only sought his immediate interest to the sacrifice of the future, then there would be some reason for this, but we should sell more than we buy, else we are growing poorer. I have made one or two attempts to illustrate this, but lest all may not have understood me, I will draw another parallel.

Suppose a farmer of the above class, whom we will name Mr. Minus, meets his wife, Mrs. Minus, at the breakfast table, and the following interesting conversation ensues :

Mrs. Minus — “George, we have been out of flour for nearly a week, and it is a good day to-day, and what say to going up to the village and get a barrel?”

Mr. Minus — “Hang the village, and all the tribe of sharpers in it. I asked old Shrewd the other day, what he sold flour for, and don’t you think, he told me ten dollars, and I warrant you it was none of the best. I saw neighbor Joggle come along, and he had

been to the city and bought a barrel for eight dollars, and you know that Mrs. Joggle is mighty nice about all she has to eat. I am going to buy as cheap as anybody, — I am hard to beat on that.”

“Well, well,” says Mrs. Minus, “I don’t blame you a bit, — your money is as good as anybody’s; and if Joggle can buy for eight dollars, I think you can too, and let old Shrewd go. He has got enough out of you, already. And while I think of it, Mrs. Neat was in here yesterday, and she said she got 25 cents for butter, a few days ago, and I know I can make as good butter as she can. You know we have had two tubs laid by all winter for a price. And I think you had better take the butter and go to the city and buy your flour, sell the butter, and make your own profits.”

“John, my boy, harness the pony,” says Mr. Minus, “I’ve got an idea in my head. Bring up the butter, Jim. ‘A penny saved is worth two pence earned.’”

Mrs. Minus — “Don’t be so excited, George; eat a good hearty breakfast; — perhaps you won’t get anything more till night. And while I think of it, I want you to recollect that we are out of most everything. I hardly know where to begin, for you know just as sure as you go to the city, and it gets round that you have sold the butter, there will be a whole tribe here; the Jones’ and the Browns, and I don’t know who. So you see how it is. Flour is one thing, and then there is sugar, tea, coffee, spices, in fact, it is a good deal easier to tell what we don’t want than what we do. So buy anything almost that you see into Smith’s or Ham’s,

dry goods or wet, — you can hardly mistake on that score. And I wouldn't stop at Shrewd's at all, he will want to get the butter away from you for some of his stuff, and you know you can get anything he has got any time; butter or no butter, he is always glad to trust. And I think when anybody has got anything *real good* they had always ought to go to the city with it, where folks know something. And by the way, had you not better let John go with you, he has ciphered clear to the rule of three, and you are so easily excited, and think that because you are so honest, everybody else is? I know Smith nor Jones, nor none of that class, would not cheat you, but perhaps they won't want the butter, and you may have to go some where else."

Mr. Minus — "I can do my own figuring, as yet. If a man gets round me this day he is smart, that's all. You see to the cattle, boys, look after the pigs, carry home Jones' wheelbarrow and the ladder, get in the wood, and if old Dunn comes up here, don't tell him about the butter, and keep a sharp look out for Scriggins' sheep, keep them out of the field lot, and the brindle heifer might as well stay where she is. Now I am 'oph,'" whistling the tune of "catch a weasel asleep."

Mr. Shrewd — "Good morning, Mr. Minus; going to the city? What you got here, butter? The collector is in the store, and he wants to see you."

Collector — "Mr. Minus, how is it about your tax, the treasurer is dunning me up, says the schools are

about closing, and he is as dry as a last years' bird's nest."

Mr. Minus — "I'll see you when I come back, about the tax. What do you pay for butter, *Mr. Shrewd*?" "We like to buy for 20,—how is yours? Good, I dare say!" "Fair."

Mr. Minus drives up to *Smith's* on C. street. "Ah, *Mr. Minus*," says *Smith*, "what can we do for you to-day?" "What do you pay for butter?" "We have been paying 20." "I want a quarter," says *Minus*. "Well, if you want a barrel of flour, perhaps we can trade." "What do you ask for flour?" "We are selling the best for ten." "Joggle told me he bought for eight a few days ago." "Very well; he paid in butter at 20. We will let you have the same for seven, and take your butter at 20, same as we paid Joggle." "The best kind of flour, do you mean?" says *Minus*. "Certainly, the very best." "'Tis done!" says *Minus*. "That is a trade!" Out went the flour, and in went the butter.

"There is 100 pounds of the butter, you say." "Yes, just a hundred." "There will be thirteen dollars coming to you, *Mr. Minus*; what will you have that in?" "You mean what will I have that out of," says *Mr. Minus*, much elated at his sagacity. "Well, any way to suit." "Well, I don't care if the rest comes out of the money drawer." "We expected to pay the balance in goods." "That want the bargain." "O, well, if you insist on the money, you can have it." So the money was counted out, and a prouder chap is

seldom seen than our hero. So he started for home, congratulating himself on his successes.

In the first place, he had bought his flour for seven dollars, and made three dollars on that, and then, on a sly, he had got a cash balance, and outwitted Smith, the trader.

He stopped at the village to pay his tax, — counted out the thirteen dollars, which left a balance of two dollars unpaid, and then started for home. After supper, and everything was arranged for a social chat, and he (Minus) had become somewhat calmed down, he thought to break his boys in, in cutting their “eye-teeth” while young. So he commenced to unfold to the family the transactions of the day, highly elated, occasionally striking his favorite tune, “catch a weasel,” &c.

“Now, my boys, take the slate and pencil and figure up what I have made.” “Well, father, what was your first offer?” “Well, if I would pay him (Smith) ten-dollars for the flour, he would give me 25 cents for the butter. But do you suppose I would give that for flour when I could get it a dollar less than Joggle, and three dollars less than he first asked for it, and then he thought he was going to pay me all out of the store, and I fixed him on that too.” “Tell me the whole, and I’ll figure it all up.” “Certainly.”

“Well, father, I believe I understand it. If he had allowed 25 cents for the butter, it would have amounted to 25 dollars for the hundred pounds.” “Yes, yes, but I had got to pay ten dollars for the flour.” “Keep

cool, dad, and I'll figure it all up. 20 cents for the butter, left you thirteen dollars, reckoning the flour at seven. But if you had got twenty-five dollars for the butter, and the flour had been ten dollars, which taken from the twenty-five would have left fifteen dollars, and fifteen is two more than thirteen. So I do not see but what you lost two dollars by the operation. Just enough to have paid the balance on the taxes," "or would have got," says Mrs. Minus, "nearly all of those little articles that we wanted." Minus stops whistling and drums on the table with his fingers.

Mr. Minus, (pettishly,) — "How was it with Joggle, — he paid one dollar more than I did?"

John — "Well, it took just 40 pounds of butter to pay for the barrel of flour, and it did not make any difference what the price was as long as one balanced the other. It would have made no difference with you if your butter had only paid for the flour, but all the excess of butter over the value of the flour, was a loss of nearly four cents a pound, or two dollars on the sixty pounds."

Mr. Minus — "Well, boys, it is about time to go to bed." [Exit boys, reflecting on the appropriateness of the old gent's name.]

Mrs. Minus — "Just as I expected. Minus of most of the useful things of life for the want of a little calculation!"

The reader will see by this simile the importance of keeping the prices up, to all who sell more than they buy. To those, also, who buy more than they sell, I

hold it is equally important to keep prices up, for when prices of labor comes down to the standard of the old countries, the per cent. on capital will come down with it. If it is claimed that these things cannot be controlled, I should say that I do not want to control it. I desire that labor, as far as legislation is concerned, should be left free ; let the law of supply and demand have its effect on society, and although we must perhaps be governed, to some extent, by the price of labor in other countries, yet let us not hasten this equality by pursuing a blind policy. If it is claimed that we do not legislate to cramp labor in this country, I should say for what other purpose is all this legislation in regard to Agricultural Societies, extending to every State in the Union but one, and most of the Territories, but to keep down the price of all Agricultural products, and as those represent labor, therefore labor has to suffer.

All those who are trying to keep down the price of what they have to buy, are like "Mr. Minus ;" got their minds so fixed on this, thinking how shrewd they are, when all the time they are cutting their own fingers, and in the end find that somebody has cyphered them out of their butter. Let the prices rule high, then the laborer gets a good support, the idle will have to go to work, pauperism will decrease, the soil will increase in value as the means of living rise, Boards of Agriculture will be among the things that were, and peace and prosperity will again reign in the land.

I have several times spoken of the habits and char-

acter of the men who are principally or prominently interested in moving the machinery by which the various Agricultural Societies, Boards of Agriculture, &c., are sustained. Here is a short extract taken from an address before the Middlesex North Agricultural Society, by B. F. Sherman, Esq.

“The subject of an address before an Agricultural Society upon its annual exhibition day should have some connection with agriculture; but the speaker ought to know that whereof he doth affirm. And it seems presumptuous for one who can hardly tell a field of growing rye from a field of oats, or wheat from barley, and who cannot tell a Devonshire cow from an Ayrshire, or a Durham, or any imported breed from a native, to address a society of practical farmers and stock-growers. And what can he tell you about the labor-saving of improved corn cultivators, who has never wielded the hoe long enough to have the back-ache, — or about mowing machines, who has never cut grass enough with a scythe for one horse baiting? Nor can fruit culture be learned from one who knows nothing about it. Ye cannot gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles.”

In this extract the speaker talks like an honest man. He says he knows nothing about the business. He has never “hoed long enough to have the back-ache,” and is perfectly inexperienced in all other kinds of farm work. Yet these men, above all others, are the men to talk to farmers, and tell them all about what a profitable business it is, — how noble, how intelligent they are, and all that.

Suppose Mr. Sherman wanted authority for deciding a legal point in controversy of considerable import,

would he go to some farmer's calendar, or to Blackstone? No more ridiculous is one idea than the other. He knows he is fond of rump steak and plum pudding, and perhaps thinks if he can get them cheap, he is the richer. I think he is the poorer.

Now let us see what he says to the farmers, because if he is going to talk, he must say something, of course.

“A plant now prominently before the community, is the *dioscorea batatis*, or Chinese yam or potatoe. No root has been on exhibition to-day, and so far as I know, no farmer of this society has attempted its cultivation. The statement made with regard to this plant, that it is everywhere cultivated in China, and affords the chief alimentary support of its vast population greatly surprised me, and has caused me to give the subject considerable attention.

Mr. Prince, of Flushing, L. I., is principally concerned in introducing this esculent. Desiring of ascertaining the truth of the assertion regarding its extensive use as food by the Chinese, I wrote to Mr. Prince, that in all treatises upon China within my reach, no mention was made of the plant, and asked for the authority for his statement. In answer, he refers to various publications, but principally to translations in French, of five large Chinese Agricultural works. If time permitted, I would read his entire letter, as it would certainly interest you. He says: ‘Your State Agricultural Society, last year, awarded a premium for 1000 bushels of carrots to the acre, and as this root is larger and longer than the carrot, I verily believe that 1000 bushels may be relied on as a regular crop. I will name to you one thing more, viz: manure—manure in quantity is absolutely injurious to the root. I have not this year put any on my three acres, and I do believe that a heavy crop could be produced on the sandy barrens of New Jersey, and on the poorest and most neglected lands of your State.’

The advantages of this esculent, as claimed, are: That it is perfectly hardy during our severest winters; that it is more nutritious than any plant we possess; that it is highly agreeable to the taste—superior to the common potatoe, which it must soon supersede; that its product is so abundant as to render it much cheaper than any other food; that its culture is easy and simple. A kitchen garden, say fifteen feet square, would grow the entire food of a family of seven, with an overplus for company use.

The agricultural press of this country has, in general, ridiculed the pretensions of Mr. Prince. It is unfortunate, if the plant is really valuable, that a more moderate course has not been adopted in bringing it before the public. If, in fact, it is in extensive use in China, and is nutritious and palatable, it will certainly be soon cultivated with us. My opinion can be of no value to you, but I will state the following facts:

French agricultural reports (some of them, at least) are extravagant in its praise.

The two last of our Patent Office Reports make highly favorable mention of it.

The United States Agricultural Society, at Philadelphia, last year, reported in its favor."

This is what Mr. Sherman says. A kitchen garden fifteen feet square is going to produce the entire food of a family, and have some to spare. Then the Bible declaration, "By the sweat of your face shall you eat bread," is revoked; is it not? Because a family of seven can cultivate a field of this size without sweating much, or having the "back-ache." Then what would Mr. Sherman make this crop out of, as "manure is injurious" in any considerable quantity? The common flat turnip contains more than 92 per cent. of water, and no man can live on that for any considerable time; yet this must be a good deal less nutritive

than that, if it can be made in a "sand-bank." What a blessing to the world it would have been had our lecturer lived at a former period; how many "back-aches" might have been saved.

On page 178 and 179 of Mr. Flint's Report is a statement of a farmer in Hopkinton, which would be a remarkable production, if found anywhere else. Our farmer, it seems, was after a premium on a crop of $43\frac{1}{2}$ rods of carrots. He says:

"Owing to the short and cold season, I have not had *so small a crop for three years*. There have been carrots raised on the same land for the last ten or eleven years, and my crops have improved in *quantity and quality each year*."

My friend, according to his statement, (and in order that there may be no possibility of a doubt in regard to it, brings forward a neighbor, who over his own signature certifies to the fact,) says that his crop amounted to 251 bushels. This is at the rate of nearly 1,000 bushels to the acre, and it is claimed to be the smallest crop that has grown on the land for three years. Does your neighbor certify to this fact, also? If this is true, and your neighbor swears to it, what do you mean when you say that "My crops (carrots) have improved in *quantity and quality each year*?"

According to this statement, the whole cost of the carrots was \$21.10, and the income from the sales \$76.80, making a profit of more than 250 per cent. At this rate, Hopkinton ought to be a remarkably thrifty town, and carrot raising so lucrative a business

that a fortune might be made every year. I most wonder that more attention has not been directed to this locality, as it seems that my friend commenced this business about the time of the breaking out of the gold mania in that distant and then inhospitable country, California. And I am very sure that but few gold diggers can show any such profits as this, after all their labor and privation.

Now let us see how extensively our Hopkinton friends have gone into this business, and how rich it has made them. For the benefit of all who may desire to emigrate to this town, I will say that it is a large territorial precinct, in the southwest corner of Middlesex County, Mass. In 1855, the population was 3,934; the valuation in 1850 was \$887,091.50. The people are to a great extent engaged in manufactures of many kinds. The shoe business takes the lead. The statistics do not show an average amount or yield of agricultural products. For instance, the yield of Indian corn was 29 bushels to the acre; wheat $1\frac{1}{4}$ acres, $12\frac{4}{5}$ bushels per acre; rye, $31\frac{1}{2}$ acres, $6\frac{88}{100}$ bushels per acre; barley, $2\frac{3}{4}$ acres, $14\frac{54}{100}$ bushels per acre; oats, $109\frac{1}{2}$ acres, $22\frac{96}{100}$ bushels per acre; potatoes, $205\frac{1}{2}$ acres, $82\frac{48}{100}$ bushels per acre; onions, $\frac{1}{4}$ acre; carrots, $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres, 550 bushels per acre. Total value of carrots, \$232.

Thus it will be seen that what thrift there is in the town does not come from its agriculture.

Take the 1,500 shoemakers from the place, and would carrots bring 30 cents per bushel, or could a

man make milk from them at a profit? This is what should more deeply interest my friend, for of what use is a surplus of agricultural products, without neighbors to consume them? Although this would be considered a poor town, yet that is of itself no evidence of poverty among the masses of the people. For if my friend can sell carrots at a profit of 250 per cent., let me say that it is not the rich who pay these prices, nor those who herald forth the immense profits of agriculture, for they in their *kindness* for the farmer, keep runners to hang upon the corners of the streets to catch some luckless market man, who, tired and weary, is in a fit mood to dispose of his load for a song. These are the men who subscribe to the guarantee funds, and think they are promoting the farmer's interest by reducing the value of his products to starvation prices.

"I can sell them (carrots) quick for 30 cents per bushel. I would recommend all who can, to cultivate this valuable root every year." Suppose, friend, that the business was prosecuted somewhat extensively, would that be likely to reduce the profits any? Try it; say, plant half an acre, and see what effect that has upon the profit. And then, instead of "declining to sell them at all," let it be known that you want to dispose of them, and actually sell them, and when you have the cash in your hand, you can then calculate upon the *profit* full as *accurately* as when they are in the cow manger. It is customary in taking account of stock to estimate all goods unsold at cost, if they are worth cost, if not, at what they will sell for. This is

among all that class of people who believe truth to be better than error, — who do not care to deceive themselves, nor any one else, — who, when they make a statement, would consider it an insult to be required to get the affidavit of a neighbor to substantiate it.

The records of your town show that farming has *not* been a *profitable* business ; that what thrift there is, is from the earnings of mechanical industry ; and were it not for this, your goods would have to be carted to market, and then sold at a price that would change the balance to the other side. These are the things I would have all farmers consider, for the mere accident of inheriting a farm should neither make or destroy the manhood of a free American citizen.

Such statements as I have in all kindness noticed above, can in no wise benefit the farmer, for if the people considered them reliable, a farm in Hopkinton would not go a begging at a price a little above the value of the improvements. And if those who have been instrumental in manufacturing a public opinion, which has induced all that class of statements to which I have taken the liberty to refer, believed *that* would benefit the farmer, it would be among the last things of their lives to consummate. They want to make the price of living cheap in our cities, as that induces thrift there, and increases their dividends. This, with them, is a regular business transaction, as much so as the "*bears* and *bulls*" in their note shaving and stock jobbing operations ; and if any farmer wants any more evidence of the facts, I hope he will lose no time to

see them as they are at their own homes, and not trust much to the papers, whose business it is to puff them and their policy into the kind embraces of the unsophisticated farmer.

And the sooner the farmers make up their minds to believe this view of the matter, and practice up to this belief, taking all necessary time to investigate and elucidate for themselves, without any regard to what "Mrs. Grundy" has to say, the better it will be for them, for their children, for humanity, for liberty, for the principles of our fathers, and for, at a future period, *Old America*.

SCIENTIFIC AND EDUCATIONAL.

This is the heading of the Act under which the Board obtain their appropriations for current, traveling, incidental, and *other necessary* expenses. "*Scientific and Educational*." Science — knowledge; collection of general principles on any subject.—*Webster*. Science — three thousand dollars' worth of manure, "run to waste, because the State did *not* make an '*appropriation*' to enable a man, boy and horse to transport it to the field." — *Board of Agriculture*. Educational — pertaining to education. — *Webster*. Educational — the philosophy of attraction, cohesion, that one object has for another of the same affinity, as the pocket to the treasury. — *Board of Agriculture*.

Educational and scientific combined — a lean peasantry, a fat aristocracy. — *State House farmers*.

CHAPTER VI.

THE AGRICULTURAL PRESS.

A Boston Farmer—Figures and Farming—Following a Phantom—“The New England Farmer”—An Article on how to Reckon the Cost of Farm Products—The Manure for an Acre of Corn—Editor New England Farmer—His Article—Note to the Editor—His Reply—Miller Rule—Article of Aug. 20, 1859—Reply to the Editor—The Farmers must Conquer their Prejudices—Cunning and Friendship—Agriculture in 1800—Questions to the Farmers—Labor to Cultivate an Acre of Corn—New England Not all a Sandbank—Amount of Corn to the Acre.

IN order to do full justice to the subject upon which I am engaged, it will be necessary here to say a word or two about myself.

About the year 1840, a gentleman went from Boston up into a very quiet and pleasant town in the interior of the Granite State, and purchased what had been considered a very productive and desirable farm of about one hundred and thirty acres. He took hold of farming with a good deal of enthusiasm, expecting to improve on the old style of practices in that section, by introducing what some termed “Boston notions.” After making some improvements on the buildings, trees, &c., by the expenditure of considerable sums, and by bringing the land into suitable condition for successful operations, and waiting patiently for some returns for the outlay, all the time keeping the figures of expen-

diture (as he was a good accountant) in view, and when the first rotation of crops failed to represent suitable returns for the outlay, yet hoping the succeeding ones to somewhat change the balance; and after a few years of enthusiastic effort to get returns at all adequate to the expenditure, he backed right square down, coming to the conclusion that farming and figuring had no relation to each other, and could not travel the same road in harmony.

Of course our friend was in a few years ready as thousands of others are to sell out. After several years of unsuccessful parleying, he found a customer in the writer of these pages.

It so happens that every man that goes to farming from some other business, thinks he can see exactly the rock upon which others split. And it very much depends upon the length of his purse, his enthusiasm, and his bump of "don't-like-to-give-it-up-so, Mr. Brown," to determine the time required to ascertain he has been following a phantom.

In the year 1851, the writer left a tolerable business to engage in "*the business*" of farming. A few years took the starch all out of his enthusiasm, as furnishing a prospective realization of the embryo fortune which was only well commenced. The location was then at fault. Who could expect to farm successfully away from the large markets, from railroads, agricultural societies, Boards of Agriculture, blood stock, wood markets, and fancy farming generally. So the writer made up his mind to leave the hills, rocks, and unyielding

soil of New Hampshire, go down into the old Bay State, where folks farm by the "card." After spending considerable time and a little money in "prospecting," he finally came to the conclusion that the old town of Chelmsford furnished the most desirable site within his means, for returning a moderate reward for the capital and labor bestowed. And to-day, after eight or nine years of farming, the writer thinks that on this farm he can produce the various farm products, such as the several grains and root crops, hay, &c., at as little cost of labor and capital, as can be produced upon any farm within his knowledge. He is equally sure that no man of ordinary strength and physical ability, can keep up the fertility of the soil, the buildings and fences in condition, pay the taxes, insurance, &c. &c., and get six per cent. on the capital, by the whole waste of his own labor, if he does nothing but farm.

It is not on my own account that I speak in this wise, but it is to make an effort to correct some of the evils that exist; that they do exist as has been claimed in this work, nine farmers out of every ten in New England, who "have no axe to grind," as the saying is, will bear me witness.

Therefore, entertaining these views, and supposing many people were not generally aware of the facts as they exist, the thought occurred to me to call attention to it through the public press. Some six months since, I penned the following article for the "New England Farmer," a paper published in Boston, claiming to have

a large circulation, and mainly among the farmers. Feeling very confident that the influence of the Agricultural Press was detrimental to the farmers' interest, however honest it was intended; yet such being the fact, I supposed they would not shrink from a candid examination of the subject, inasmuch as they always seem ready to publish the most absurd statements, the tendency of which was, to keep down the price of Agricultural products.

HOW TO RECKON THE COST OF FARM PRODUCTS.

MR. EDITOR: One of the great reasons why farmers do not succeed any better in their business, is that they do not stop to figure — they are negligent in this particular, and seldom, if ever, know the precise cost of a single article they produce. They work hard and long, taxing their physical powers to the utmost, and neglecting the mental, till they have been persuaded to believe that it is all right that they should produce for others to consume, without adequate recompense to themselves.

Now, what I want to say is this: I want to see every farmer who produces any article to sell, know exactly what it costs — no guess-work about it; but to *know*, that's the point. I presume no one doubts but that everything we produce has a positive, definite cost, for whether we know it or not, such is the fact; then why deceive ourselves in the matter? I know it is thought to be very difficult to ascertain the precise cost of farm products; but if it is difficult it is not impossible. Then let us try to systemize the business to such a degree as to become familiar with it, and in time it will become so easy that we should be almost ashamed not to know all the facts in the matter. How long would a merchant or manufacturer stand if they did not know

the cost of their goods. Take, for instance, a pair of fine gaiter boots. How is the cost of them to be reckoned? The material of which they are composed is taken from every quarter of the globe; many islands of the ocean are brought into requisition to produce them. The French, the English, the Italian, and the shrewd Yankee, have all had a finger in the matter; also various machinery, as well as busy hands, have been brought into requisition by many different people, and yet any manufacturer would be ashamed not to know, within one cent, the cost of every pair he makes.

Let us reckon up the cost of cultivating an acre of corn in the same manner that a manufacturer reckons the cost of his goods, and see what we shall make of it. We will take an average acre of New England land, such as is usually put to corn in this section, and see what it *does* cost to raise a bushel. I will, in the first place, make the figures, and then give some reasons for reckoning as I do. The reader will understand that we are considering the matter as it actually is, and not as it is under some extraordinary circumstances made to appear. We will suppose this acre to be worth forty dollars in the market, and located one-fourth of a mile from the buildings, and we will cultivate it in the usual way.

<i>One Acre of Corn</i>		<i>Dr.</i>
May 10,	Two men, two yoke oxen and plow one day.....	\$4.25
" 13,	One man, four oxen and cart one day hauling manure	3.25
" 15,	Ten loads manure.....	10.00
" 16,	One man one day, and yoke oxen and harrow half day, spreading manure and harrowing.....	1.75
" 17,	Man, horse and boy $\frac{1}{4}$ day furrowing.....	.75
" 18,	Man and boy one day planting, \$1.50, seed 25...	1.75
" 19,	Putting up line, &c.....	.25
June 6,	Two men, horse and plow cultivating and hoeing.	2.50
" 6,	To replanting and ashing.....	2.00
" 25,	To hoeing and cultivating.....	2.50
July 10,	To pulling weeds.....	.50
Sep. 10,	To two men cutting stalks and stooking do.....	2.00
" 25,	To carting stalks to barn, &c.....	.50

Oct. 12, To harvesting.....	2.00
“ 13, To husking and taking care of butts.....	2.00
“ 13, To interest on land, capital and taxes.....	3.00
“ 13, To fencing, and rents of barn and corn house....	3.00
Dec. 15, To shelling and marketing corn.....	5.00

\$47.00

Acre of Corn.

Cr.

Dec. 15, By 30 bush. shelled corn sold.....	\$30 00
“ 15, By 6 bush. ears soft corn sold.....	2.00
“ 15, By stover and pumpkins.....	5.00

\$37.00

Net loss on crop..... \$10.00

Thus it will be seen that we have cultivated our crop in the most prudent and economical manner; we have charged nothing to the crop but what rightly belongs there, and have allowed a high average yield, and sold it for much more than farmers usually get, and yet have made a net loss of ten dollars!

I want to say here, that, in my opinion, there are but comparatively few acres of corn planted in this State but what run the owner in debt more than this has. And what is true in regard to this crop is true of most others; only much more so, for aside from the hay crop the corn is the most reliable, as it is the most important upon the farm. I do not wish the reader to understand by this, that I suppose the farmers usually sell their corn. This is not so. Farmers in this section are generally buyers of this article, and consume upon their farms this and most other crops, and by this way of doing business do not generally realize more than one-half what we have allowed.

The farmers, I think, have a peculiar way of mystifying their business by running one thing into another, as by feeding out their hay, corn, &c., to make more manure at a loss of some fifty per cent. — to raise more corn at still another loss, and in this way go on, year after year, and do not find out their mistake till their

physical energies are broken up, and, unless they have had some outside successes, a portion, at least, of their capital is exhausted.

It seems to me that farmers, like all other classes of men, should call things by their right names, and if hay will bring a dollar a hundred, and corn a dollar a bushel, why not sell it, and not feed it out to stock, when we cannot possibly get more than one-third of it on the growth of our cattle, and oftentimes not anything. I very well know that stock makes manure, and manure, judiciously applied, makes hay and corn; but all these things have a dollar and cent value, and should not be purchased at too great a cost. What I want is this, (as we have it from the best authority, "that the laborer is worthy of his hire,") that the man who labors upon his farm, (if judiciously,) should so understand his business as to realize as much as other laborers get. I can see no reason why a man who owns a farm should throw his labor away, or any considerable portion of it, any more than the merchant or manufacturer, who, to save clerk-hire, do their own work. One of two things is evident, that the farmer gets no return or per cent. on his capital; or, reckoning six per cent. on his capital, he gets no pay for his labor. I mean, of course, by work on the farm.

I know very well that it will be considered unusual to reckon some things which I have put into this crop. But what if it is unusual? Do they not rightly belong there? The old custom of half reckoning, or not reckoning at all, is what I want to see broken up, and let every crop and every animal upon the farm answer for itself. In this way, and in no other, can the farmer hope to stand on an equality with all other classes of men. I am perfectly aware that different localities, seasons and circumstances, will vary the figures somewhat, so that no positive rule can be given which will always be applicable; yet, the rule will always hold good,—never deceive yourself, nor cut your corners too close, for there will always be some waste or losses

which no system can prevent. Our business is extremely hazardous. Crops are liable to be cut off or broke in upon, cattle to sicken and die, and being exposed to the extreme variableness of the climate, we find, after the utmost care, that we are constantly running great risks to health and future enjoyment.

However, let us stick to our caption, and see what we can do to make up this loss on our corn crop, for we have made a positive loss there, and the shrewdest Yankee that ever was made, cannot figure it any other way. Suppose we go into the stock business, and see if that will extricate us from the dilemma? This is a very important part of agriculture, and most of our friends who are fond of good roast beef, and good sweet butter and milk, (barring the naughty milk-man,) consider it very profitable. Let us see. When a calf is first dropt, his hide is worth one dollar, the meat will pay for taking it off for the pigs, and I presume that no farmer would make any other use of it. The account will stand thus :

<i>Calf,</i>	<i>Dr.</i>
To self.....	\$1.00
To 5 qts. milk per day one week, at 2 cts. per quart.....	.70
To 6 qts. skim milk per day seven weeks, at 1 cent.....	2.94
To 1½ bushels meal.....	1.50
To care and attention, 3 cents per day.....	2.94
To 18 weeks at grass, at 10 cents per week..	1.80
To 26 weeks barn, at 50 cents per week.....	13.00
	<hr/>
	\$22.88

Thus it will be seen that our calf has cost us at one year old, \$22.88. Now shall we sell it or grow it up into an ox or cow? If it is decided to sell it, a loss of more than one-half must be sustained. If to keep it, my word for it, the loss will be greater still. This is stock-raising. It will be seen that there are several small items that I have not put into the cost of this calf, such as rent, interest, &c., which legitimately belong there. Usually in reckoning the cost of cattle,

we offset the labor account against the manure ; but no one will suppose that a calf can be taken from the cow at one week old and cared for until it is eight weeks for any such pay.

I know that the question comes up here, how is it, then, that the farmers get along ? I can very easily answer that question, but can do so, perhaps, in no better way than in the language I have used before, and say that no poor man can live by farming, unless he works for wages. I am perfectly aware that this view of the matter is directly antagonistical to the views of those who undertake to shape public opinion. But what if it is ? If it is true, it will stand ; if not it will fall. To take a narrow view of the subject, I might say the popular one, it would seem to be for the interest of all other classes of men but the farmers to have farm products cheap. But, if the farmers were wise, they would at once dispel this popular clamor of glorifying them in order to fatten upon credulity. I freely admit that such arguments, in times past, seemed plausible and generous, but I begin to see through the film that has been placed upon my eyes, and rather reluctantly admit that it looks a little foxy. Why is it that all farmers who have no outside help, find that it is with the greatest difficulty that they can meet their engagements, and are continually in debt to the merchant, the mechanic, and the money-lender ? It is, because they have to sell their products, almost universally, under the cost—many less than one-half what it costs to produce them. And I hesitate not to say that many farm products do not pay mechanics' wages, simply to harvest and market them. The amount of the loss to the farmers of New England this year, *on the corn crop alone*, is sufficient, if sustained by the traders and manufacturers, to close the tills of every bank in the State, and "*nary red*," would be the universal response. In all other kinds of business, as far as I know, some system or uniformity of prices prevails. What the mechanic charges for a certain

job to-day will be the price all the year, always charging a small profit on the material used and a living price for his work. This is right, and with this arrangement we find no fault. We expect to pay the traders and mechanics a fair profit; but how is it when we have anything to sell? Is there ever a word said about profit or cost? Not at all! We can buy the article so and so, and that settles the matter. Now, what I want is, to have the farmer *know* what the article costs, and not *scab* the craft.

Chelmsford, Oct., 1859.

This article was published in the *New England Farmer*, Nov. 12th, (1859,) and perhaps has excited more comment than any similar article that has been published. This was what I sought, and did not care how extensively the ideas were circulated, if I could have the privilege of meeting, by such argument as I could furnish, the reasoning of those who took a different view of the matter. This seemed to me to be fair, for if I was right, then, of course, others were wrong, and *vice versa*. At any rate, I did not see how a discussion of the various subjects could do any hurt, if the object was to secure a more equal distribution of the rewards of labor.

Of course, I could not say but little in a single newspaper article, nothing more than to break the ice, supposing the same privilege would be extended to me that was allowed to others. And I presume most of those who have commented upon this article in the *Farmer* have supposed that I could reply if I desired to do so. That they have been honest, mainly, and desired the general interest of the people, I have no

doubt. Generally those who have written upon this article, have mistaken the meaning of the writer in one or more of the views taken. But all who have read attentively what is here written, will need no other explanation. In regard to the amount of manure it took to fertilize an acre of corn to produce the thirty-seven dollars' worth of grain and fodder, it will be seen corresponds very nearly with my previous estimates in this work, and although it was there put a little too low, the object of which was to keep within bounds, that if I erred at all, it should be against myself, and make the variation less than the facts would prove, rather than otherwise.

Some who have commented upon this article, have said the fertilizing material should be two or three times as much, which would have more than doubled the crop, and as the labor bill would have been but little more, it would have told on the profits. My answer to this would be, that the crop is now considerably above the average, either in this State or in the country, and I believe that truth is better than error, and although a man may have a right to deceive himself, he never has to deceive others. Facts are good enough for me.

In the same paper in which this article was published, (Nov. 12th,) the editor commented upon it in an editorial article, the whole of which I here publish.

COST OF FARM PRODUCTS.

“In another column we give an article upon this subject, which may prove discouraging to some, but one which well deserves attention and critical investigation. We understand that the world is sustained by agriculture; that in it, it lives and moves and has its being; so there must be profit somewhere. Whether that profit is to be found among our New England people, is the question to be solved.

In looking over the items set down by our correspondent, we believe he has allowed about *twenty-six* days labor as necessary to produce one acre of corn. On referring to the ‘Transactions of the Massachusetts Society for the Promotion of Agriculture,’ we find that in the year 1800, they sent out a series of questions all over the State, making such inquiries as would elicit replies likely to show the average cost of our common farm crops. Among these questions was the following:

“*How many days labor of a man are usually employed on an acre of Indian corn, including the getting in of all the stover and stripping the husks from the ears?*”

No question among the *fifty* which they propounded brought so many widely-different answers as this.

Dr. Payne, of Worcester, set it at *ten* days; Dr. Hubbard, of Concord, at *fifteen*; Mr. Babbit, of Brookfield, at *sixteen*; Mr. Heath, of Brookline, at *fourteen*, and Mr. Gardner, of the same town, at *eighteen*; the Middlesex Society at *fourteen*; Mr. Kent, of Newbury, at *twenty*; Mr. Packard, of Marlborough, the same; and Col. Parsons, of Gloucester, at *thirty-two*. The average of these returns gives *seventeen and two-thirds* days’ work for a man to produce an acre of corn, beginning with the plowing and placing the corn in the bin. With the improved implements of the present day, we ought to be able to accomplish the work with two or three days’ less labor than they did then.

The subject is an important one, and we hope it will receive careful attention."

In the next paper but one, (Nov. 26th,) the editor had another leading article in reply to my article of Nov. 12th. Also, two other articles on the same subject, one from an anonymous correspondent, (few of whom shall I notice in this work,) and one from Asa G. Sheldon, Esq., of Wilmington. Both articles are here submitted.

IS FARMING PROFITABLE?

No one thing operates more injuriously to the interests of agriculture than the widely-spread and popular idea, that farming is not profitable. It is almost a work of supererogation to reply to the charge, that the cultivation of the land, as an occupation for the masses of the people, is not a profitable employment, because it is evident to all who will look, that it is from this source that all supplies for the sustenance of man and beast are mainly drawn. The art of agriculture underlies all other arts, and sustains them all. Cease the cultivation of the soil, and commerce, manufactures, all sciences, and mechanic arts, and even breath itself, would soon cease.

The pursuit of agriculture as an occupation, may not be as profitable under all circumstances, as some other pursuit. It may be better for the people of a sandy tract of country on the sea-shore, to turn their attention to fishing, than to raising grain or grass, or for those in a mountainous and rocky country to make the water of the valleys turn their wheels to transform forests into various articles for household use. There may be reasons why individuals in all our towns should find employment in agriculture less profitable than some others in which they might engage. But with an average price of labor, land and implements, and with that degree of skill which the land demands of

all, we do not believe that many acres of land are ever cultivated at a loss, when the crop is not injured by blight, frost, or other casualty.

In the *Farmer* of Nov. 12, Mr. T. J. PINKHAM, of Chelmsford, Mass., sent us an article entitled, "*How to Reckon the Cost of Farm Produce*," in which he intended to show, by a single illustration of the culture of an acre of corn, that the farmer loses, rather than makes, money, by his farming operations. We did not then, nor do we now, think that his premises or conclusions were correct, but gladly published his bold article for the purpose of arousing public attention to this matter, and if possible, of establishing a more correct opinion in the public mind. In this, we are happy to say, there is now a fair prospect of succeeding. As we then supposed would be the case, men of great experience in farming matters have taken up the glove thrown down by Mr. Pinkham, are criticising his positions sharply, and reversing the picture he drew.

The past season has been an unfavorable one in which to obtain a good crop of Indian corn, — too much cold and wet weather prevailing early, and it being too cold and dry in the latter part of the season; and yet, by exercising the proper care in selecting the land, in manuring so as to give the young plants an early and vigorous growth, as well as to sustain the corn during its time of maturing, we have never harvested a sounder or better crop of corn in any season. It has given us *sixty-five* bushels to the acre, most of which is suitable to be sent to the stores to be sold for seed corn.

We have not kept the precise cost of this crop, but near enough to show that it was not over seventy-five cents per bushel. Let us see — corn is worth now one dollar a bushel.

Sixty-five bushels, at \$1.00, is.....	\$65 00
Cost of 65 bushels, at 75 cents, is.....	48 75
Profit.....	<u>\$16 25</u>

Stover, equal to one ton of best hay.....	\$16 25
100 bushels turnips on same land.....	10 00
	<hr/>
	\$42 25

Such is the present year's result with us, and under the same mode of treatment, we have no doubt similar results would follow nine times in ten. We believe that the work of a good farmer for twenty days, will bring a crop of corn on an average from forty to sixty bushels to the acre. He must be a man of judgment; must not spend five or six days in getting out the witch grass from an acre at the first hoeing, instead of destroying it by very late fall, and very early spring, plowing. If he makes this mistake, or some other as great, he labors at a loss, and adds five or six dollars to the cost of his crop! And so with regard to several other points which it is scarcely necessary to enumerate.

PROFIT OF FARMING.

I notice a piece in your paper of Nov. 12th, 1859, headed, "How to reckon the cost of Farm Products," and signed T. J. Pinkham, Chelmsford, 1859. Mr. P. gives us a very particular statement of the cost of raising, and the value of one acre of corn in dollars and cents, which statement I am not disposed to find fault with, but am disposed to take it as it stands. I would only simply remark, that in Chelmsford, and its surrounding towns, where it is known that a farmer has any corn of his own raising to sell, instead of soliciting purchasers, he will have five times as many call on him as he can supply; this shows that a shilling a bushel is rather a high price to charge for shelling and selling corn; but still I am willing to take all his figures, just as they are, and thank friend Pinkham for his close and fair calculation. It is just what I have been hoping some one would do, and hope we will have more statements of the same nature, from those who are disposed to believe there is no profit in

farming. But I think his story will leave the subject as it is. I think it would have a tendency to lead young men who are now thinking what they shall do for a living into a great error. There are two sides to everything. His estimated cost of plowing is fair, and sufficient for plowing an acre of old pasture, trodden by the cows for years. If this was the kind of land, I will still add a little more experience to it. At the last hoeing of the corn, charge fifty cents for a half-bushel of rye, seventy-five cents for a bushel of red top seed, and twenty-five cents for sowing it over the ground, thus increasing the loss to \$11.50.

After having been cultivated through the season, according to the writer's account, what farmer, who has his senses, when the sun shines on this acre of land in 1860, with the grass and rye then growing upon it, will not say that this acre of land is worth double what it was on the morning of the tenth day of May, 1859, before the plow broke the sod? I will suppose this acre of land to be an acre of hay land, run down so as to need plowing, which we cannot suppose bore more than ten hundred to the acre. Is it not reasonable to suppose if this ground is sown down to barley and grass seed, that it will, for years, produce one ton to the acre? And cannot any man buying standing grass, afford to pay as much for one ton of grass standing on an acre of ground, lately plowed, as he can for a ton and a half, where he has to swing the scythe and the rake over three acres of ground to collect the hay of a poorer quality?

Whether the acre of land the writer speaks of was intended to be improved for pasture or mowing land, it is plain to be seen that the cultivation of the ground, while the corn crop was growing, rendered it capable of producing double its former value of grass for years to come. And this gives the profits of farming.

Although he did not tell us in words, that there was a profit in farming, he came so near it he unlocked the door, and made it very easy to swing open and let us

look in. Go on, friend Pinkham ; give us more statements, remembering that agriculture is so much like pure old gold and silver, that it will continue to shine as long as you continue to scour it, and a long time after. But if you should ever be able to convince me that there is no profit in farming, you will give me more anxiety, and cause in me more alarm, fearing that the world will come to an end by starvation, than Miller's preaching, and all his followers, ever did !

ASA G. SHELDON.

Wilmington, Mass., Nov. 14.

I then wrote to the editor a polite note asking him if I could have the privilege of replying to himself and others, in the "Farmer." His answer to this note is here inserted :

Boston, Dec. 3, 1859.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your note of Nov. 27, I have to say that the publishers as well as myself, are obliged to you for the articles you have sent us that have been published, as well as for those not yet in print. Those, also, will be published. The reason of delay is, that I am always crowded with communications, and must observe a sort of miller rule, — first come first served, — though regard is paid to the importance of the subject, and to seasonableness.

I have given two articles in to-day's paper in reply to yours, and have others on hand, so you have the satisfaction of seeing that you have aroused a general interest on the subject, even if they controvert your positions. I believe, with you, that there is great looseness and uncertainty in most of our farm operations, but do not believe that lands judiciously cultivated, are ever cultivated at a loss, only in cases of casualty.

Your articles will appear in due time, mixed up with those who are paying you some attention. I think great good will come out of the discussion, if not carried

too far. I am obliged to make up a *variety* for each paper. Very truly and cordially yours,

SIMON BROWN.

The editor, it seems, evades the direct answer to my question, but says "they are much obliged to me," &c. — thinks I am doing a good deal of good in "arousing public attention," and "my articles will appear from time to time," &c. — observing a sort of "miller rule." We shall see. In the "Farmer" of Dec. 3d, the editor, in a short note to correspondents, says :

"We have received several seasonable and valuable articles, which we shall soon find room for ; and while we express our obligations to the attentive and intelligent correspondents of the *Farmer*, for their numerous favors, we would say their circle is constantly increasing, and that in order to give a hearing to all, it becomes necessary for each to be as concise as the nature and importance of his subject will permit. The *critics* are after Mr. Pinkham with a *sharp stick* ; he has sent us other important queries, and will not be *alarmed* at any fair treatment, though it might be a little *severe*."

Up to this time I had nowhere said a single word by which the editor might infer or presume, that I was anxious to call him or any one else out in discussing the several subjects which had been mooted. I knew that the reverse of what the Agricultural press taught in regard to Agriculture, was true. I thought I saw a systematic and well-contrived plan, having its centres in the great cities of the country, to defraud Agriculture of a suitable reward for labor bestowed. I expected that a strong effort would be made to controvert my position, or cut me off entirely from an expression

of my thoughts through the channel or medium to which I have referred. After the editor had tried his own hand to effect this purpose, he then calls on any one to come to the rescue, saying they are after him with a "sharp stick," and the *treatment* may be a little *severe*. For nearly six months, almost every number of the "Farmer" has had something to say on what I wrote; and in some of the papers, as many as five or six articles, written either by the editor or some of his correspondents, in reply to me, many of them, however, either entirely, or in part, agreeing with my views.

And now, although I have not had the privilege of saying a single word for several months, yet I submit to the readers of the "Farmer" if my position has not rather gained, and stands better before the people than when I commenced.

My first article to the "Farmer" was published Aug. 20th, (1859,) the object of which was to see if the "Farmer" would entertain an honest avowal of antagonistic views. This article was replied to by a friend from Springfield. As I have not his name, I cannot give his article entire; but my reply to him, which is here submitted, will convey something of his mode of reasoning.

"IS THERE ANY PROFIT IN FARMING?"

MR. EDITOR: It will, without doubt, be recollected by many of your readers that I wrote an article, which you were kind enough to publish in the *Farmer* of Aug. 20th, 1859, with the above caption. The position which

I took in that article will also be recollected, viz., that farming in New England is not a paying business; that the public, and even the farmers themselves, to a large extent, are deceived in the matter. This I undertook to show with what logic I possessed; also, I gave some statistics, and a few quotations from what I deemed good authority, to prove my position.

Now, I must in candor say, that when I penned that article, I supposed it would be replied to, if at all, by just that class of farmers of whom I spoke in the article, who, "having money to spend," &c., &c., consider this as a good business.

It will, perhaps, be as well for me to state in the outset, that I intend in this article to reply to my "Springfield" friend, who undertook, in the *Farmer* of Oct. 22d, to review the article to which I have above referred, and to show that farming *is* profitable.

It is an old saying, and a very good one, that "circumstances alter cases." As this is one of the "cases" that "circumstances" have altered, and as but a very small proportion of the farmers can be located in a thrifty and growing city, comfortably, pleasantly, and, for the sake of the argument, and for nothing else, profitably if you please, at farming. Springfield is situated on the banks of the Connecticut River, in Hampden County, in this State. It is a city of some 15,000 inhabitants, and is at this day making great progress in wealth and population. The Western Railroad passes through this place; the United States Armory is here located, which adds largely to the thrift of the city, also factories of various kinds are in successful operation. Further, the soil on the banks of this river is well adapted to the growing of tobacco, and large quantities of it is put to this use. Here, also, land is sold by the foot. Is it necessary for me to look any further for the solution of the argument of my friend "J. A. A."? What say you, brother farmers, all over New England? If your ancestors had left you the broad acres in a great and populous city, how mon-

strously "profitable" farming would seem. Do store and other bills accumulate, and the crops come in light? Have you become worn out by hard toil, and the doctor's bill looks you in the face? Have the wife or the little ones been on the sick list, too? Or, is it necessary to send the boy to college? A few corner lots will harmonize the whole. What a beautiful thing farming is!

Now, Mr. Editor, I suppose I must take up your correspondent's article, somewhat systematically, and treat of it as he goes along. In the first paragraph, he says the writer "must be located in a very ill-flavored portion of the country." In the old town of Chelmsford, joining Lowell, the second city in New England in wealth, population and enterprise, (saving tobacco,—we don't grow the weed here, we profess to be a moral people,) is the writer's residence. Of the capabilities of the town in the Agricultural line, perhaps I can give it in no better way than in the language of one of our most distinguished citizens. Dr. Bartlett, in a lecture before the Agricultural Society of this town, said, "that in his opinion, not a farmer in town was getting a living, without he had either fruit or wood to sell." Now, although Chelmsford produces a large supply of both of these articles, and there are but few farmers who have neither to sell, so that on the whole, this may compare favorably with most farming towns, yet, with all the privileges that this has over most places, even here it is up-hill work. The truth of the matter is just here—that no farmer could, for any considerable length of time, sustain his position, were it not for the outside helps that he is constantly obliged to resort to. He must have capital, and it is folly to think to farm without it. Then, this capital is dead property, for with this, he has to combine a larger amount of labor and economy than would give him a better living at many of the trades that are in vogue, that are much more easily attained than to know how to farm. One of two things is true; the farmer has to relinquish all hopes of

any per cent. on his capital, or throw away his labor to get a fair per cent. on his investment. Does any one believe that a man can take a farm and its appendages entirely on credit, and pay his interest, and in the course of time, free himself from his liabilities, and retain the farm? This is what a large proportion of those engaged in other pursuits are constantly doing.

If my friend "J. A. A." will be kind enough to stop guessing, and go into the figures, the facts, as they actually exist, and from these obtain or arrive at his conclusions, he will be quite as likely to be correct. This guess work should be abandoned, and facts and figures should take its place. Now if "J. A. A." has made a fortune at farming, or any considerable portion of one, he has the ability to tell how it is done. This would do much to establish his position. In this State, there are 35,000 farms, and allowing two men to each farm, would give 70,000 farmers, equalling in numbers all other trades. If "J. A. A." will find one solitary individual (Springfield included,) out of this army of farmers who has for a series of years made fair mechanic's wages over and above a reasonable per cent. on his investment, at farming, then I shall learn something that I never before have seen. And, unless he can do this, and much more, then his whole argument falls to the ground.

Perhaps I can illustrate the position I take, in no better way than by relating an anecdote, which was recently told me. A friend of mine who takes a similar view of the matter with me, said "he had been several times opposed in his view by a stout and rugged old farmer who instanced his own case to prove that the business was lucrative." "Well," said my friend, "you have made money, have you?" "Yes, I have done well, and I know it is a good business. But, what are you figuring about?" "I was merely reckoning up to see how much you have made." "I guess I know how much I have made without your figuring." "Well, well, I merely wanted to see; figures, you

know, wont lie." "Well, how do you make it?" "Do you want I should tell you?" "Certainly, you can't alter it." "Well, then, if I have got it right, you lack \$60,000 of having made a living." "How do you make that out?" "You say you had so much (showing him the figures) left you?" "Yes." "You are now worth so much?" "Yes." "Well, then, if you had put your money at interest when you came in possession of it, and kept it there, and got your own living since, you would have been worth what I told you."

Now if my Springfield friend will furnish the evidence of what he says, and will truthfully make it appear that this is "profitable," and that farmers are the most independent people in the world, it is all I ask for. I think, however, that where we mainly differ is in this—he has one class of farmers in view, and I another. It is the poor farmer whose position I am speaking of, and not these city folks who farm for amusement, without regard to the cost.

Again, friend "A." says: "I suspect that Mr. P., having probably been employed in other pursuits before engaging in Agriculture 'some seven or eight years' since, may possibly be lacking in Agricultural experience, so necessary to success, and has had the misfortune to locate in a bad situation, both combining, perhaps, to render him sick of his new vocation, and consequently he looks upon the dark side." Here is more guess work, at which friend "A" has been about as successful as he is in guessing at the "profit" of farming. The truth is, I am not "sick" of farming, nor have I "located in a bad situation." All that I want, is, that the truth and right may prevail. When I see all other classes of men making a living by their business, and generally much more, (which I do not object to,) I am led to inquire how is it with the business that sustains all others? I would not say a word, did not I believe that there is a remedy for the wrongs that I am speaking of. But, it is no use to say a word about a remedy till we understand our position, and if things are all right, then let them remain.

Again, "a good cow should give four quarts at early milking, at least, or eight quarts per day, through the greater part of the year, and even more than this, a considerable portion of the time." I believe a cow may be kept well, in most localities, for about forty-five dollars per year, and should yield an average of six quarts of milk per day. The milkmen generally get from four to six cents a quart for milk, and, consequently, the farmer should not receive less than three or three and a half cents for his milk, at his door." Now this is all guess work again, and you have not given a single fact to substantiate a word of what you have said. A cow that gives milk, requires $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on her live weight per day of good English hay or its equivalent to sustain her position. Is this keeping her for forty-five dollars per year? The farmers have been selling their milk for eighteen cents per can in this county, and in New Hampshire, on the line of the railroads, this last summer. The cans hold, Massachusetts measure, from nine to eleven quarts. Is this "from three to three and a half cents per quart?" No supposition or guess work here. Now, if friend "A." can put these items together, and figure up a "profit," I am thinking it would take a larger city than Springfield to hold him.

T. J. PINKHAM.

Chelmsford, Mass., Nov. 7, 1859.

The following is an article which I wrote in reply to the comments of the editor upon my articles, and which he declined to publish. At the time I wrote this article, I had before me his letter, on page 162.

MR. EDITOR:—In discussing this matter of farming, I presume it would be well to lay down some general rules, upon which all are willing to stand, and from this stand-point take our observations; for if the premises are not well established in the commencement, we shall strive in vain to arrive at correct conclusions.

I presume that upon this point there is no controversy, — *that the pursuit of agriculture is useful and important, therefore should be remunerative and honorable*; also, *that those who follow this business for a livelihood should be as well recompensed as those who live by any other branch of human industry.*

I wish to consider that we agree upon this brief premise, and shall now proceed to establish what I have previously written by facts and arguments which I think are incontrovertible; also, to show that those who have taken up their pens to controvert my position, and those who sympathize with them, are doing great mischief to the farmers of our country.

To the farmers, I want to say, that they must learn to conquer their prejudices and open their eyes, that they can distinguish the difference between *cunning* and *friendship*! A merchant said to me the other day, "We merchants are a mighty shrewd people, all smooth and fair on the outside, but eyes were made to see, and ears to hear."

In the *Farmer* of Nov. 12th, the editor refers to the "Transactions of the Massachusetts Society for the Promotion of Agriculture" in 1800, (going back some ways for "Young America,") to elicit evidence to controvert my position. In these "Transactions," he finds, among others, this question:

"How many days labor of a man are usually employed on an acre of Indian corn, including the getting in of all the stover and stripping the husks from the ear?"

This ends the business; the corn is husked, and there it is in a pile on the barn floor, if they had barns in those days, and if it was like the corn that I raised this year, (1859,) it would not be worth much if it laid there long. The editor says that "No question among the *fifty* which they propounded brought so many widely different answers as this," some setting it as low as 10 days to do this work, others as high as 32, the average being $17\frac{2}{3}$ days.

Now the candid reader will, by a careful perusal of this article, (p. 157,) see at once that I did not undertake to cultivate this acre of corn at all, but merely to show the public what it costs to raise corn as it is usually raised in this and other New England States. I know very well that a man can hurry over an acre of corn on our *plainsland* with a little less labor than I have allowed. But no one who has ever been so far from home that his "mother has discovered that he was out," need be told that the whole of New England is not a sand-bank, and that ploughing and hoeing is *not always* a desirable recreation.

Many fields of corn in this and other New England States cannot be well prepared for the seed with a less amount of labor than I have allowed for the whole cultivation of this crop. Now, about the amount of corn. It is said I have got it far too low. Upon this point, perhaps, it will be well to let others speak.

According to the United States census in 1850, the average yield of Indian corn in all the States, to the acre, was $19\frac{2}{31}$ bushels, a small fraction over nineteen bushels to the acre. This was in the whole United States. In five of the New England States (Rhode Island is not given,) it was 32 bushels to the acre. This was according to the last census, viz: Massachusetts 31, Vermont 32, Connecticut 40, Maine 27, New Hampshire 30. Does this look like trying to mislead the people? or does it look as though I meant to state the thing about as it was? I do not go back sixty years, as my friend the editor did, but take the most recent statistics we have, and regret that we have none more recent.

CHAPTER VII.

THE AGRICULTURAL PRESS, CONTINUED, AND IMPORTANT CORRESPONDENCE.

The Editor of the New England Farmer—Vote of the Board of Agriculture—Ed. Emerson, of Hollis, N. H., and his Article—Population, Inventory, Business and Business Capital of Hollis—Wages of Hired Help—Threshing and Husking Corn—An Article on Milk Raising—Questions for Farmers' Clubs—An Article in Defence of the Writer—"Farming Unprofitable," by H. C. Merriam—Important Suggestions—Valuable Correspondence—Letters from Hon. Simon Brown, Hon. Richard S. Fay, and Hon. George S. Boutwell—Farmers should Keep the Figures—The Tailor and the Farmer—The Barre Correspondent—Concord River Meadows—Unjust Taxation—Dr. Loring's Letter—Farming in New Braintree—The Chinese and their Agriculture—The Traders.

AFTER the publication of my article of Nov. 12th in the *Farmer*, and the editor had called on the faithful to come to the rescue, advising them that they need not be particular about the "treatment," as "others had spoken sharply," and come with "sharp sticks," as much as to say, our "craft is in danger," and he must be put down. As soon, however, as the editor saw that the current was setting in my favor, and he had got more than he bargained for, he softened down in his own language, refused to publish anything more from me, unless it come up to his idea of policy, and from that day to this has had to fight hard to stay the

current of public opinion. Soon after the publication of the article to which I have referred, the Board of Agriculture (the editor being on the Board) called up the subjects there presented, discussed them, and agreed *unanimously* (save one, Mr. Brooks, of Princeton,) that my positions and estimates were correct. Has the public ever, from that day to this, been apprised of the action of the Board in this particular? If so, I have nowhere seen it. If what I then said was true, why seek to cover it up, or stifle investigation? Although the action of the Board is often the subject of public comment, and their doings are published in their journals and reports, yet this *vote*, and their *action*, has not been so treated. I presume the intelligent reader needs no reasons for this from me in this connection.

In order to give the reader an idea of the way that some of the correspondents to the *Farmer* talk about farming, I shall here publish entire an article written by one of the editor's friends, and a man in whom he has a good deal of confidence, and takes a great satisfaction to himself that he is not a "fancy farmer, or of giving undue credence to books." If, in the editor's reference to "books," he meant the "Bible," no one would presume to doubt a single word he has said on that.

IS FARMING PROFITABLE?

“MR. EDITOR:—I have just read in the *N. E. Farmer* of Nov. 12th, the article signed ‘T. J. Pinkham, Chelmsford,’ on the profits of farming, or rather on the *losses* of farming. I am surprised that any one living in the counties of Middlesex and Worcester, Mass., or Hillsborough, N. H., should write such an article, when the farmers in these counties are the most wealthy of any part of the population.

There are are forty or fifty farmers in the town of Hollis, N. H., worth from \$3,000 to \$15,000, or more, and I have known most of them from the time they took possession of their farms, either by purchase or from their fathers. I think at least two-thirds of them either owed, or had to pay out to heirs or support the old folks, to at least two-thirds of the value of their farms at the time they took possession of them.

In almost every case where a young man has bought a farm, and has been temperate and industrious, and had tolerable health, he has made money. Nor have these farmers been miserly or mean, either with themselves, their families, or the public. They have most of them good, comfortable dwellings, well painted inside and out, for their families, good barns for their stock, and sheds, &c., for wood, carriages, grain, &c., most of which they have either built or repaired since they came into possession. They educate their children, and spend money for proper purposes as freely as any other class of citizens. If farming is such poor business, how have these men supported their families, paid their debts, repaired their houses and barns, or built new ones, and lent money, taken stocks, &c.? Could they do it by raising corn at a loss of \$10 each acre, or calves at a loss of \$16 on each calf?

Let us look at his estimate below on the cost of raising an acre of corn, viz :

*One Acre of Corn.**Dr.*

May 10,	Two men, two yoke oxen and plow one day.....	\$4 25
" 15,	One man, four oxen and cart one day hauling manure.....	3 25
" 15,	Ten loads manure.....	10 00
" 16,	One man one day, yoke oxen and harrow half day, spreading manure and harrowing.....	1 75
May 17,	Man, horse and boy $\frac{1}{4}$ day furrowing.....	75
" 18,	Man and boy one day planting, \$1 50, seed 25..	1 75
" 19,	To putting up line, &c.....	25
June 6,	Two men, horse and plow cultivating and hoeing	2 50
" 6,	To replanting and ashing.....	2 00
" 25,	To hoeing and cultivating.....	2 50
July 10,	To pulling weeds.....	50
Sept. 10,	To two men cutting stalks and stooking do.....	2 00
" 25,	To carting stalks to barn, &c.....	50
Oct. 12,	To harvesting.....	2 00
" 13,	To husking and taking care of butts.....	2 00
" 13,	To interest on land, capital and taxes.....	3 00
" 13,	To fencing and rents of barn and corn-house....	3 00
Dec. 15,	To shelling and marketing corn.....	5 00
		<hr/>
		\$47 00

*Acre of Corn.**Cr.*

Dec. 15,	By 30 bushels shelled corn sold.....	\$30 00
" 15,	By 6 bushels ears soft corn sold.....	2 00
" 15,	By stover and pumpkins.....	5 00
		<hr/>
		\$37 00

Net loss on crop\$10 00

Now, our land, (upland,) must be broken up, whether we raise corn or lay down immediately to grass.

Not over one-third of the cost of breaking up should be charged to the first crop. The manure, if spread, not over one-fourth should be charged to the corn.

Few replant or ash, and as to pulling weeds, you had better let them alone than pull them in a dry time. A boy will cut the stalks for half the price, and your men will husk it out in an evening, if good corn.

Shelling the corn is much too high. I have had fifty bushels threshed out in a day by one man several times. Now let us see :

$\frac{1}{3}$ of the cost of first plowing to the first crop.....	\$1 42
$\frac{1}{4}$ of the manure and hauling	3 31
Harrowing, &c.....	1 75
Furrowing, planting, seed and line.....	2 75
First and second hoeing.....	5 00
Cutting stalks and transplanting.....	4 50
Husking corn.....	1 00
Interest, &c.....	3 00
Threshing out corn... ..	1 00
	<hr/>
	\$22 73

All this help has been called one dollar per day. Help hired by the month, for six months, does not average over 58 cents per day, and this help, besides doing the work set down in the above list, is expected to get up in the morning, make the fires, feed the hogs, milk the cows, feed what stock may be at the barn, and cut wood, or work in the garden the rest of the time till breakfast, and milk and do the other chores at night—well nigh enough to pay the board. But call it 75 cents per day—three-quarters of \$22.73 is \$17.05. Allowing his estimate of \$37.00 sold, the cost that should be charged to the corn is \$17.05. Profit, \$19.95.

I consider corn one of the best crops raised; wheat, oats and grass follow it better than they do potatoes.

If asked how our farmers had contrived to pay for their farms, build, paint and blind their houses, have money to let, and stock in corporations,—I should answer the question by the above estimate. If ‘T. J. P.’ can account for it in any other way, I should like to have him.

ED. EMERSON.

Hollis, Nov. 14, 1859.

“REMARKS.”—[By Mr. Brown, editor of the *Farmer*.]—“Thank you, Mr. Emerson, we have no doubt great good will come out of this discussion. Mr.

Emerson's name will be recognized by many readers as that of a frequent correspondent to these columns, — but for the gratification of those who do not know him, we will say that he is quite largely engaged in farming, working with his own hands and directing his affairs in person. No one can justly charge him with being a fancy farmer, or of giving undue credence to books."

The writer would particularly invite the attention of Mr. Emerson and the editor of the *Farmer* to the following extract, taken from a rather ancient book, and recommend that they give it *due* "credence: "

Thou shalt have no other god before me.

Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of those that love me, and keep my commandments.

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.

Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.

Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

Thou shalt not kill.

Thou shalt not commit adultery.

Thou shalt not steal.

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's.

I will now leave this article to speak for itself, after saying a single word. If farming is as good business as Mr. Emerson tells about in his town, why do not the people make more progress? Certainly there are but few towns but what would compare favorably with this, either in population, enterprise or wealth. In 1855, the population was 1,293. The total inventory was \$597,992. All the active capital of the town was \$7,118. The business of the town consists of 2 stores, 4 carpenter's shops, 11 saw and grist mills, 5 blacksmith shops, 3 wheelwright shops, and 16 cooper's shops. According to my friend's statement, his "forty to fifty farmers" must monopolize nearly all the wealth of the town, and that does not show that labor meets a fair reward. The mechanical business of the town is considerable, but their whole capital is extremely limited. Now one or two things, it seems, must be true; either the farmers are not that liberal people my friend talks about, or the industry or morals of the people is at fault.

And then my friend must be extremely hard with his help, according to his own statement. Here is what he says: "Help hired by the month does not average over 58 cents per day, and this help, besides doing the work set down in the list, is expected to get up in the morning, make the fires, feed the hogs, milk the cows, feed what stock may be at the barn, and cut wood or work in the garden the rest of the time till breakfast, and milk and do the chores at night — well nigh enough to pay the board." With a little alteration, this would make a splendid "nursery hymn,"

which have not generally been supposed to be true in fact. However, if all this only pays a part of a man's board, most men would have to hire a man part of the time (at least) to pay a full board. Then he commits a great error in husking. A smart man will husk two baskets in an hour, or the sixty-six baskets in thirty-three hours, which he calls an evening's work, or one dollar, if done for hire.

These are the statements that Governor Brown endorses. What do the farmers think of them?

Here is an article on milk raising, which any child can reckon up and see how profitable the business is. This was published in the *Farmer*, Dec. 17, 1859.

A PLAIN QUESTION IN ARITHMETIC.

MR. EDITOR:—Suppose a farmer buys a cow on the first day of April, weighing 1000 pounds, and six years old, for fifty dollars. On the next day after the purchase she drops a calf, which takes all the milk she gives during this month but one quart per day, say twenty-five quarts, which is sold for two cents per quart. During this month she consumes two per cent. on her weight of English hay, which is worth fifteen dollars per ton, and two quarts of Indian meal per day, at one dollar per bushel. On the first day of May, her calf is sold for six dollars. During this month, (May) she gives nine quarts of milk per day, which is sold for two cents per quart, and consumes hay and meal same as last month. On the first day of June, she is turned to pasture, which is worth eight cents per day, and increases her milk to ten quarts per day, which is sold same as last month.

On the next month, July, the same facts exist as last month, except she falls off in her milk one quart

per day. August she falls off two quarts of milk per day from July, and consumes twenty-five pounds of corn fodder daily at five dollars per ton, in addition to her pasturage. The next month, September, her corn fodder is increased to fifty pounds daily, and her milk is reduced to six quarts each day; her pasturage is also reduced half. During October she runs in fall feed, or mowing fields, has nothing else, and her milk is reduced to four quarts per day, which is sold for four cents per quart. The cost of feed this month, October, the same as pasturage, eight cents per day. In November, she still runs in the field, but is put up nights and fed with ten pounds of good hay and two quarts of fine feed, at eighty cents per bushel, each day. Her pasturage is reduced to four cents daily this month, November, milk selling for the same as last month and reduced to three quarts daily. From the first of December to the first of April, she is fed wholly at the barn, and consumes ten pounds of good hay, one peck roots, at twenty cents per bushel, and twenty pounds of meadow hay, or corn fodder, at five dollars per ton, daily. In this month, December, she gives two quarts milk per day, and in January, one quart, and dries up entirely the first of February. All her milk from the first of October has been sold for four cents per quart.

This, in my judgment, is a fair sample of milk raising in this vicinity. Now I should like to have your correspondents in different milk-raising districts reckon this up, and let us know whether the farmer has made or lost by the operation, and how much. Also, how this corresponds with the business in their locality. Evidently, there are some minor considerations which I have purposely left out of the account, in order to see how people reckon in this important branch of human industry. Although milk, to some extent, is one of the necessities of life, yet, if it is sold below its cost, the evil that is done to the community is far

greater than the good. At some future time I intend to answer this, (with your permission, Mr. Editor,) myself. In the meantime I should like to hear from some of your correspondents on the subject.

Perhaps I ought to state here that I have avoided in this calculation the fractions of a cent which often go into the prices of this article, but they will not vary the account much; at any rate will not make it any more favorable to the raiser of milk in this section than I have given it. For instance, one farmer told me that he sold his milk through the first or spring and summer season for two and an eighth cents per quart, and had contracted this fall and winter at three and a fourth cents. However, I prefer the calculation made as I have reckoned it; holding that it is not very material whether we make a very large or a smaller loss in the business, as it in the end has about the same effect, whether we dwindle along a whole lifetime to waste our effects or be smart and find the bottom of the hill at an earlier period.

Many people seem to apprehend that it is of but a little consequence whether they make a loss in the sale of their products or not, inasmuch as they can go ahead and appear to be doing something; as one man remarked, "somebody will get the benefit of it." But let me say to my friend, and all who take this view of the matter, that you forget about those poor neighbors and their families who have been less fortunate than you, and who depend on their own efforts for a livelihood, but cannot go into this branch of human industry, except at a loss, on account of the ruinous competition, which only can be prosecuted by those who have an income equal to this drain upon their resources.

T. J. PINKHAM.

Chelmsford, Mass., Nov., 1859.

"REMARKS."—[By the editor of the *Farmer*.]—
"Our correspondent is determined to probe this busi-

ness of farming, as a business on which loss and gain is concerned, to the quick. He is doing the farmers a good service, and is welcome to our columns."

Why didn't you stick to that, Mr. Brown?

On Dec. 31, the following and last article was published. Notwithstanding, that just two weeks before, the editor said I was doing a good work, and should have entire liberty to his columns; yet it seems that the following were home questions, and it was easier to satisfy his conscience than his purse.

My object in penning this article was, to break the ice for a thorough investigation of the object of all legislation upon the farmers' interests, and the effect it has upon the people. The reader can read it, and if he desires to object to it, I hope he will have the privilege to express his thoughts to the fullest extent.

SUBJECTS FOR DISCUSSION IN FARMER'S CLUBS.

MR. EDITOR: As I see that an effort is being made by the State to institute and promote Agricultural Clubs throughout the Commonwealth; and as I have known such clubs to be at a loss to find subjects promotive of their interest and the general good to discuss, I thought I would send you for publication in the *Farmer* a few of the many questions in which the farmers should take deep thought, and consult together at the present time.

Has a man a right to follow a losing business?

Are any of the "Statute Laws" of this State oppressive and degrading to the farmer?

Is the common system of marketing promotive of the farmer's interests?

Have the farmers a right to combine, or act in unison, to promote their interests?

Is it a public benefit to sell farm products below their cost?

Is New England farming at the present time conducive to health?

Would a change of thought and effort among Agriculturists, from how to obtain a large surplus, to the idea of a sure profit, result in universal good to all classes?

Can most of the evils of society be traced directly to the unprofitableness of farming?

I want to say at some time, and perhaps I might as well say it now, and in this connection as well as in any other, that, as a citizen of Massachusetts, and a farmer, and my interests and rights being inseparable from those of my brother farmers, I am opposed now and forever, to all *State effort or State aid*, to promote, as it is thought by some, the farming interest. I can see nothing in it but "*evil*," and that continually. "Let every tub stand upon its own bottom," is perhaps not a very genteel expression, yet it conveys the idea. For half a century our good and ever indulgent mother, the *State*, has fondled and caressed the farming interests, till she has made fools of one portion of the people, and nearly bankrupted another.

Repeal all laws that are antagonistic to the farmer's good, and dry up the pap which has flowed from the treasury of the State for a quarter of a century, and in five years, if the farmers of the old Bay State don't show signs of life and prosperity, which they never before dreamed of, then write me down as incompetent to judge of the natural course of cause and effect. "Where the carrion is, there also will be found the vulture." Let the course which is fast gaining ground in the State, be continued for another quarter of a century, and if a "*child*" that is not easy to manage, but will be extremely troublesome, is not fastened upon us, then I am no judge. If the State has got any stray change in its huge pocket, that it can find no bet-

ter use for, let it pay its debts, and wean her offspring before it has the power to kick her over.

Let the farmers put on and wear a clean dicky, become more familiar with the slate and pencil, and learn the difference between profit and the prime cost of an article, and in five years not a man among them could be found who would be willing to acknowledge that they were ever *under guardianship* to the State. Further, let the lawyers, doctors, preachers, and the soft-hand gentry generally, observe the familiar adage, "shoemaker, stick to thy last," and if they happen to feel the need of anything in *our line*, and have got any loose change in their trowsers pocket, and will call around and be civil about it, they can be accommodated.

T. J. PINKHAM.

Chelmsford, Mass., Dec. 19, 1859.

This article was written in the fall of '59, and I submit to the candid reader if, in the two acts of 1860, in regard to the State buying up the Concord River Meadows, and the Pleuro humbug, cannot be traced with an unerring hand some of the warnings that are of importance to, not only the people of this State, but of the Country, there hinted at.

The excitement and damage done the farmers of the country, by the extra session of the Legislature, will soon pass away and be by many forgotten, but not so with the act in regard to the River Meadows. This is private property, owned by individuals, and in which the public have no more interest than any other property of a private nature. The wrong consists in taxing the public for sectional and private interests, and establishing a dangerous and unprincipled precedent.

There is one little article that was published in the "Farmer," that seems to me to be plain common sense, and without comment, I here insert it.

THE CORN AND OTHER CROPS.

You say, in your last paper, that the critics are after Mr. Pinkham with a sharp stick, relative to his communication of Nov. 12th. I have read, with interest, what Mr. P. said, and I think his estimate nearest to the cost of producing an acre of corn than those cute men who have as yet criticised his estimate; take, for instance, Mr. Emerson, who hires his men so that the cost of the day's work is but fifty-eight cents per day. I would like to give more than one-half of that sum to board my hired help; I should think I was evading some of the commands of the good Book, where it says, "the laborer is worthy of his hire," if I paid him only one dollar for husking sixty-six bushel ears of corn. Now for Mr. P.'s estimate; he only charged ten dollars for ten loads of manure, which four oxen hauled out; these oxen will draw out, easily, one-half cord that is worth five dollars per cord, in any farmer's yard, therefore, if as some say, one-half of the value of the manure is left in the ground, he has not charged too much for it. Mr. E. objects to the charge of plowing, and seems to intimate that part of it should be reckoned as improvement of the land, if the land was well laid down to grass; for myself, I should rather have it, than to have it plowed; for the amount of manure usually put on by farmers, will do more good as top-dressing, than otherwise applied.

In answer to the question put by those who attempt to show up Mr. P., by asking how do the farmers pay for their farms, paint their buildings, &c., I will say, on most farms, there are either wood, rock, or something else, which the farmer in the winter carries to market, which will bring the cash; if not, how does he do it? Five acres of corn will take the time of the entire sea-

son to cultivate, so the best judges say, viz., 100 days; and he gets in profit, eighty-five dollars to do all these things with, according to the estimates of the other writers. How many years would it take to pay the interest, taxes, and for the farm, if he paid \$2000 for it, at the last estimate? S.

Cape Elizabeth, Dec., 1859.

REMARKS. — We meant no disparagement to Mr. P. or his article, by our remarks. — *Editor Farmer.*

In the “Farmer” of March 10, 1860, is an article written by H. C. Merriam, which has many good ideas in it, and I give it place here.

IS FARMING PROFITABLE?

This question is worthy of all the consideration which it has received in the able articles published in your columns, and naturally leads to others equally important. That Agriculture is profitable, the results of particular crops have been relied upon as proving the affirmative, while it is well known that a farmer may raise seventy-five bushels of Indian corn per acre, and have many acres of it, and yet the same year lose a fruit crop worth three times his corn crop; so with his other crops.

In the latter days of Mr. Jefferson, it was proposed to obtain an act of the Legislative Assembly of Virginia, by which his property might be disposed of by a lottery, to extricate him from debts incurred by his generous hospitality, in entertaining almost daily a great number of distinguished guests, foreign and domestic. An objection was made to this project, that it savored of gambling, and was derogatory to the fame, and incompatible with the dignity of the ex-president. This probably prompted Mr. Jefferson to write his essay on gambling, in which he says “that the farmer is the greatest of all gamblers.” A quarter of a century ago,

when I first read this essay, the remark was not particularly noticeable, but much subsequent reflection, and some little observation, have convinced me that this remark, as most others of this great man, contains more truth than poetry.

I do not believe that farming in Massachusetts is a profitable business compared with other pursuits. Farming is a term that admits of many definitions, varying according to the systems of different localities, climate, soil, &c., &c. I use it as applying to the cultivation of every thing raised in this State, and farming is generally profitable according to climate, natural fertility of the soil, facility of production, the price of land and labor, taxes, competition in the market, and the style of living and doing business, demanded by the imperious decrees of fashion.

Now, is farming a game of chance as declared by Mr. Jefferson, or is it a pursuit in which a man can make as definite calculations of expenses and results as are made in the sister arts? Must the mass of farmers live as cheap as they can, and trust to God, for the result of their labor? The painter, if he is master of his business, knows the exact cost of his paints, the quantity necessary to cover a square yard, the number of yards to be covered, the cost of laying on the paint, the margin of his profits, which his capital will return, and how often he can turn it; the mason, the number of bricks necessary for a given wall, the time required to lay them, the cost of labor, and the exact result of his operation; the carpenter, the quantity of lumber necessary for a given structure, &c. So it is in regular and legitimate trade and commerce, with the advantage of insurance against shipwreck, &c., while the farmer, in the failure of crops, must seek his insurance in the declaration that "while the earth remaineth, seed time and harvest shall never fail."

In the sister arts generally, skill, sound judgment, experience, and definite calculations, are not the sport

of chance, but accomplish their purposes with almost as much certainty as instinct attains its ends.

How is it now with the farmer? Can he, when he plants his potatoes, or his orchard, with the greatest skill and judgment, tell anything about the result? Can he hasten the completion of his job, prevent drouth or rain, frost or the rot? These are things over which he has no control, but things controlled by a power before which his puny wit must bow, his boasted skill and science become foolishness, and as fruitless as an iceberg. Now let a general farmer cultivate all the crops; in no season will more than half of them be successful in Massachusetts. The rot may strike his potatoes, his carrot seed may not vegetate, his corn may fail, his turnip seed, sowed the 25th of July, wet or dry, may not sprout till frost comes, his grass land, stocked down with great skill and care, may fail in various ways, and in no season are but a few of the carefully calculated results realized. Man sows, but God gives the increase. Hence that strange faith so characteristic of the farmer.

Does any such uncertainty as this attend the sister arts? Can any business in which man's best faculties are thus baffled and contracted, (other things being equal,) be compared with this, where the operator may be master both of the inception and result of his labor?

That Indian corn may be raised for fifty cents a bushel, or is more profitable than other crops, does not prove Agriculture, in general, profitable, for the character of the soil limits the number of acres which can be planted, and admitting that a farmer may raise 100 bushels per acre, the same season in which he does this, his loss from the failure of his oats, rye, barley, potatoes, hay or fruit, may be three times the value of his corn crop.

That Agriculture is unprofitable, compared with other business in Massachusetts, is the practical judgment of farmers generally, deny it as you may, gloss it

over as you will; else why do so many of their sons desert the plough, hardly enough remaining at home to take care of the good old fathers and mothers? Have they not seen their fathers and neighbors, hard-working and frugal, farmers till sixty years of age, still relatively poor, while their relatives and equals who have engaged in other pursuits are rich, clad in fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day, with leisure to enjoy life, with means to purchase its pleasures, and comforts, too? Why are farmers willing, even desirous, to have their sons quit the farm, and seek an easier and shorter road to fortune and happiness, than they have trod?

The truth must be told, they desire a better life for their children than they have had, and sigh for the means to put them into a position to attain it.

The inevitable conclusion to be drawn from this general desertion of Agriculture is, that farming is unprofitable. The almighty dollar is the moving principle, the stepping stone to command the blessings of life, and not the avoidance of hard work, but work that does not pay; the condition of eminent success in all the arts, is honest hard work, indomitable labor with the head and hands united. There is no other potent to success. Farming is the most delightful of all occupations, where it can be pursued for its unalloyed pleasures, and not for its dubious profits.

Perhaps God, when he ordained that man should earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, designed to protect him from the dangers of excessive wealth, from that effeminacy and deterioration consequent upon self-indulgence and sloth, and from that debasing slavery to avarice which grows with the power and facility of accumulation.

I admit that a man can live by farming, but how does he live? how does he dress? what are his pleasures? when has he leisure? at what age can he retire from business, and live at ease with dignity upon the

fruits of his labor? How often can he go to the White Hills, to Saratoga? when can he visit the battle-fields of his fathers, or the monuments of their fame, with his family, and have his business support it? Trips to Europe, or even to the National Capitol — can he make them?

Yes, a man can live in Massachusetts by farming, but only by economy and self-denial, unknown and unpracticed in other pursuits. Take a survey of any common country town; who are the rich? Men that live, and not stay on the earth. They are men who have done something collateral to farming, traded, shaved notes, lumbered, &c. True, there is now and then a man with the strength and constitution of a giant, with a Yankee wife to match him, with mind enough to have been a Webster, with a will like Napoleon's, who by working sixteen hours a day in cultivating the earth, and selling his products, has made a few thousand dollars, but this man is an exception. In commerce, he would have been an Astor or Girard; in manufactures, an Abbott Lawrence; in science, a Morse, Humboldt, or a Stephenson; in law, a Mason or a Dexter; in the pulpit, a Channing; in letters, a Prescott or a Macauley, but he is obliged to be unknown to fame, and as untravelled as a Japanese.

Now, I know a very skilful farmer who boasted that he made \$1000 in 1856. One of his neighbors said that "he could prove that he lost \$400. On being informed of it, he replied that "Mr. — knows nothing." "I don't know about that," replied his friend. "Well, what was your investment?" "\$10,000." "Well, the interest on that is \$300. What was your wear and tear, which you have not calculated?" "About \$350." "What was your own labor worth? The man who took your place on the market wagon has \$500 a year; you have earned as much. Set this down at \$500. Well, your wife has worked hard, kept no girl, and has done all the work in your great family of hired

men ; had she worked as hard for others, two or three dollars per week would be considered little enough. Set her work down at \$150. Now, how does your account stand ?

Interest on investment.....	\$600.00
Your labor.....	500.00
Wear and tear.....	350.00
Wife's work.....	150.00
	<hr/>
	\$1,600.00
Offset improvements.....	250.00
	<hr/>
	\$1,350.00

“ Had you not gone on to the farm, you might have had \$1,350. Instead of which, you have but \$1000, and a net loss of \$350.”

Take a survey of farmers generally in this State. Have they doubled their property in twenty years? Certainly not. Then they have not made six per cent. on their investments, and all the labor is lost. Well, they have reared families. What of that? All the members of their families have done work enough to have commanded in other pursuits much more than a living.

Again, compare men of like ability and habits engaged in farming and the sister arts, and what is the result? I know two brothers of equal education, (not an uncommon case,) the superior of the two inherited the homestead, the other went into trade in Boston and inherited nothing. They are both well off. The farmer is worth \$25,000, and the other \$150,000, and has not done a quarter part as much hard work. Just such was the case with their father and uncle. Now the farmer, by his mere skill and labor in other pursuits, might have been worth \$30,000, for his equals in the vicinity have done it in the sister arts, — masons, carpenters, overseers and traders. I compare equals in habits and integrity.

These facts and results are confirmed by general observation, and are too true to be overlooked, and naturally lead to the inquiry, why is not farming in this State as profitable as the sister arts, and what can be done to make Agriculture (the nursing mother of all true greatness, and the most noble, elevating and pleasant of all human pursuits,) as profitable as other business?

In the *New England Farmer* of Dec. 24, the following article was published:

IS FARMING A PROFITABLE PURSUIT?

"Facts are stubborn things."

"*Is farming profitable?*"

Mr. Pinkham says not; I would not say it is the most profitable business, but a man can live at it, if so disposed. I was bred a mechanic, but left my trade and took hold of farming, and when I commenced was not worth one dollar. I paid \$4,030 for my farm, then had all my stock and tools to buy. I have had the good luck to pay for the farm, stock and tools, and have put on above \$3,000 worth of buildings since, and do not owe one dollar to any man. I have made it all from my farm, although farm, fences, buildings and interest, have cost me over \$10,000. Let it be worth what it may, I have paid so much, and made it from the farm itself. I have never been in any speculation but farming.

I consider the great secret in farming is, to take hold of one string and pull that steadily when the wind and tide are against you. Keep beating, and you will gain some,—and when the wind shifts in your favor, you are all ready to sail; then comes a good harvest. But the man that shifts every time the wind does, is always beating against wind and tide, therefore he condemns the business he is in, and complains of hard times. I do not brag of being rich, or that our New England farmers can be *very* rich by mere farming, but I do

argue that they may make a good living and lay up a little against a wet day.

A. B.

Barre, Vermont, 1859.

This was a stronger argument against my position than I ever expected to see. On looking the article carefully over, I was led to infer one of two things. One was, that the writer had failed to understand my position in regard to what farming was, or that there was some mistake about it.

I therefore sat down and penned a carefully worded article in order to draw the writer out, to see if he had made a mistake, and had coupled a successful speculation, such as a wood or timber operation, with legitimate farming. This article could not obtain a place in the *Farmer*. I then wrote to the editor of that paper twice to obtain the address of his Barre correspondent, telling him I wanted to correspond with him. To neither of these letters could I obtain any reply. I then wrote to a friend in Boston to call at the *Farmer* office and see what they had to say in the matter. My friend wrote me that his name was not known at the office, or they did not know who the correspondent was.

I thought it singular that so important a matter should find a place in the *Farmer*, without so much as knowing the name of the author. This was unusual. The whole had rather a suspicious look on the face of it. In talking the matter over with one of my neighbors, he told me that he had frequently been in the town; his wife came from an adjoining town, and his wife and himself both felt quite sure that there was some error in re-

gard to it, as neither of them had any knowledge of such person in the place. The reader can easily judge whether a man having accomplished what "A. B." claims in a small country town, would be likely to be unknown. As it is not incumbent on me to prove a negative, I will leave the subject, hoping that the parties interested will place the matter truly before the people. For, as I just said, if this is true, it is a strong argument against my position; but if the reverse, then my position will not suffer, and I will here state that I have no fears of that, not in the least.

I well know that some men can do great things,— what would seem almost impossible to some; but until a different system of reckoning is obtained, all the money that can be made at farming can be put in a small compass.

CONCORD RIVER MEADOWS.

As the editor of the *Farmer* claims the right to tax me and all farmers in the State to furnish means to drain his meadows on Concord river, and also to import fancy stock, and do many other things that are positively injurious to all laboring men, then I claim the right to be heard, while the people and not the fancy have the power. For the tendency of this right to tax the people is to deprive us of the *means* to pay a tax at all, and also of the privilege of being taxed. If we have to go over to Concord to drain his meadows, it would seem to be right for the Concord farmers to come over here to Chelmsford and help us, as our

meadows might be improved ; but the absurdity of this arrangement is that the parlor farmers would get their work all done up, and we should have to “dig our potatoes ” after the frost had claimed the right to nip the fingers.

This right also to tax us to import fancy stock at fabulous prices, and then when they conclude to die off as they do in their own country, to again tax us to replace them, is but another part of the same system, the tendency of which is, that the whole arrangement will some day have to be either disbanded, or we shall become a nation of serfs and nobles, and our democracy will be in name only. I say these things because I believe them to be true ; and those friends whom I signalize as actors in the drama, must look for the cause down deep at the bottom of things, and not wholly at the idea of momentary relief by flying to the public chest as a remedy, for what they consider as evils are not evils, only as injudicious legislation has fastened them upon us, and the only legitimate remedy is not to multiply, but displace the cause. “Put the axe at the root of the tree.”

And it may not be out of the bounds of inquiry in this work, as my object is to do good and not evil, to enjoin upon all farmers the importance of looking carefully to those whom they select as law makers ; for if I can see clearly, the acts of the last, and one or two other legislatures, will cost them millions of treasure, and fasten upon the people a system or code of laws that no one generation can wholly eradicate.

Notwithstanding all that has been said on the immense profits of farming in the public prints and otherwise by the fancy, I have seldom met a man who in private conversation makes any such pretence. But almost universally they will tell you that it is a losing business. The reader has seen how it is. As soon as the figures are made, the tale is told. Make them any way you will, or anywhere you please, the result is nearly the same. In Massachusetts or Ohio, Vermont or Wisconsin, the result is always about the same. Go down South, where labor is almost cheap enough to satisfy Mr. Secretary Flint, although I have always supposed they did furnish a scanty living for their workers, and the figures are no better for agriculture. Cotton, sugar, rice and tobacco cannot be made of nothing any more than corn, wheat, hay, or any product grown at the North.

Entertaining the opinions I do in the matter, and being confident that no one when put to the test can show any other result from actual statements and figures, the idea occurred to me to correspond with some of those men who have been most prominent in presenting the other side of the subject, to show the reader how they talk when asked in plain terms in regard to their own experience or practice.

I accordingly wrote, or caused to be written, letters to many of the fancy and other farmers in this and other States on the subject. The following is a copy of the letters sent, and some of the answers are here subjoined. It will be proper to state here that out of

all the letters written and sent, I have received answers to but few, and will say that I am greatly obliged to those who were kind enough to favor me with an answer, although the reader will need no promptings to define the reason of the neglect of those who did not.

“DEAR SIR: — I am preparing for the press a small work to be entitled ‘FARMING AS IT IS,’ expressive of my views of Agriculture, as a means of living for the young men and young women of this section of the country, with limited or no means but their stout hearts and strong arms.

And, sir, as you have had large experience in this branch of human industry, and are equally interested in whatever pertains to our best interest and the prosperity of the country, I have thought it advisable to address you and a few others upon this important subject, hoping you will kindly consider the matter.

The point of inquiry is this: have you so separated your agricultural from your other interests as to be able to decide with a considerable degree of accuracy, if in your *own practice* you have made a *profit*, or a net income above a reasonable estimate on the value of the labor performed, and a fair per cent. on the capital invested?

An early reply is respectfully solicited.

With much respect, I remain, your friend,
J. T. P.

Chelmsford, Mass., March, 1860.

Hon. Simon Brown in his reply, says, “I have to say that *I have not*, and therefore my experience would not be valuable to you.”

The reader is aware that this Mr. Brown is one of the men who claims to be competent to teach the people how to farm, and travels the country for this purpose,

and is paid out of the treasury of the State. He is a farmer in old Concord, in this County, is editor of the "New England Farmer," is continually talking and writing about the monstrous *profits* of farming, both in his own practice, and in that of others. He nearly doubled his money on the corn crop last year, and yet, when asked in plain terms, to put his name to the facts and figures of his own Agriculture, he says, "I have not," or "I cannot say," &c., &c. Further comment is unnecessary. His letter is here subjoined.

Boston, March 23, 1860.

DEAR SIR: In your note of the 18th instant, you inquire:

"Have you so separated your Agricultural from your other interests, as to decide with considerable degree of accuracy, if in your *own practice* you have made a *profit* or a net income above a reasonable estimate on the value of the labor performed, and a fair per cent. on the capital invested?"

In reply, I have to say that I have not, and therefore my experience would not be valuable to you, so far as *exact* statements are concerned. I am glad you are writing upon the subject, because the more thorough the investigation, the more decisive will be the conviction among our people that farming, as an occupation, is healthy, profitable and honorable. I am very sincerely and cordially yours,

SIMON BROWN.

Hon. Richard S. Fay, says, "I do not claim to have received a *profit*," &c., &c.

Mr. Fay's farming, as he says, is no criterion by which to judge of the profits or losses of farming generally. He undoubtedly, like thousands of others, sup-

poses it is for the best good of the people to make farm products cheap, when the reverse is incontrovertibly true. For this purpose he labors, but I hope however that ere long, he and others will see their error.

The following is Mr. Fay's reply :

Boston, April 9, 1860.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of April 3d, addressed to me at Lynn, I have just received. You ask me the following question :

"Have you so separated your Agricultural from your other interests as to be able to decide with a considerable degree of accuracy, if in your own practice you have made a profit or a net income above a reasonable estimate on the value of the labor performed, and a fair per cent. on the capital invested ?"

I will answer in reply, that my farming operations form a very small proportion of the labor or money expended upon *my place* in Lynn, which is not, from the nature of the soil, adapted to the purposes of general Agriculture. I have, however, kept an accurate account of all my expenditures, labor, money, &c., applied to Agriculture, as well as the receipts, and I can safely say that as a capitalist, I am not dissatisfied with the result. I do not claim to have received a "*profit or net income above a reasonable estimate for labor performed, and a fair per cent. on the capital invested,*" for if I understand the expression above quoted, it would be a most unreasonable profit, but I have had a fair return for my labor and capital.

I am convinced, from experience and observation, that a young man, with limited means, such as you describe in your note, at the present prices of land in Massachusetts, can make money at less risk in the pursuit of Agriculture, than in any other department of human industry, — provided, *he understands the business*, and has had a proper Agricultural training. *Poor farming* will not pay, — the same penalties await the

want of skill in this as in other occupations. It will not pay perhaps to grow 30 bushels of corn to the acre, or a ton of hay, — it will not pay to breed ordinary animals at any price; but it will pay to grow good crops, and good animals; and the same skill which is required to insure success in other pursuits, will find a double reward in Agriculture.

I have read several communications from you in the "New England Farmer," upon the profits of farming, but until I know the point you are aiming at, I cannot tell whether the purpose you have in view is likely to be useful or not. If I were to enter upon the subject you have in hand, I should take the maximum crops that have been and are grown, test the question of profit or loss upon them; if a profit, I should point to those crops as the standard of success, and a falling off from the standard, as a sure declension until it reaches the lower point, which you may also establish, as the point of loss. I see nothing gained in the way of information to the young man entering life, by informing him that Mr. A. has made money by farming, and that Mr. B. has not, unless you can go into their accounts and show the reasons for the two opposite results. A failure of success does not of necessity prove that the business in which it occurred is not a profitable one. Indeed, in all departments of industry, the inherent unprofitableness of the business is the least common cause of failure. Ninety-nine men out of a hundred, whether in manufactures, agriculture or commerce, as well as in the learned professions, who *fail*, do so because they *do not understand*, or *neglect their business*. I have written this hastily, — judging from your note, that an early reply would oblige you. The motive for my saying more than to reply to your question, I trust you will appreciate. Very truly your obt. servt..

R. S. FAY.

The letter from Hon. George S. Boutwell is valuable in this particular; it shows that he is keeping the fig-

ures, the debit and credit; and that, after all, is *the* thing to be desired. Let all farmers do this, and a revolution for good must be the result. Make the figures, brother farmers everywhere, and do it every day, upon every crop and every animal, and take your time; consider this a part of the work of the farm. Never put it off till a rainy day, or Saturday night, or Sunday, making this an excuse for staying away from church. Have a tag fastened upon every animal, and every product, with some kind of cabalistic characters, same as the tailors have upon their coats, pants, &c., so that you will know at once the cost of each article, and when a customer comes along, tell him it cost so and so, just as the tailor tells you, and let everybody know that figuring and farming are synonymous. If it is right that other folks should make a profit, it is equally so that the farmer should. And all those who have a fortune, or are in receipt of an income outside of the business, should recollect that when you so cheapen the price of farm products below living wages, you deprive those in embarrassed circumstances of the means of a living.

Groton, 21st March, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 18th instant is before me, and I regret that I cannot aid you in your inquiries.

I took a farm in 1854, that had been much neglected, and for two years after, I did not attend to its cultivation. Since that time, my chief expenditures have related to the renovation of the land. I have not, however, kept an account of receipts and expenditures. It

is my purpose to do so in future, but heretofore, such an account would have had no value in the elucidation of the subject of your inquiry.

My belief is that hay, grain, milk and butter, pay a small profit to the producer. Other products I have not tried. Very respectfully,

GEO. S. BOUTWELL.

Salem, May 13, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR: Yours of March 28th, was laid aside with a view of writing an elaborate answer, but I find this to be impossible on account of pressing duties. I seize a moment now, on my return from Brookfield, where I am engaged in extirpating the terrible cattle disease, to say that there is no doubt of the profit of farming when pursued carefully and economically. I stated last season in an address, that no manual labor was so well paid, and I believe it.

As a proof of my assertion, I would state that the town of New Braintree, wholly Agricultural, is the richest in the State in proportion to its population.

My own accounts show a very fair increase on a large investment: and of course, I must farm at a great disadvantage.

No business requires so much patience, foresight, and sagacity, none so thorough an adaptation of one's operations to the locality in which one is situated.

Truly yours,

GEO. B. LORING.

The letter of Dr. Loring I hope the reader will give a careful perusal. He has spoken plainly, just as every man had ought to speak, when the rights of others are involved. For I know of nothing more annoying than this running all round the stump, or like the Irishman's flea, when you put your "finger on him he is not there."

The Doctor says that his "own accounts show a very fair income on a large investment: and of course, he must farm at a great disadvantage." Why so? Why not you farm at a *profit*, same as our merchants and manufacturers, who seldom do any of their own work, but often pay several times as much for help, clerk-hire, book keepers, &c., as any farm workmen expect. If farm labor is better paid than any other "manual" labor, why cannot a young man, who holds himself up as competent to teach farming, do what he thinks others may do?

"No business," says the Doctor, "requires so much patience, foresight, and sagacity, none so thorough an adaptation of one's operations to the locality in which one is situated." If the Doctor had said in addition to this, that no business required so much physical exertion and deprivation, then I should agree with him.

But the principal point in my friend's letter to sustain his position, is the "wealth" of New Braintree, which he cites as "proof" of his argument. He says that this town (New Braintree,) is wholly "Agricultural," and the "richest in the State in proportion to its population." Let us see how this is.

I presume that the Doctor will not claim that this proves anything either way; because a town is rich and Agricultural, does not prove farming to be profitable. For if these people made their money at farming, that would be an argument, but as they did not, but inherited it, mainly and by their inactivity have been gradually decreasing in population, and it is one of the very few towns that have done this, in the State. The year

before the last census was taken, there was but one marriage in the town, and the deaths were greater than the births. From 1850 to 1855, the population fell off 77, more than 15 each year. This shows anything but prosperity.

Now for my friend's facts. It "is the richest in the State in proportion to its population." In 1850, the population was 852, the inventory, \$554,624. This would give \$653 to each inhabitant, or to a family of five, \$3,265. In Brookline, in Norfolk County, the population at the same time was 2,516. The valuation, \$5,436,854.50. This would give to each person more than \$2,100, or a family of five persons, \$10,500, more than three times as much as New Braintree. In North Chelsea, the valuation would give to each person, \$857.00. In the town of Watertown, Middlesex County, the population was 2,837. The valuation, \$2,351,583.20. This would allow to each person, \$828, or a family of five persons, \$4,140. In New Bedford, the population was 16,443. The valuation at the same time, \$14,489,266. Making \$881.00 to each person, and to a family of five persons, \$4,405.00. I presume that this will do. There are other towns in the State which the census of 1850 shows the same result, and if we exclude foreigners, as they should be in a calculation of this kind with their property, there would be many towns and cities exceeding in their average valuation the town of New Braintree.

The Doctor further says: "As proof of my assertion, I would state that the town of New Braintree, is wholly agricultural." ("Wholly agricultural.") Let us see.

In 1855, the report on the industry of the State says there was a carriage manufactory making \$1,500 worth a year, or the year previous; also, \$7,155 worth of boots and shoes made; value of palm leaf hats \$70; value of lumber purchased for market, \$1,400; value of fire-wood prepared for market, \$1,250; also, a shoe shaving establishment. Thus it seems that although the people are mainly agriculturists, they are not wholly so.

Now let us see what these wealthy farmers earned, for if farming is more profitable than any other "manual labor," as the Doctor asserts, and after some six weeks of time to prepare a strong argument in "proof of his assertion," he has gone up into the western part of Worcester county for his arguments, where they keep the fancy stock, and have got the needful to do it with.

The total products of the year 1854, were as follows:

Wool products,	179 pounds, at	30.....	\$53 70
Butter,	12,635 "	25.....	3,158 00
Cheese,	265,650 "	10.....	26,565 00
Indian corn,	7,710 bushels,	1 12½.....	8,674 00
Wheat,	48 "	2 50.....	120 00
Rye,	1,800 "	1 25.....	2,250 00
Barley,	2,522 "	1 00.....	2,522 00
Oats,	4,758 "	50.....	2,379 00
Potatoes,	13,000 "	50.....	6,500 00
English hay,	2,100 tons,	14 00.....	29,400 00
Swale hay,	542 "	6 00.....	3,250 00
Apples,.....			3,477 00
Pears,.....			8 00
Cranberries,.....			366 00
Buckwheat, 125 bushels, at 75 cents.....			94 00
Swine, 238, valued.....			2,380 00

Total.....\$91,206 70

If any one supposes that this \$91,206.70 represents truly the earnings of the farmers of New Braintree for the year 1854, they are greatly mistaken, and before setting themselves up for teachers, they had better go to school, and not be very ambitious to get into a high class neither. With just as much propriety might a manufacturer figure up the value of the raw material of which his goods are made, then estimate the value after they are manufactured, and adding the whole together, calling that sum the earnings of the year. Of course our manufacturer would deceive himself, possibly others; but if he was rich, worked hard, was very prudent, he might remain in blissful ignorance, but some morning his heirs would wake up a little disappointed.

Then according to this report, the prices were some higher in 1855 than now.

If I were to estimate the earnings of this town for the year, I should make the figures thus, taking the sum total as it stands :

\$91,206.70, less 15 per cent. for marketing, selling, and loss.....	\$13.681 00
Earnings of capital, 6 per cent. on \$300,000.....	18,000 00
Raw material of which the products are made.....	30,402 23
	<hr/>
	\$62,083 23

Let this sum be taken from the whole earnings, it will leave \$29,123.47 as a compensation for the labor. This divided among 250 farm laborers, would give each \$116.

Thus my friend Dr. Loring will see that if there is

“no doubt of the profit of farming,” he has been extremely unfortunate in his facts to “prove” it; for he must perceive that what he supposed to be facts were only imaginary ones, and I only regret that his time could not have been so much at his command as to have enabled him to have written out his “elaborate answer,” for I always find it much easier to talk to those who, when they speak, say something, rather than words.

Until we have a more correct system of estimating the cost of farm products, no poor man can earn a respectable and comfortable living at farming. That many of the farmers of New Braintree are wealthy, and the town is wealthy, is no argument to prove the profitableness of agriculture. If these men had earned their money, it would have been different. As long as we are able to export grain and animal food to countries whose laborers are serfs, we have got to do one or two things: either defraud labor of a decent reward, or exhaust the soil, perhaps both. This is just what we are doing. For while labor is nominally much lower in Europe, their farm products are much higher. There agriculture can be done at a profit; here only at a loss. When we shall learn to increase the fertility of our land without domestic animals, keeping them only when the income from them will pay day wages for the food and the care they demand, then nearly the whole secret of successful farming is obtained. Now we make slaves of ourselves to provide for our animals, rearing and fattening them, without the least prospect of a reward for doing so.

The Chinese have increased the productiveness of their soil, cultivating constantly the same for many centuries, and yet it is just as ready to bear its burden now as ever. They have comparatively no animals, not relying on these for plant food. Neither have they any such thing as agricultural societies, or Boards of Agriculture; yet there is no lack of human food. They rely entirely on the law of supply and demand, as all classes of people should, believing that all industrial interests are best protected when left entirely free. There is no more need of legislating for the farmers than the shoemakers; if, when the latter run till they run nearly down, and then "strike," so the farmers should watch carefully their rights, and when their labor yields them a scanty living, they should pause.

All farmers should keep all the stock, and raise all the products they need for their own consumption and use, and never sell an article from the farm only in case of emergency, at a loss. No matter what men say or pretend, this is the only ground upon which we can act; for the price of human food in the cities and market places to the consumers is not governed by the realization of the farmer, but by the cupidity of the speculators. When wheat sells for sixty cents per bushel in Chicago by the farmer, flour ought to be sold at retail in Boston for five dollars per barrel. But this is not the fact, for the price of flour in Boston depends quite as much on a manufactured money market, as on the price of grain at the West. When beef is sold

for six dollars per hundred in Cambridge, the consumers in Boston should buy the article for from four to thirteen cents per pound. But let me say that the price of beef to the producer, has but little to do with the cost of the article to the consumers. The losses of the farmers increase the profits of the traders.

Some of the most distinguished agricultural writers and lecturers to whom the people have been pleased to listen, have written to me in reply to my interrogatories, and say that they have nothing to say that will be of any use, or in their own language, "I have no accounts with my land accurate enough for publication," &c.; or, "I do not know of my own knowledge," "I have made no money," &c., &c.

Out of all the answers I have received to my inquiries, not a single one, with the exception of Dr. Loring, have claimed that they themselves have got pay for their labor. They never took the view of the matter that was suggested.

It seems to me proper here to state that the Secretary of the "Board of Agriculture," Mr. Flint, did not favor me with a reply. Inasmuch as he is in receipt of large pay from the State, which the taxes of all farmers in the Commonwealth go to support, I was in hopes that he would let the farmers know what he had to say in the matter. Because, if he is no farmer, had this fact ought to be kept from the people? Is a man who knows but little about farming practically, as a means of living, the best man to stand at the head of the "Board," supposing the object is to benefit the

farmer, as is professed? If not the farmers' interest is to be promoted, but those who live on the labor of the farmer, then the arrangement is undoubtedly wise.

The last five years have been the most disastrous to the farmers of this country that they ever experienced, and whether they know it or not, it does not alter the fact. The whole of these troubles, or nearly so, can be directly traced to what is termed the fostering care of legislative action; a fondness of the *pap* that flows from the public chest. As this *pap* is increased, the poor will have to suffer; and it will not effect the poor only, but will permeate throughout all society.

THE FIRST CONVERT.

Strange things *do happen*, sometimes, any way. The reader has seen what the Hon. Simon Brown said in his letter, in regard to the professions of young men, and the profits of his own Agriculture.

Who then would have thought that in a few short weeks a hopeful conversion would have resulted upon the principal idea embraced in my letter, to which his is a reply?

After conning this letter over in his mind a few weeks, he came out in a leader in his own paper, of May 19th, following, a portion of which article I here insert.

“In view of this increasing interest in Agricultural pursuits, we wish to suggest that, in our opinion, greater freedom may be extended to farmers' sons and daughters in the choice of a profession. For ourselves, we

are ready to sign a proclamation that, henceforth, every one who desires to do so, may leave the farm and the farm-house, forthwith !

As the business of Agriculture now stands, there is little hope of success by any of those sick of home, victims of fate plodders, who believe they were made for mechanics, merchants, peddlers, preachers, politicians or fiddlers. All these classes are wanted, but not on the farm. In the late discussion of the question, "What will tend to make farming pleasant and profitable as a pursuit?" by the Legislative Agricultural Society, it was well suggested that a love of the business is essential. People must take hold of it from choice, and voluntarily devote to it the best energies of their minds and bodies, or the business will not be either pleasant or profitable.

Who has not often remarked, that, among the strange whims of our common humanity, there is a disposition to do those things which it has been forbidden to do, and to leave undone those things which it has been most persistently advised and exhorted to do. Recognizing this as a well-known, but often neglected principle of human nature, *we do honestly believe there is danger that the advice to farmers' sons to stick to the farm may be too frequently repeated."*

I am free to admit that I did not expect to make converts quite so easily, as this article of the editor indicates; yet, such seems to be the fact. And if this writer sees a sufficient amount of truth and practical advancement in the many other ideas contained in this book, and is as ready to admit that we have outlived the single idea principle, that the only road to excellence is over the necks of humanity, and will work in conjunction with the thousands of others who must see that the principles here advocated are practicable and

reasonable, and for the general welfare, what an amount of good may in a brief time be accomplished.

“A single word that is fitly spoken,
May wound or soothe a heart that’s broken.”

It is not apt to be the case that those individuals who are the most easily enlisted, make the best “soldiers,” yet, as the politicians say, we go for “principles not men;” and as in this stage of the controversy, considering the reasonableness and importance of the position taken, it would seem reasonable that brief conversions would be likely to ensue, therefore, I hope that none will question the probationary time taken, as the greatest sinners often make the most valuable pleaders of a good cause.

And as it is not to be supposed that Mr. Brown could have embraced the whole of the code of principles in this work, from the brief letter he was so kind as to acknowledge, inasmuch as he still holds to the opinion that the farmers should ignore the idea of being “*mechanics, merchants, peddlers, preachers, politicians or fiddlers;*” and as this idea seriously conflicts with my views of the matter, he will see that he is not yet wholly converted, having only taken the initiary steps to a more perfect development.

For I hold that this idea that farmers should be mere drudges upon the farm, electing others to do their preaching, trading, &c., is a fundamental error that needs to be eradicated, and were it not for this “Board of Agriculture,” and all the other humbugs of the day, which are gnawing at the very vitals of the working

farmer, would be among the things for which a free and enlightened people have no place. In another paragraph in the same article that I am now briefly reviewing, the editor says, "We might also refer . . . to the labor-saving implements which do the work of menials and slaves."

Recollect that the Editor is talking about New England farmers and New England farming; not Old England nor the land of the Hottentots, those very men who for more than a quarter of a century he boasts of having "spoken to editorially," in regard to their interests and good, and has always been foremost in his endeavor to persuade young men everywhere to "stick to the farm," saying that all other business is overdone, and this yields a profit unparalleled. And now when confronted in his position, he turns round and sneeringly talks about the country boys as being "fate plodders," anxious to become "peddlers, preachers, politicians, fiddlers," &c. Then professes to see in the late inventions a relief for the "*menials and slaves.*" What implement, let me ask, has yet been made to do the most repulsive work upon the farm? It is only the genteel work that is now done by machinery, mainly, leaving the "severity of our toil" yet to "*menials and slaves.*"

However, I will say but little more, as my friend will be led to think that instead of his being a convert, he is hardly prepared as a candidate for the anxious seat; hoping, therefore, that all twinges of conscience, however slight, will admonish him of the importance

of the subject, and that the principles here advocated are the only touch-stone to a complete redemption.

“For ourselves, we are ready to sign a *proclamation* that, henceforth, every one who desires to do so may leave the farm and the farm-house, forthwith.”

Rather cool! How long since you came to this conclusion, and who is to draw up the “proclamation?” This is important. Perhaps the country boys will demand an explanation in regard to the “*menials* and *slaves*.” And also, would like to know if this “proclamation” is to include “*fiddlers, mechanics,*” &c., as well. Those words grate harshly on New England ears. Do you think this treating the young men respectfully, after having done more perhaps than any other man by way of advising them “to stick to the farm,” thereby rendering them unqualified to engage successfully in any business. Verily,

“The evil that men do, lives after them.”

Again, my friend the editor says, “But if the number of papers *devoted* to the interest of the *farmer* which are now read and supported by farmers, may be cited with hopefulness and exultation, surely the *talent* and *ability* which are displayed in their management may be regarded with the highest degree of satisfaction.”

I should like to inquire what papers he refers to as being “devoted to the interest of the farmer?” Certainly a paper that speaks of the working farmers as being “menials and slaves,” and tells about their “dog-

ged wilfulness,” (genteel expressions — refined language,) would hardly be considered very strongly “devoted to the farmer’s interest.” Perhaps if the editor would explicitly define what he understands by the word, (farmer,) we could then understandingly consider the subject.

In pharmacy there are two classes of practitioners ; one class we call doctors, (or the regulars,) the other, quacks or quack doctors, (irregulars.) If this term were applied to one class of farmers to distinguish them, calling those who rely on their own industry and capital for support, “farmers,” and those who live mainly by preying upon the farmers, quacks or quack farmers, we could then consider them understandingly.

Therefore, if the editor wishes to be understood, when speaking of the “papers” as being “devoted to the farmer’s interest,” this latter class of farmers, or as they now stand, quacks or quack farmers, then there is no chance for an argument. For of what use would all this “machinery” which is doing the work of “menials and slaves” be, were it not for the papers to puff them into existence ? Are not the papers, yea, and their editors, too, but “clay in the potter’s hands,” to deceive the farmers of their rights ? Then were it not for this “*dogged wilfulness*,” “*mistaken for independence*,” which the editor loathes so much, that “*the business of farming has bred a hearty contempt*,” and in some degree puts a veto on the “fat strikes,” of the fancy.

This 19th of May article of the editor is so full of

subject matter that requires but little criticism, it being more explicit than any language of mine can make it, that perhaps, on the whole, it would have been better to have given the whole a place here rather than the few extracts I have made, although what I have taken is a tolerable index to the article, and can in no wise be called a garbled synopsis. The italics mainly are mine.

With one or two extracts more, I will leave it. "We might also refer to books on agriculture which are swelling our libraries to a size that is fast assuming the solid proportions of the libraries of *the professions*."

Who has written a book that is of any benefit to the farmer? It is true that some books have been made, but generally they are reprints from old English works, or are translated from other languages, and of course are not adapted to our system or policy of industry. In England, I have the authority of Hon. Henry F. French for saying, that while their labor is much lower, their products are much higher than ours. Proving conclusively that if there agriculture is but a paying business, here it must be a losing one. I now refer to hired labor, for there is no class of men under the sun who work so cheap, or at so great a loss as the owners or occupants of farms in New England. Allowing that farm property should pay a dividend of six per cent., same as city property, then charge the depreciation in value to the income, and all the surplus there is left to pay the owner his labor bill, would scarcely affect the sight, if lodged in the eye.

I have spoken in another place of the value to the farmer of one class of books, (Flint's Reports.) If these "books which swell the libraries," &c., are of any use to the farmer, I have always failed to see it. Book-making, like shoe-making, is a trade, both useful and important; but I fear it is not always the best workmen who get the best pay. Slap shoes and slap books are in some particulars somewhat analagous; in others, the analogy does not hold, for while the slap shoe, like the lion, shows its teeth, warning the beholder of inevitable danger, the slap book, like a more stealthy foe, lives and fattens by *suction*. The one draws hard upon the purse, — the other upon the mind as well; and that although a vacuum of books is to be deplored, a vacuum of mind produced by the multiplication of deceptive books is to be abhorred.

A single extract more will close this criticism. "A noble band of brothers, these readers and contributors of agricultural papers. Social, sympathetic, united!" This reminds me of the fable of the "fox and chanticleer." The rooster, it will be recollected, took refuge in the branches of a handy tree to save himself from the clutches of his wily foe. The fox then resorted to a stratagem, and said all sorts of pretty things to induce his shy neighbor to come down. "A noble band of brothers, * * * * social, sympathetic, united," and many other beautiful things that a hungry and cunning fox would be likely to say, was said. Whether chanticleer had enough of that "*dogged wilfulness, mistaken for independence*," to keep him out of harm's

way is not stated. Presuming that he had, then the mild terms of "menial and slave," perhaps followed.

Now, if my friend the editor thinks he can embrace the whole code of principles here inculcated with open arms, he will be received. But the simple avowal of regretting that he has said so much to induce the young men "to stick to the farm," although important as far as it goes, is hardly a full recompense for the many evils under which the farmer labors. And that although all have a right to promote their own interests, yet let us not seek to fasten wrongs upon our people, looking down into the long future, that will have a tendency to rob honest labor of a just reward.

Jefferson says, that "These truths are self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, *deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.*" These are the principles upon which our institutions are based; our policy being with all classes of industry but agriculture, to rely on the natural law of supply and demand. Now, let us conquer all prejudice, and let this law permeate into *all* branches of industry. This legislating for agriculture is virtually prohibiting all poor men from obtaining a livelihood at farming, unless they work for wages; having a direct tendency to keep down the price of agricultural products and lands to the standard that yields little or no return for labor.

Then why not ask the "*consent of the governed*" at the ballot box, if they want a *supervising head* at the metropolis? If I can see clearly, an emphatic, No! would redound from Berkshire to Barnstable, from Maine to Wisconsin. Any other answer would evince an imbecility, the existence of which all farmers would be slow to admit. When the markets for the various products of mechanical industry become so overstocked with goods that labor yields a reward insufficient to supply the conveniencies of life, the workmen stop, take breath, consult together and devise means to increase the awards of the toiling masses. If they succeed, and accomplish the object of their desires, the *world applauds* and *honors* them for it. But let them fail, and the iron heel of oppression is upon them. Where is the man to-day that does not think better of the shoemakers of New England than he did before the late *strike*? Do they not stand higher in the estimation of all thinking men now, than ever before? Have they not proved to the world their competency to manage their own affairs, and without any resort to legislation, or any demands upon the treasury of the State or country? Although they have not done all that was desired, yet they have solved the problem, that to be *menials*! and *slaves*! never.

Had a similar law to the statute making it a penal offence to "expose for sale a load of wood, hay," &c., (about which I shall speak more fully elsewhere,) been enacted, in the early history of our government, making it obligatory on every shoemaker, under a penalty

of twice the value of the goods exposed, to employ an *expert* to stand between him and the purchaser, whenever an article of his industry was put in the market; and further, had laws been enacted, and the people's treasury severely taxed, to keep down the price of shoes, and the most fulsome measures been adopted to destroy his manhood, would the workmen, yea, and the *workwomen*! too, have had the independence, the courage and the stamina, at an inclement season, amid storms and sleet, for more than six weeks, to stand out against the combination of capital, threats and insolence, hurling back into the teeth of quack philanthropy and a dogmatic inclination to rule or ruin, "NO SLAVERY HERE?"

There is none too much of that "dogged wilfulness, mistaken for independence," which is so annoying in some circles. "*A fortiori.*"

"Consensus facit legem."

Now let the farmers think these things all over, and see if they cannot see in the early and late statutes a sufficient reason for the invasion of their rights, and the intolerable presumption emanating from certain classes of men, *who have a rage for speaking*, "*Cacoethes loquendi*," or, *an itch for scribbling*, "*Cacoethes scribendi.*"

"Vendidit hic auro patriam."

They would sell their country for gold.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE STATUTE LAWS—THE LAW OF CUSTOM, AND HOW THE FARMERS LIVE.

The State Laws Detrimental to the Farming Interest—Agriculture the Foundation upon which all Interests Stand—The Honesty of Farmers—The Tailor and the Farmer—The Statute and the Surveyor—The Wood Law—The Influence of the Laws upon the People—The Farmer and his Half-Bushel—Adulteration of Goods—The Weight of Grain and Meal—The Legislature and its Enactments—The Fancy and the Appropriations—Special Laws—Diseased Cattle—Purity of Blood and the Taxes—Concord River Meadows—The State going to Farming—The Law of Supply and Demand—Let the Farmers Alone—How the Farmers Live—Not all by Farming—Speculating Farmers—Sheep and Butter—How the Farmers Manage to Raise the Wind—The Farmers Interest—Prolific Hens—The Hen Fever—Important Suggestions—Profit and per cent—Legal rate of Interest—Net Profit—Earnings of Farmers—Farmers should work, but not consider themselves slaves, menials, or under guardianship—A Grand Tea-party—Farming a hazardous business—What constitutes poor and good Farming—Modern Definitions—Draining the Meadows again, and the Cattle Disease—Judge French and his policy—The Laws and the Pleuro Legislature—The Board's Commissioners, and their guessing.

IN the examination of some of the subjects which have been presented in the previous chapters, some of the State laws have been noticed. There are other laws, and the law of custom growing out of these, that for a long series of years have had a detrimental influence on the farming communities. The people have grown up under these laws, have been influenced by them, till they have been thought necessary burdens to

bear, and the inequality in their operation has been lost sight of.

If the many things that have been proved by facts and figures, which seem to be incontrovertible, and operating to impoverish, degrade, and infringe upon the rights of one class of the people are true, then there is some cause for it; and it would seem to be the duty of all good men to seek out this cause, and gradually restore that equilibrium among the people, that no one interest may be fostered to the detriment of others, and no class of the people be grievously taxed that others at their expense may be benefited.

My views of the matter are, that Agriculture is the foundation upon which all other interests stand; without this, civilization ceases, and as a nation we cease to exist. Whatever operates to the disadvantage of this interest, permeates throughout all society, and, as a whole, we stand lower, or fail to reach that position we otherwise should.

"It has been wisely said that that people who are governed the least, are governed the best."

"The essence of all law is justice." * "Those who have made pernicious and unjust decrees, have made anything rather than laws." †

It is often said that the farmers are more intelligent, independent, and honest, than any other class of the people. I presume the farmers do not think themselves flattered much when they hear this. Because in their every-day transactions, they find that the laws

* Hampden.

† Cicero.

degrade them. If a farmer desires to have a coat made, the tailor is supposed to be the best judge in regard to what he wants. In him he places confidence, and the law puts no arbiter between them. His charges the law considers valid, and let him cut the coat as he will, put in such material as suits him, the statute makes no provision for any umpire between them. The court holds the farmer liable for the amount of the bill, and the sheriff, if need be, enforces the decision. But if the tailor feels the need of something to *warm* him up, he calls to the clod-hopper in passing his door, and asks him what he wants for the load of wood? Before the price is agreed upon, somebody's clerk steps in with the statute under his arm to settle all controversy. With a long pole in one hand, and a constable's warrant in the other, the farmer's mouth is entirely closed. If he demurs, the statute is read to him in this wise :

1. "All cord-wood exposed to sale shall be either four feet, three feet, or two feet long, including half the scarf ; and the wood, being well and close laid together, shall measure in quantity equal to a cord of eight feet in length, four feet in width, and four feet in height." R. S. c. 28, § 200.

2. "If fire-wood or bark shall be offered for sale before the same shall have been measured, by a *public measurer* of wood and bark, and a *ticket* thereof signed by him, delivered to the driver, *certifying* the quantity of wood which the load contains, the name of the *driver*, and the town in which he resides ; the driver or *owner* of such wood or bark shall, for each load, severally forfeit the sum of *five dollars* to the use of the town where such wood or bark shall be offered for sale." Ibid. § 201.

The object of this law is, I suppose, that the tailor may not get cheated by the *honest* farmer, over whom so many crocodile tears are shed. I know of but few articles of consumption in which there is so little possibility of a chance for deception, as a load of wood. It is exposed to view on all sides, and as to the quantity, repeal the statute, and any farmer's boy who is large enough to handle the whip or goad, would soon learn to measure it correctly, and take pride in establishing, when young, a name for integrity that would last him as long as he lives.

How is it possible to conceive of anything more degrading to an honest man, when going to market with the product of his own toil, to contemplate upon the statute, making it a penal offence to expose for sale the most necessary articles of consumption, without first going to some snob, whom the law has armed with brief authority, and with a long pole in one hand, a peck measure in the other, and a pair of balances on his shoulder, undertakes to dictate about the quantity, quality, compactness, &c., of the article.

If the farmers are such consummate rogues that no confidence can be placed in them, then the law has made them such ; or, if they are incompetent to estimate correctly the quantity or quality, then, also, the law is responsible for that.

The farmers can never take that position they ought, in society, till all these laws are repealed. That they quietly submit to them, and do not ask to have them changed, is the strongest argument it is possible to con-

ceive of, of the influence of long-standing laws upon the minds and habits of a people.

The statute law, binding as it is, upon them, is scarcely less imperative than the law of custom. This latter growing out of the former, has now such force that no man in purchasing of the farmer, ever thinks of, (in fact, the farmers do not expect it,) consulting him at all as to the quantity or quality. The price agreed upon, then, says the purchaser, bring in your article; let us weigh or measure it. The farmer is not supposed to have a half bushel, a pair of balances, or a common rule. All his crops exposed for sale are weighed or measured by the purchaser's apparatus, when all we purchase is weighed or measured by the seller's standard; so that the law of the statutes and custom have relieved the farmers of all mind in the matter, and left nothing but physical power. The farmer would be laughed at if he undertook to tell the cost of an article, and I know he would be ashamed to tell, if he knew.

While it is scarcely possible to deceive any one by covering up any imperfections in our products, they are of such a bulky nature, that they must be exposed to full view, how is it with those we buy? Nearly all manufactured goods, such as boots, shoes, clothes, cloths, hats, caps, bonnets, and many kinds of groceries, spices, &c., are either greatly adulterated, or glossed over on purpose to deceive all who are not in the secret, and there is no arbiter to stand between the purchaser and the dealer. The law makes no provision

for this, — to cheat the farmer is called smart, and entitles one to place and power.

The law making a bushel of whole grain weigh some six or eight pounds more than a bushel of meal, operates entirely to the disadvantage of the grower. To the miller the grain is the raw material, and the meal or flour, the manufactured article; and if the law makes one weigh sixty pounds, so ought the other. I do not object to standards, nor the law making it penal to violate them, but they should be uniform, and bear upon all alike. The manufactured article should weigh the same as the raw material, and the variation in *price* not *weight*, should pay for the process. Then a man that was not thoroughly posted, would stand some chance in the world.

Every farmer knows and feels that all these laws operate against him. He does not complain, and would not, though they were much more severe. They existed when he was born, — were taken from the code of the mother country, where labor is, what American labor is destined to be, if it is not already, a perpetual warring with the elements for subsistence.

Not a session of the Legislature passes, but what some laws are made placing the farmers more completely under guardianship of the State, and inflicting great wrong on the people; proving, conclusively, that the State supposes the farmers incapable of conducting their own affairs, and seeking to place them in the same condition that we find them in the old countries.

These things will continue just as long as we have

our Boards of Agriculture, Agricultural Societies, &c. As long as appropriations are made upon the treasury to maintain a few fancy men to keep down the price of labor, that the non-producers may luxuriate at a cheap rate, so long will these enactments be augmented, till freedom in thought and deed is entirely crushed out among the people, and we are mere "hewers of wood and drawers of water."

One or two of the special laws of this session of the Legislature, (1860,) should be mentioned in this connection. For instance, the act of the Legislature appropriating the people's money to pay for certain *diseased cattle* in one section of the State, thereby inflicting two wrongs upon the tax payers.

By taking our money to import to this country, at great cost, foreign blood, that the fancy are so much in love with, and which experience has proved are no benefit, either to the State, country, or the people, only as it furnishes means of living to a certain few, to do this, and is a heavy tax upon the people to maintain it in its *purity*, as it is termed.

The enactment taxing the people to buy up certain meadows on Concord River, to the supposed benefit of the owners, and an injury to many. For if the lands are valuable, as is probable, why tax the people to buy them? The people are not to own them, but individuals, and if they want them, or want the water taken off, let them pay the bills. Admitting these lands to be as valuable as they have been represented, what is that to do with the State, as an organized govern-

ment? Unless the State wants to go to farming on a magnificent scale, and make paupers of all who cannot manage to get their hands into the treasury, the sooner she washes her hands of all special enactments to perpetuate and fasten upon the people institutions to build up an aristocracy of power, compelling the poor to feed the rich, and the rich to make provision for the poor. If the State wants to do this, and crush out the liberty our fathers fought for, establishing a government of nobles, then go on,—the ice is already broken, and the clear and muddy water is visible.

But, if a wiser policy is, to let the people take care of themselves, and the State; leaving them free, untrammelled by class legislation, trusting to the law of supply and demand, placing confidence where confidence belongs, with the people, taxing them for nothing but what is clearly right, leaving all cases of a doubtful nature where it belongs, then, and only then, shall we maintain in their purity, those principles which we love to cherish.

All the farmers ask is to be let alone; let them, like all other trades people, and work people, manage their own affairs in their own way. If they want foreign stock, let them buy them with their own money; and if they want their meadows drained, let them pay for this, also, with their own cash.

If they do not understand their business, stop this legislation, and repeal the laws that degrade them, and they will soon learn how to do their own work,—measure a load of wood,—drain their meadows,—slaughter their cattle,—weigh their hay, &c., &c.

HOW DO FARMERS LIVE?

It is often said that if farming did not pay, how would it be possible for the farmers to live? I have in another place said that it was not by their labor; neither is it by their capital alone, but by the two combined. This is not all, for there are but comparatively few farmers who have muscle enough, and capital enough to combine with it, to live by farming. Then how do they live? This is an important question, and should be carefully met.

In this country the people are proverbial for changing from one thing and place to another. Very few men farm and do nothing else. In one farming town, I heard an observing person say that there was but one man in the place that lived wholly by farming. I ask the candid reader everywhere, how many men he knows who live entirely by this? Among the 35,000 farmers in this State, how many are there who depend upon this wholly for a livelihood? I presume not one in a hundred. We have seen that very many farmers are gradually wasting their property. On the downfall of these, some, taking advantage of their necessities, contrive in part to live; a few to accumulate. Many have sons or daughters in some kinds of business, perhaps in factories, stores, the trades, or the professions, whose earnings, in part, are occasionally put to this purpose. Others have a faculty of speculating in many little things that come in their way, on which a profit is made. Mechanical business often concentrates in some particular point, increasing the value of landed

estates in the vicinity, and by this, many are made wealthy, and without any thought of their own, are relieved from the oppressor's yoke, and too often become oppressors themselves.

Some contrive to get their hands into the treasury of the State by making folks believe that they have a peculiar faculty of so comprehending and adjusting agricultural affairs, that while they benefit the non-producers by making farm products cheap, they help the farmer by persuading folks to consume what is produced. Any one would suppose to hear them talk, that they had the faculty of converting the whole populace into aldermen, and increase their gastronomic power, merely to furnish a market for the multiplied products of the farm.

One man is fully satisfied that farming is profitable, and goes on to prove it in this wise. He says: "I bought a hundred sheep for \$200, and after keeping them a few months sold them for \$400. Therefore, is not farming profitable?" This is the substance of the argument. And is the reader prepared to say from this that farming is a good business? If our friend had raised his sheep, and reckoned fairly, then made a profit, that would have been an argument in favor of his position. But as the man of whom he purchased made a net loss of more than he made, it proves that in this instance the farmer or the producer suffered, while the speculator pocketed the profits.

Another friend, in order to show that there was profit in keeping cows, estimates the cost of keeping

two a year at \$56.02. From these two cows he raised two calves, made 320 pounds butter, besides the milk for the family, affording a large profit. If he had reckoned the whole cost of producing the material upon which the cows were fed, he would have found, calling the labor one dollar per day, that his two cows for the year would have cost double his estimate, and then the profit would have been on the other side. Such arguments as these do not show farming to be profitable, but the reverse.

Reckon labor low enough and farms low enough, of course a profit can be made. But I want to see the standard fixed at one dollar per day, whether a man works on his own farm or for hire, and six per cent. on the capital invested, and then, and not till then, can a poor man live by farming.

It has been my lot to see a good many bragging farmers, and it always reminds me of the boy who whistled to keep up his courage in going through a grave-yard. I have generally remarked that those farmers who indulged in this, were generally severely troubled with the shorts, and were obliged to borrow under difficulties. Very many of these men who make estimates on the profits of agriculture understand the philosophy of the business about as well as the city girl did who told her father one day that if "she was in his place, she would not be bothered running after eggs all the time; she would buy a hen, as they did not want but a dozen a day, and any hen would lay that, she knew." It is fair to presume that this

girl had been reading Mr. Flint's Report, or perhaps, was the daughter of some of the "State street farmers," the fecundity of whose fowls and other animals are so notoriously prolific. The "hen fever," 'tis true, is among the things that were, and a hundred other fevers are ready to take its place. It is to be hoped, however, that all the originators of fancy fevers will not meet with the same fate. It might, however, do no harm to suggest that the future executive officers of the State keep this case in mind, as a precedent of some importance to the people.

PROFIT AND PER CENT.

As I have many times in discussing this matter, been obliged to use the terms *profit* and *per cent.* or *per centum*, and as it is quite possible that all may not understand their import alike, I have thought an explanation here might not be wholly out of place.

PER CENTUM is a Latin word, and means by the hundred. Ten per cent. profit, means ten dollars on the hundred; the hundred being the investment, the ten the profit. If the investment or capital applied, is ten dollars, and the gross amount of sales are twenty dollars, then the per cent. is one hundred. The legal rate of interest in this State is six per cent., or six dollars on the hundred. This all can easily obtain without much labor, and usually without liability to loss. This explains why it is that as long as farm products sell below the cost to produce them, estimating the per cent. on the investment, and a fair reward for the labor; cap-

ital will be diverted from this to other interests, and farm property will constantly depreciate in the market.

PROFIT. Webster defines this word thus: profit, "advance in price of things sold beyond the price of purchase; gain; advantage." In trade and commerce the word is usually considered to mean the advance in the sale price over that part of the expense which embraces the principal items in the cost, as the raw material, — the labor, teaming, transportation, &c. When a man embraces *all* the items in the cost of the article, such as rents, interest on investment, allowing a supposed per cent. for losses, travelling expenses, postage, stationery, wear of tools, &c., &c., then this would be better defined by the prefix *net*, *net profit*.

Thus it will be seen that the word profit is not very definite as indicating the success of a business. A man may make a large profit, and yet make a net loss. The rule is to figure so as *not to deceive yourselves*, for if a loss is sustained, it is highly important to know it. The net profit of a man's business depends quite as much on the amount he does, as the profit he makes. If he makes ten per cent. on a business of ten thousand dollars a year, and his private expenses are \$1,100, he runs behind-hand one hundred dollars. If the business is increased to \$20,000, and his private expenses to \$1,500, his profit being the same, would give him a net income of \$500 per year. This is what every farmer should understand; to make his own figures, and let no man or class of men, however friendly they may pretend to be, cheat him out of the reasonable wants of life. His study should be to make his business so

remunerating that he can afford to live well, consuming what is necessary, the good things of his farm ; and when the net profit of his business will not afford this, it is time to pause,

If I should say that the gross amount of sales from all the farms in Massachusetts would not exceed \$300 a year, on an average, over the amount paid for hired labor, calling as it should be, house rent, fuel, vegetables, grain, fruit, all meats that are made from the farm, dairy products, &c., consumed by the family, a sale made, and should be placed on the credit page of the account ; probably no one would say that I have put it too low. The average value of these farms is about \$3,100, and the stock and tools, perhaps \$400.00, making \$3,500. The interest on this sum is \$210.00. Taxes, insurance, repairs, \$50.00, making \$260.00 ; which, taken from the gross amount of sales, would leave \$40.00 as pay for the labor done by the family. This forty dollars is to buy clothing, groceries, boots and shoes, hats, bonnets, pay doctor's bills, parish taxes, &c., &c., for a family of six.

If I am right in these calculations, and correctly understand the meaning of the words profit and per cent., then farming must be both unprofitable and nearly non-per-cent-able. This proves conclusively that farmers do not live entirely by their labor, or the profits on their business, but by consuming what they have previously earned or inherited.

TO FARMERS.

In this connection, I want to say a word or two to the farmers in regard to what is best to do. It is well to work, — to be industrious, — to be prudent, economical, philanthropical, benevolent; in a degree, independent; having a love for your country, for your brother man, and the race; in favor of liberty; always recollecting that things are of a vast deal more importance than words, — the one being the name only, the other the living fact; that names or words are only valuable when they reflect their prototypes; intelligent, being booked upon all matters pertaining to the good of the people; scrutinizing closely loud professions and noisy declamations; looking down deep into the motives of men, canvassing their professions, solicitations and expressions. This is precept. Now for the practice.

When an all-wise Providence placed man upon the earth, with mental and physical powers and capacities, and said, "In the sweat of your face shall you eat bread," he meant for you to use those powers and faculties for your good. Therefore, we are just as much bound to use the mental as the physical, to make provision for the wants of life. And as no man can live wholly by himself, but must, in a degree, depend upon each other; therefore, when we exchange labor for the end for which we toil, let effort, capacity, ability and reward, be as nearly mutual as possible. To this end, I have laid down as a rule in this book, and upon this I am willing to stand or fall, to sink or swim, as a maxim, that a reasonable day's work, the year round, shall

bring one dollar. Then, as all farmers have more or less property, I have claimed that this should pay an annual dividend of six per cent. Now the question is, how shall this be brought about? Because we have seen that, allowing farm capital to pay this per cent., it leaves but a trifle for labor. I presume that all farmers will say that this would be a good thing, but! but! that is the rub; that *but*. Now let us see how this is. Our capital must pay us six per cent., that is settled, and we must know how to get it. City folks generally manage to get more than this; at any rate, they get all they can, and grow fat upon it, and make their calculations as much for the earnings of capital, as their hands or heads.

They would consider it highly insulting for the farmers to presume to dictate to them in regard to this or any other interest. If the thing was thought of, another tea-party would be on the tapis at once. Let us pay as much attention to the culture of our minds, and as judicious a training for our children, as we have to our farms and steers, and frown upon every attempt of any party to dictate to us upon any matter; then, presumptive, indeed, would be that man who attempted any thing of the kind.

All must have the products of the farm; then let us earn in supplying them, sufficient to meet the reasonable wants of life, or cease the supply. Undoubtedly there are some who in their hearts object to this, but no one, I presume, is brassy enough to say so.

Farming being an extremely hazardous business,

therefore, it will not do, when we get a paying crop or product, to apply the rules of arithmetic to it, and multiply the presumed profits beyond the surmise of the most credulous, then proclaim it upon the "house-tops," to the injury of all producers, and the advantage of none but the sharpers and genteel aristocrats who bask in the sunshine of the public crib.

It is often said that poor farming will not pay. The fancy of late, are very unanimous in this idea. It seems to be a fortunate thought, that is hailed with great gusto, as furnishing a powerful argument to oppress labor. "Poor farming will not pay." Mr. Fay says this in his letter, on page 199. Many others use the same language. Mr. Brown, Mr. Boutwell, Dr. Loring, and most "*treasury farmers*," embrace the idea with the tenacity of a wild-cat. "Poor farming does not pay." An editor out in Connecticut, says that Mr. Pinkham's farming is nothing to go by, "but farming on the average." That is true, my farming is nothing to go by, but farming in general. That is what I am talking about. And if this editor had stuck to truth and right in all he said, as well as in this, knowing what he was talking about, he would not have considered "manufactured articles" Agricultural products, or reckoned those in with the earnings of the farmers. Neither a large proportion of the animals slaughtered in Connecticut would he place to the credit of the farmers of his State.

"Poor farming does not pay." Mr. Pinkham's farming does not pay, and that is nothing to go by,

“but farming on the average.” That is just the point I wish to meet. If poor farming does not pay, what farming does pay? That is the question. Mr. Fay says that his farming “is not expected to pay.” His is too good, mine is too bad. Mr. Brown says he does not know whether his pays or not. Mr. Boutwell says he has farmed but about six years, and he wants more time. He thinks that some kinds of farming can be made to pay, but is not sure. Let me kindly say to Mr. Boutwell that when he learns that buying cows and cow food, and selling their products, is not farming, but speculation; and when he has tried this for another six years, “keeping the accounts” all the time, he will find that the best cow he has milked will be the one that is not fed on meadow hay and grain, but that noble milking *animal* that is *fed* by the toil of an injured and meanly rewarded populace.

“Poor farming does not pay.” Does good farming pay? Who can find an affirmative answer to this question? Did the State farm at Westboro’, under the direction of that noble and disinterested body of men, who worked for nought in their love for the dear people, pay? Had it not have been for the milk drawn from that extra milking cow that does not soil genteel hands, would the Board in their philanthropy have thought it for the public good, at great sacrifices, to have been so constant at the milking bee? Strip! Strip!! Strip!!! Who says *farming* does not pay?

Farming: the practice of tilling land.—*Webster*.

Farming: the practice of *tilling* the public chest.—*Board of Agriculture*.

Perhaps all farmers do not read the papers, and for this reason, and as a *souvenir*, I have thought it well to transcribe to these pages a few extracts from agricultural literature. The following is taken from an editorial of Governor Brown's. The article is headed, JUBILEE! THE YEAR OF REDEMPTION IS AT HAND!

"The sufferers have been turned out upon the merest technicalities of law, scourged with the bitter taunt that they once *had a year of grace*, but did not improve it, or their opponents, squat in the charnel-house and amid the dead bones of a breathless and rotten corporation, would shake a musty old parchment in their faces, and declare that they held a *chartered* right for their ungodly power!"

The Governor is congratulating himself and a few owners of the meadows on Concord and Sudbury rivers, on the success of their long cherished plans to get a law by which the people's money could be filched from them to drain their lands on these rivers. I have spoken of this elsewhere, and shall make no comments here, but simply ask the farmers what they think of it? how they like the language, the spirit, the sentiment, and the PRINCIPLE and *precedent*?

The above extract was taken from the leading editorial of the Governor's, dated April 28, 1860.

From the same paper, dated June 16, 1860, and written by an associate editor, (Judge French,) on the "cattle disease." I take this extract, and simply remark here to the farmer to note how these men speak when at home, and not in the farmer's clubs in the country, talking about the honest, independent, and intelligent yeomanry.

“It requires some equanimity to hear with serenity the stupidity of a portion of the community, who ought either to inform themselves, or hold their peace on this vital question. Stupidity is undoubtedly the unpardonable sin. A lively, wide-awake, progressive sinner, we have some hope of; but a dogged, mulish, thick-hided old foggy, who rolls himself up in a heap, like a porcupine, shuts his eyes, and sticks out his quills in all directions, deserves such treatment as John Quincy Adams advocated for the Chinese: a little smell of fire and gunpowder, or one of its ingredients, to bring him into sympathy with the breathing, moving world.”

I here place on record, also, five sections of one of the bills passed by the Pleuro Legislature, in regard to the subject upon which Judge French thinks the farmers are so “*dogged, mulish, thick-hided, old fogies,*” &c., &c.

Sect. 8. Whoever shall drive or transport any cattle from any portion of the Commonwealth east of Connecticut river to any part west of said river before the first day of April next, without consent of the commissioners, shall be punished by fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or by imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding one year.

Sect. 9. Whoever shall drive or transport any cattle from any portion of the Commonwealth into any other State before the first day of April next, without the consent of the commissioners, shall be punished by fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or by imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding one year.

Sect. 10. If any person fails to comply with any regulation made, or with any order given by the commissioners, he shall be punished by fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year.

Sect. 11. Prosecutions under the two preceding sections may be prosecuted in any county in this Commonwealth.

Sect. 12. All appraisals made under this act shall be in writing, and signed by the appraisers and certified by the commissioners, and shall be by them transmitted to the Governor and Council, and to the treasurers of the several cities and towns wherein the cattle appraised were kept.

It seems by this act that a farmer in the western part of the State cannot drive his cattle to pasture, if he has to cross the Connecticut river, without consent of the commissioners. Neither can we in any section of the State cross the line of the State for the same purpose.

Why not ask the selectmen of the town, or the town physician? Are they not supposed to be men of some judgment and intelligence, or does the Board of Agriculture monopolize all of these requisites? If I have read the papers correctly, they have not guessed much better than other folks might. I have thought some times not quite as well. And certainly their public acts and their avowed principles do not show that they have either better judgment, more intelligence or integrity than others; and if this is a fact, then I have failed to read individual character, sagacity, humanity and public spirit in them correctly.

CHAPTER IX.

THE COST OF FARM PRODUCTS.

A Remedy for the Evils that Exist—The Old Nations Oppressing Labor—A Hungry Man and the Breakfast Table—Material in the World to Produce Animal or Plant Life—The Farmers Want to Sell Out—Double the Value of Farm Property in Ten Years—The Wants of the People that Gives Value to Property—The Action of the Atmosphere Upon Plant Life—Table of Equivalents—Table of Cost of Material out of which Crops are Made—The actual Cost of a Corn Crop—One Year at Farming—Columbus and his Outfit—The Products of Massachusetts—Forty Bushels of Grain for Each Inhabitant—The Tailor and the Farmer—Neat Stock—A Fancy Yoke of Oxen—Milk Making—A Cow is a Mill—The Cost of Milk—Definition of Farming—The Cost of a Cow—The Cost of Keeping a Cow—Pork Making—Barnyard Fowl—Swine in the United States—Pork Exported—The Cost of Beef—The Cattle Markets—Stall Feeding—The Cost of Oxen—How to Reckon Their Value—The Wood Crop—How to Estimate its Cost—The Cost of Farm Products Divided into Three Parts—Crops at the West.

IN the preceding chapters I have spoken freely in regard to the actual condition of the farmers and farming. My object has been to state the case truly, as I understand it. In the investigation and consultation of authors, as I have progressed in the work, and from all that I can learn from whatever source, in my correspondence with such farmers as I supposed have been mostly observant of the workings of the labor interest upon the people; all have confirmed more strongly the views I have entertained in the matter.

What now remains to be done is to seek out a remedy for the evils that exist; because, if there *was no remedy*, then it would have been better not to have said anything upon the subject. I shall, therefore, in those chapters that are to succeed, endeavor to devise some means by which these wrongs can be righted. As, in the history of nations, we have taken new ground, and stand out boldly before the world in our declarations, in our laws, in our institutions, religious, educational and love of freedom, let us not fall into the great error of the old countries, of oppressing and defrauding labor. But rather let us strive to stand aloof from and profit by the precedents that are before us, and seek to leave *all* our industrial institutions free, trusting to the law of supply and demand to supply all our wants, as no people or classes of people, can for long series of years, under oppression of laws and customs, maintain that independence of thought and action which in a true sense go to make a nation great. "*Audi alteram partem.*" Hear the other side.

Without going any further into the preliminaries, I will proceed to examine the subject under consideration. This I consider the most important part of the investigation — THE COST OF WHAT WE PRODUCE. As well might a merchant, a manufacturer, or a mechanic expect to succeed by selling their goods for the most they can get, without any knowledge of the cost, as the farmer.

Therefore, I want to say so much about this, and say it in such a way, that it will be just as easy to

know what our crops cost, as it is for a hungry man to know what to do when he sits down to the breakfast table.

Unless we know this, we cannot know how to economise either in capital or labor, — when to add or subtract, — what we can afford to pay for this or that, all is confusion and doubt. But when we can tell in one or two minutes what any article costs, — an ox, a horse, a cow, a ton of hay, a bushel of grain, or any other crop, then all is clear and satisfactory. In farming, as in law, wherever there is a doubt, let it be construed in favor of, and not against labor. If occasionally we get an extra crop, or an extra animal, it will not do to reckon all by this. For to make a good animal or a good crop it always requires more food than it does to make a poor one. As animal or plant food is capital or past labor, therefore to consume these without any adequate compensation, is wasting what has already been earned.

There is just the same amount of material in the world now that there ever was, to produce plant or animal life. This can neither be increased nor diminished. Although our soils can easily be exhausted, and rendered so barren that they cease to produce, yet, if by disposing of this plant or animal food, the return is sufficient to replace them, and allowing for the labor to do so, then no loss is sustained. Otherwise, to dispose of the products at a cost of the labor merely, not calling the material of which the product is made anything, would be like a tailor selling his garments for a

price only sufficient to pay the labor bill, throwing away the cloth or material of which they are composed. If the farmers constantly dispose of their products at a loss, they alone are not the sufferers, but they are throwing their labor into the market at so low a rate that others are obliged to come down to their standard, thereby not only selling their labor at a price that affords but a meagre support, but reducing the value of what they have previously earned or inherited. For if farm products are low, so are farms. As long as the people can buy what they want at half the cost to produce it, they would be fools to invest in the business. This is just the state of things that now exist. About every other farmer wants to sell out in this section of the country, — undoubtedly in many others, and they can find nobody who wants to buy. Why is this? Because, as I have just intimated, that the business is not remunerating. Therefore, men will not risk their previous earnings, and hazard their future, upon so doubtful an enterprise. Let four-fifths of all farm products be sold at a price that will yield one dollar per day for the labor to produce it, and six per cent. on the capital invested, and we double the price of farm property in ten years.

Calling the value of farm property in this State \$150,000,000, in ten years let it be \$300,000,000, and who are the sufferers? It is true it would cost more to live than it now does; but all must recollect that it is not the high cost of living that is an evil, but the evil only is, when industry fails to supply that cost.

I am well aware that the present price of farm products to many seems high. I think it safe to say that, take all farm produce, the consumers pay double what the farmers realize. The principal reason for this is, that we send or drive our children to the cities and then transport there the material for them to live upon. The evils of this system to the farmers is almost incalculable; for all must be aware that it is the *wants* of the *people* that gives value to property. Reduce the population and industry of any locality and you reduce the value of the property in the same proportion; and *vice versa*. This being so, then how plain the reason for the evils that exist.

We will now proceed to the solution of the problem, how to ascertain the cost of farm products? In another place we have shown by a close mode of reasoning, the cost of that kind of fertilizer to which the farmers are mostly indebted for the material of which their crops are made. It was also shown that by actual experiment this was found to be very nearly correct. As the cost of the material of which crops are made depends as much upon the value of the labor as the crop itself, therefore the reader must bear in mind the standard, which no one will say, I think, ought to be reduced.

Before going more particularly into the examination of this, it will be well to explain, as I understand it, the action of the atmosphere upon plant and animal life. Many have supposed it possible to manufacture crops out of the material that floats in, or of the air

we breathe. That some soils are capable of producing crops without being fertilized for that particular crop, we every day see demonstrated. But, that a crop can be removed from the soil without detriment to it, is an impossibility. Because, if sufficient time elapses for the atmosphere to reinstate the soil to its former fertility, then the per cent. on the investment is a total loss for the time being. That a small per cent. of crops are made from the material that floats in the atmosphere, is not questioned. But it must be recollected that the ammonia from whence the most of this fertility springs, is but the gasses that are constantly escaping from all vegetable and animal life and decomposition, and the farmer is supposed to lose as much as he gains by this.

Therefore, our interest and policy is, to fix as much as possible all those gases upon the farm, yet those that actually do escape cannot be said to be an actual loss, because they will rest somewhere. In the rains, snows and dews, also, there are some plant food, but the principal action of these are in a mechanical way, preparing the food for the plant.

Now we are prepared to ascertain the cost of our goods. If the material of which a bushel of corn is made, as we have before seen, costs 43 cents, it will then be easy to ascertain the whole cost of this and all other crops.

I want to remark here, however, that most tables of practical equivalents, either by actual experiments or chemical analyses, greatly vary. This is not at all surprising, since most plants or grains of the same kind

have a variable intrinsic value. This depends very much on the soil and the season. Also on the condition in which they were cured. Old hay, all things being equal, has more nutriment than new hay, weight for weight. The more water a plant contains to the solid matter, the less nutriment. Thus it will be seen that a good degree of judgment is to be used, in a proper understanding of the subject.

The following table of comparative value of different kinds of cattle fodder, is translated by the Rev. Mr. Rham, from the French of M. Autoine :

Good Hay.....	100 pounds.
are equal in nourishment to latter-math, or second crop.....	102 “
Clover Hay, cut in the blossom....	90 “
* Meadow or Swale Hay.....	300 “
Green Clover	410 “
Green Indian Corn.....	275 “
Beet Root Leaves.....	600 “
Potato Halm.....	300 “
Rye Straw.....	442 “
Oat Straw	195 “
Pea Straw	153 “
Bean Straw... ..	140 “
Buckwheat Straw.....	195 “
Dried Stalks of Indian Corn.....	400 “
Millet Straw.....	250 “
Raw Potatoes.....	201 “
Boiled Potatoes.....	175 “
White Silesian Beet.....	220 “
Mangold Wurzel.....	339 “
Turnips	504 “
Carrots.....	276 “
Rye, Grain.....	54 “
Wheat, Grain.....	45 “
Barley, Grain.....	54 “
Oats, Grain.....	59 “
Peas,.....	45 “
Beans,	45 “
Buckwheat, Grain.....	64 “
Indian Corn, Grain.....	57 “

* This is from actual experimenting, and not chemical analysis.

COST OF FERTILIZERS, OR THE RAW MATERIAL.

If these figures are a tolerable approximation to the actual facts, then would it not be fair to assume that if a hundred pounds of English hay is equal to a bushel of 56 pounds of Indian corn, and the raw material of which the corn is made costs 43 cents, that the 100 pounds of hay costs the same for the material out of which it is made. According to this mode of reasoning,

The Material for a Ton of English Hay.....	would cost..	\$8.60
" " " " Green Clover Hay, "		2.10
" " " " Green Indian Corn Stalks		3.12
" " " " Beet Root Leaves "		1.43
" " " " Potatoe Halm "		2.86
" " " " Rye Straw "		1.94
" " " " Oat Straw "		4.41
" " " " Pea Straw "		5.62
" " " " Swale, or Meadow Hay "		2.86 $\frac{3}{4}$
" " " " Bean Straw "		6.14
" " " " Buckwheat Straw "		4.41
" " " " Dried Stalks of Indian Corn		2.15
" " " " Millet Straw "		3.41
" " " Bushel, or 60 pounds of Potatoes		.12
" " " 40 " White Silesian Beet		.08
" " " 40 " Mangold Wurtzel		.05
" " " 40 " Com. Turnips		.03 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " " 40 " Carrots		.06 $\frac{1}{4}$
" " " 56 " Rye, Grain		.44 $\frac{1}{2}$
" " " 60 " Wheat		.57 $\frac{1}{4}$
" " " 46 " Barley		.36 $\frac{2}{3}$
" " " 32 " Oats		.23 $\frac{2}{3}$
" " " 60 " Peas or Beans		.57 $\frac{1}{3}$
" " " 40 " Buckwheat		.26 $\frac{5}{6}$
" " " 56 " Indian Corn		.42 $\frac{1}{5}$

If I were asked why I did not reckon this cost of manure by chemical analysis rather than by the nutri-

† This kind of hay is usually obtained without the use of manure; yet, I find that most meadows that have for a long time been cropped, are failing.

tive value or practical equivalents, I should answer that the result would be nearly the same, and this is much more easily understood by most farmers. I do not pretend that these figures are just right; in fact, no set of figures can be made to suit all cases, for the cost of the manure or material of which crops are made, is controlled by circumstances, such as the price of labor, &c., same as the crops themselves. That the principle is right, there is no doubt. And that the figures are an approximation to the facts, it seems to me, from observation and investigation, are equally true.

If the reader understands what is here written, how perfectly plain and clear the principle of vegetation will seem, when before, it has been shrouded in uncertainty, or what some term, luck.

Suppose, now, we reckon up the cost of an acre of corn.

<i>Acre of Corn.</i>	<i>Dr.</i>
To 23 days work of men and team at \$1.00.....	\$23.00
“ interest on land and taxes.....	3.50
“ fencing and rents.....	3.00
“ use of tools, line, and scare crows.....	3.00
“ raw material to make 40 bushels grain.....	16.88
“ “ “ “ 1½ tons stalks.....	4.68
	<hr/>
	\$54.06
<i>Acre of Corn.</i>	<i>Cr.</i>
By 40 bushels shelled corn at \$1.04.....	\$41.60
“ 1½ tons corn fodder at \$6.15.....	10.22
	<hr/>
	\$51.82
Net loss.....	2.24

If this loss looks hard and discouraging, all there is to do, is to put the labor bill down to 75 cents per day, and then a profit is made. If this latter will not pay the family expenses, then the excess must come out of the capital or past earnings, as is the common practice.

It will be seen that by this system all can know how things are going, for if a man is going behind hand, the quicker he finds it out, the better. Although individuals may profit by a neighbor's downfall, yet community suffers. If the farmers of our country could make a small profit on a majority of their operations, so that the profit would be greater than their losses, making a net profit, this would increase the wealth, prosperity and happiness of the people more than all the gold of a dozen Californias.

According to the present system of figuring the cost of farm products, when a profit is made to appear, it is often owing to a deceptive way of reckoning; for if we reckon the cost of the fertilizer by the amount applied and not by the amount taken off, and we take much and apply little, then we take from the soil, put it in the pocket, and call this making money; when in fact, it is only changing it from one pocket to the other. And as this so-called profit is used for the ordinary expenses, hence the great deterioration of the soil, the depreciation of farms, the exodus of the young men to distant places, and the general unthriftiness of farming communities. With just as much propriety might the grocer estimate the amount of his sales by the week, and not by the actual amount sold, — the banker

his notes by the square yard, as to reckon the cost of the material of which crops are made by the acre, or the amount applied. If a man puts ten dollars in his purse and takes out five, it is fair to presume that five remains. But if he puts in five and takes out ten, then it is equally fair to presume that five were there before. And what a fool he would be considered, if he hopped up and down, published it from "Dan to Beer-sheba," that he had made five dollars, or one hundred per cent profit, when in fact, he had only brought it to the light of the sun, the reflection of which was so much brighter than his vision, that it fairly crazed him.

In order to become familiar with the slate and pencil, or figuring, suppose we take a farm and carry it on one year, and see what kind of a scrape that will get us into.

<i>Farm.</i>	<i>Dr.</i>
To interest on capital, (\$4,000).....	\$240.00
" " " in stock, (\$500).....	30.00
" taxes and insurance.....	25.00
" depreciation of buildings.....	50.00
" interest and wear of tools..	20.00
" labor of self and wife.....	400.00
" depreciation in value of horse.....	10.00
" hired man six months and board.....	150.00

\$915.00

<i>Farm.</i>	<i>Cr.</i>
By house rent.....	\$100.00
" fuel, standing.....	15.00
" milk sold.....	200.00
" vegetables sold	50.00
" fruit sold.....	50.00
" hay sold.....	40.00
" vegetables used in family.....	25.00
" milk " "	20.00
" two hogs.....	40.00

By increased value of stock.....	100.00
“ “ “ wood.....	25.00
	<hr/>
	\$665.00
Net loss.....	\$250.00

If the farmers will carefully look these figures over, I think they will admit that but few farms of this value and amount of help, will show a larger amount of sales, and yet it seems we have failed to meet expenses by the whole amount of the per cent. on the capital of the real estate and ten dollars besides. In fact, I do not suppose that one farmer in a hundred ever expects to get any per cent. on his capital. The last item but one on the credit side, in nine cases out of ten, should be struck out entirely, where this amount of milk is sold. Often it should be put to the debtor side, on milk farms, as most milk raisers expect to have their cows depreciate in value. This would increase the loss to \$350.

All those items on the debtor side but the labor bill after deducting house rent, amounting to \$275, should be reckoned into the cost of each and all the crops, with the manure or raw material, *pro rata*, and the receipts above these items only would go to pay for the labor, just the same as a manufacturer reckons his rents, traveling expenses, &c., into the cost of his goods. I know that the amount of sales from any ordinary farm are so small, comparatively, that this makes a large item, as in the above instance, making more than 33 per cent. of the cost of each article, in the per cent. on the capital, depreciation of buildings, taxes, insurance, tools,

&c. All these things every farmer and all business men have to account for, and if they cannot get them as profit on the sale of their goods or products above the raw material and the labor, then the capital has to suffer. Now we can readily understand why it is that farmers are gradually running themselves out, (*dwindling*, in commercial parlance,) unless they have outside success.

According to the above figures, about 75 per cent. of the total amount of sales goes to pay for the items noticed above, and 25 per cent. for the labor. The tailor, the hatter, the shoemaker, the blacksmith, the carpenter, &c., usually get about 50 per cent. on the gross amount of sales for the labor bill. The lawyer, the doctor, the clergyman, the legislator, receive more than 90 per cent. of all their receipts for their labor. The reader will be careful not to confound present with past labor. One is capital, the other present earnings or wages. It is a principle engrafted into the economy of all civilized nations, that past earnings should work in conjunction with labor, to lessen the burdens of the people. Thus we see that the value of a medium farm, with stock, tools, &c., if properly invested, would earn as much as a man. This is where farmers are committing a great error. They couple the earnings of their capital with their labor, for a livelihood; whereas, a man without capital, and fair judgment, will earn a better living by his labor alone. And the farmer, unintentionally, but really, by uniting the two, (capital and labor,) is doing all he can to prevent the other (labor) from doing this.

Assuming the above figures to be correct, or nearly so, let us see what it costs to make some of the most common crops. Take, for instance, a ton of English hay.

<i>Cost of Hay per ton.</i>	<i>Dr.</i>
To raw material.....	\$8.60
“ per cent. on capital, rents, &c., &c.....	5.00
	<hr/>
	\$13.60

If this can be sold for \$15, we get \$1.40 for our labor. But if it will bring \$20, it will increase the cost to \$15.26, leaving as pay for the labor, \$4.74.

<i>Cost of Corn per bushel.</i>	<i>Dr.</i>
To raw material.....	.42
“ per cent. on capital, rents, &c., &c.....	.33
	<hr/>
	.75

If this can be sold for \$1, it would give as pay for the labor, 25 cents per bushel.

<i>Cost of Wheat per bushel.</i>	<i>Dr.</i>
To raw material.....	.57
“ per cent. on capital, rents, &c., &c.....	.50
	<hr/>
	\$1.07

If this can be sold for \$1.50, it would leave for the labor, 43 cents per bushel.

<i>Cost of Carrots per bushel.</i>	<i>Dr.</i>
To raw material per bushel.....	.06
“ per cent. on the capital, rents, &c., &c.....	.05
	<hr/>
	.11

If carrots can be sold for 15 cents per bushel, it would leave for the labor, 4 cents per bushel.

Thus it will be seen, that by a proper knowledge of the business, it is just as easy to calculate the cost of a farm crop, as it is the cost of the shoe or coat crop. It must be borne in mind that I have made no calculation on hazard, accidents, or calamities, such as frosts, hurricanes, potatoe rot, weevil, squirrels, crows, &c. If this business is more hazardous than some others, then a larger margin must be left, as no man can do a hazardous business for the same per cent. he can a safe one. Thus, a merchant who is engaged in the tropical fruit business, cannot do it for the same per cent. he can the grain business. Another idea is, that if we apply the raw material for a large crop, and from some unforeseen cause a small crop only is taken off, our material is not lost. It is there for another crop. The labor and per cent. may be wholly or in part lost. That is all, or nearly so, although some soils will waste more than others. I know many suppose that the manure will work down through some soils, out of the way of plant roots. It is possible this may be the case in a very coarse, loose soil, to some extent. But all sub-soils that I have noticed appear to be entirely free from this. It is the office of the soil to absorb and hold plant food until called upon to give it up. And although water will pass down through the soil, yet I think it will not be able to take with it much that is valuable as a fertilizer.

I might extend these calculations to all the crops raised, but think they have been sufficiently extended to give the reader a knowledge of the principle, and as

but few farmers can produce all or any crops at an equal cost, it will be better for each to figure for themselves. On some farms, a smaller per cent. than this should be reckoned, but on most farms, a larger must. For, where there is one farm where the gross amount of sales is more than three times the per cent. on the capital and depreciation, there are ten where it is less. It will not do for a man to say that his farm did not cost him anything; therefore we should reckon no per cent., for somebody had to earn it, and because he has been more fortunate than others, it is no reason why he should try to prevent others from doing what some one has done for him. Recollect that the soil of itself, has no money value any more than the air. If it were possible to fence this off, and fix a price upon it, it would be done. When Columbus first set his foot upon this soil, the whole country could not have been sold for enough to have paid for the out-fit. Yet then the soil was capable of as great a production as it is to-day.

It is the people that make the value to all property. Not only to the soil, but the products of it. What the people require they will pay for, and no more. Of what use is it to increase the products of the soil three or four times beyond the wants of the people? They can only use so much. The surplus is used to cheapen what is wanted. Massachusetts produces nearly grain enough to feed her citizens, yet she imports twice as much as she makes. Why is this? Because the West are making paupers of themselves and their posterity,

by sending to the East the requisites for future production, at a price that gives them no return to keep up the condition of their soil, thereby making and keeping them poor, and the land poorer.

There are more than 40 bushels of grain produced in the United States for each of her inhabitants. This is more than three times what is wanted for actual consumption. A full grown person may require ten bushels of grain per year: certainly not more than this. But calling 20 bushels to each person, allowing this to make all the meat and for brewing, for all purposes, and we have 400,000,000 bushels surplus, to hang like an incubus upon the necks of the people. If we could transport from our fields the crops, and not impoverish them, it would be different, but as we have got to return, either sooner or later, all that we take away, then the evil is evident.

If a tailor sold his coats, &c., for the cost of the labor only, without reckoning for the cloths and small articles, soon he would have no capital to buy cloths, &c., with. The time it would take to bring about this result, would be governed by the amount of his business, and the length of his purse.

PHILOSOPHY OF AGRICULTURE.

In other parts of this work, I have said, in substance, what I intend to say here. Possibly I have not been understood. It is a well known principle of nature's economy, that no matter is lost. In all the various processes of growth or decay, this principle holds good.

At the creation, before the rocks had become disintegrated, there existed the same principles of plant and animal growth that now exist. This law will hold good as long as the world stands. If we extract from the soil all the principles of vegetation, and transport it to the sea, yet this principle or law would still hold good, although this might depopulate the earth for a time; yet, in the elapse of ages, by the well known principle of nature's laws and chemical changes, that are constantly going on, the sea would give up this material to the earth, and vegetable and animal life would again appear. Nature, in all her laws, aims to perfection. The process, it is true, is slow, as we reckon time, but recollect that all our anxieties and difficulties exist only as we conflict with these principles.

A plant germinates, vegetates, grows and expands, being fed by the decomposition of other plants, till this gives way to the laws of vegetation and plant life, adding by each successive rotation a larger amount of food for subsequent products, till a luxurious growth is obtained; every year adding new or increased fertility to the soil. Then man begins to take away for his or his neighbor's consumption, the material that the next crop requires to feed upon, and in a few successive years, robs the soil of those very principles that are necessary to sustain plant life; and then he complains that his soil is exhausted. In all this there would be no loss, if he had been sufficiently wise to have exchanged this substance for its equivalent, so that he could return to the soil that he had taken away, with sufficient additional recompense to pay for the labor in

both taking from and returning to it, the elements, to reproduce that which he had taken.

This, in brief, is the farmer's great mistake. Whenever we look upon the waving grass that is ripe and fit for the harvest, the first question should be, can we remove this from the soil and sell it for a price sufficient to return an equal amount as a fertilizer, and pay us for the labor, by so doing? If not, then let it remain, as nature can in no particular be defrauded, and not be cognizant of the fact. By the removal, it might be exchanged for ready cash; so might the clothes upon your back, and there would be about as much good sense in the one as the other. A bare soil and a bare back are somewhat analogous; the one the cause, the other the effect, which is as sure to follow, as the gout is an alderman.

NEAT STOCK.

Domestic animals are sometimes a blessing, often a curse, to the owner. They are good and useful just so far as they administer to our wants and happiness. But when they become so numerous that the receipts from them yield but little return for the labor to rear and keep them, then they are a curse. They are like the leprosy eating out our very vitals. But few men who have not kept a careful record of expense and income, are aware of the enormous drain upon our resources, when they get the mastery. Not one man, yea, not one *farmer* in a hundred are aware of the cost to grow up an ox or a cow. One of the great and fundamental errors of the age is, that we cannot keep up the fertility of the soil without domestic animals.

These are often the cause of the deterioration of the soil. Without animals of any class, from mineral and vegetable matter alone, the soil obtains any required state of fertility. I presume that a given quantity of hay left upon the soil, would fertilize it as much as the same amount removed, fed to animals and the whole returned to the soil in their manures. And as there is always some loss attending an operation of this kind, and as the labor to do this is great, therefore, unless the growth or the income of the animal in some way pays for this labor, how absurd it is to throw it away, when perhaps the family need its reward.

Thousands of families are to-day in want of the very means for encouragement and support, that goes to sustain a large surplus of domestic animals, without any hope of reward. To such an extent has the idea obtained among the people, that a fancy yoke of oxen will enlist the admiration of the populace, when the man who reared them is neglected and abhorred. A *fast* horse, a yoke of *fancy* oxen, a *splendid specimen* of a cow, or a *mammoth* pig, are far greater objects of admiration, thought and eclat, than man. While the former are lionized and surfeited to repletion, the latter is neglected, worked to excess, and uncared for.

In passing through one of the interior towns in a neighboring State, I came to what had once been a tolerable homestead. The soil was pretty good, but the buildings, the fences, the trees, were in a deplorable plight. The barn set nearly in a straight line between the road and house, and like the house, was in

a dilapidated condition. The shingles were dropping from the roof, the boards from the walls, the doors from their pailings, and all in all, it was one of the most complete wrecks that one could conceive of for a habitation for man. On the sunny side of the house, were more than half a dozen uncombed, unwashed, bare-footed and bare-legged children, with their hair streaming in the breeze, as the frost played such pranks with their toes, that they were obliged to keep upon the move. As I was looking upon the scene before me, the thought occurred in my mind, that this man was either a rum guzzler, or he had a fancy yoke of oxen. One of the two I thought must be true. To prove it, I reined up my horse, and in passing between the house and barn, heard voices in the latter. One of the older children ran up to the wagon and asked me if "I should like to see the oxen." I asked if they had a yoke of oxen. "I guess you'd think so if you should see them." Stepping from the wagon into the barn, I saw at a glance how things were. The old gentleman and the old lady were there; only they were not old save in care, toil and anxiety. At one end of the leanto stood three half-fed cows, with the cold wind from the open spaces in the sides of the barn, piercing their frames, and appeared to be entirely innocent of card or brush, or any thing but the coarsest fare.

As I passed by the oxen, and was looking at the cows, I saw that it did not please the old gent. I knew that he wanted me to leave the cows, and pass judgment upon the "steers," as he called them. I

told him "that I did not think much of oxen, but thought cows were a very useful animal in a family." I saw that this remark pleased the old lady. As she came out where I was, she asked me "which I called the best cow?" I explained to her Guenon's theory as well as I could. She thought I had *guessed* right on the quality of the cows, and after telling her "that no cow could manufacture milk of nothing, all that came out of the udder had first to be put in at the mouth,—that she could as well make a palatable pudding of saw-dust, as a cow could make milk of the stuff I saw before them."

In passing out of the barn, the old gent says, "aint you agoing to look at the oxen,—they got the PREMIUM," — "and a half a dozen such," says I, "would get *you* into the *poor house*." As I was stepping into the carriage, I could hear rather loud talk about "oxen, cows, hay, meal," &c., between the parties in the barn. This was the desirable point, to get them to discussing the matter. I do not wish the reader to understand that I did not see the oxen, nor the barrels of meal before them, nor the battening on the walls around them, nor their sleek and glossy hair, with the brush and the card. All these I saw. And I thought I could easily define the influences that had been at work, that had caused this man to neglect his own children, to allow his buildings to go to ruin, his wife and little ones to suffer for the most common conveniences of life, that a morbid and false interest and pride might be satiated. I do not wish to be understood as saying that I do not

like to see handsome oxen. What I desire to be understood as saying is this, that I do not like to see innocent children robbed of the useful things of life, that the gamblers and stock-jobbers of our cities can luxuriate in tender roasts and juicy steaks, without knowing something of the cost to make them. The farmers themselves eat little or no good beef. Old farrow cows and two year old heifers and steers are too often a luxury to them. Not one-fourth part of the beef that is killed in this country is fit for human food. All this grows out of the idea that our farms can only be fertilized by animal manures.

MILK MAKING.

There are but few crops upon which greater errors exist than this. Milk can no more be made of nothing than any other crop. Although some cows produce more milk than others, and some will make more from the same food, yet no cow can make milk from nothing. Not only can the amount of milk be controlled to considerable extent at pleasure, but the quality also. Perhaps the best type of a cow is a flouring mill. The hopper is the mouth. Nothing comes out at the spout, without having been first put in at the hopper or mouth. And not quite all that is thus fed comes into the troughs. The dust or the sweepings of the walls and the floor, is the waste of the animal. That that comes out at the pores of the skin, (the scent that enables the hound to follow the fox,) are the sweepings. The flour is the milk. The middlings and the

bran are the liquid and solid excrements. As the quality of the flour, &c., depends upon the quality of the grain, so the milk and the excrements are equally dependent upon the food the cow consumes. A cow that is fed upon corn meal and good hay, will give a better quality of milk than the same cow would if fed upon slops, turnips, and coarse herbage.

The cost of a quart of milk depends so much upon circumstances, that no figures can be made to suit all localities. But I know of nothing that will induce thought more than figuring. Assuming my figures on the grain, hay and root crops to be correct, let us now see what it will cost to manufacture them into milk, and at what price the milk can be sold. I want the reader to keep in mind all the time that the rate of wages is one dollar per day, and six per cent. on the capital. The capital is past labor; the per cent. upon it, is the earnings of the capital, and if rightly invested, the labor to do this, is usually reckoned at about one per cent. Webster's definition of farming is, "The practice of tilling land." If, then, we want to get at the cost of a milk crop, it will not do to buy a cow and the food upon which she is fed. This would not be farming, but speculation, or manufacturing.

We have seen that to raise a calf to one year old costs about \$22; the next year \$15; the next year \$20, making a three year old cow to cost \$57. This cow is our mill, in which we are going to manufacture milk. The hay, grain, grass, &c., is the raw material, the power is the labor. As I shall offset the labor

against the manure, these two items will be dispensed with. As it will be necessary to keep the cow one year, I shall reckon for that time.

<i>One year's milk.</i>		<i>Dr.</i>
To 1½ tons hay.....	\$30.00	
" 10 bushels meal.....	10.00	
" 15 bushels carrots.....	3.00	
" pasturing, fall feed and cow corn 182 days, at .08.....	14.56	
" interest on mill	3.42	
" rents, fencing, &c.....	3.00	
		<hr/>
		\$63.98
	<i>Cr.</i>	
By increased value of mill or cow	\$5.00	
		<hr/>
		\$58.98

Credit by 4 quarts milk per day, 1,460 quarts, making it cost per quart, $.04\frac{58}{1460}$, or a small fraction over 4 cents per quart. Allowing buttermilk to pay for the labor to make, and 8 quarts of milk to a pound of butter, the butter would cost $32\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound.

Therefore, it seems by these figures that a man who can sell his milk for five cents per quart in the winter and three cents in the summer, is getting a per cent. on his capital that is in unison with our laws and institutions, and one dollar per day for his labor. No allowance has been made in these calculations for accidents and mishaps.

Some may suppose it singular, perhaps, why it has cost as much to keep the cow this year as it did the three years before! The answer to this is, that we have made 1,460 quarts of a good quality of milk, containing fifteen per cent. of nutritious matter, and had to keep up the ordinary functions of the cow besides.

PORK MAKING.

It will be difficult to institute any figures in regard to this crop, as so much depends upon the selection of the animal, and many other circumstances. That the hog is an animal that all farmers should keep, there is no doubt. The number should be governed entirely by the amount of waste about the premises. These and the barn-yard fowl should be considered the gleaners of the establishment, and kept in sufficient numbers to consume what there is. And all there is kept should be well fed ; it will not pay to half feed them. At the prices that have ruled for the last three years, the fewer animals that the farmers keep, above what they require for their own use and convenience, the better it will be for all laboring men.

In regard to hogs, I know of no better plan, when pork is less than $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, than to fatten two per year, one in the winter and one in the summer, killing one each in the fall and spring. The size of them can be regulated to meet the wants of the family.

I think that a bushel of corn meal, if scalded and judiciously fed, will make eight pounds of pork, if the hog is thrifty. This is the extent. It will not do to calculate more than six pounds to the bushel generally.

In 1850, there were in the United States, all told, 30,315,700 swine. At 250 pounds each, would make (7,578,925,000) seven billion five hundred and seventy-eight million, nine hundred and twenty-five thousand pounds ; which would give to each person one hog of 329 pounds, reckoning the population in round num-

bers at 23,000,000. Allowing one hundred pounds of pork to each person for necessary consumption, it would leave a surplus of 5,278,925,000 pounds. It is true that we export hogs, pork, lard, hams, &c., largely. We also import all of these articles. But I can find no statistics for several years back, which would justify the assumption that anything like half this surplus is exported.

These are the reasons why this part of farming does not pay. And no New England man can get anything for his labor at pork making, at any such prices as have ruled for the last three years, calling the manufactured grain the raw material to the pork maker.

Until the great West has made her soil as poor as that of New England, or she shall take a wiser view of her interests and the good of her people, can no man succeed by farming alone in the Eastern States.

THE COST OF BEEF.

I have spoken elsewhere in regard to the cost of cattle. And the same remark I made in the making of pork, as is now practiced at the West, will apply equally well in regard to this article. As long as beef cattle are sold at the great markets for from four to eight cents per pound, it is no use to think of making beef here. It is true that the farmers of the eastern section of this State, a portion of New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Connecticut, can avail themselves of the low prices of cattle at Brighton, Cambridge and New York markets, and from these sources obtain their

oxen, cows, &c., at much lower rates than they can raise them. And from these they can make milk, butter, beef, &c., at a lower price than they otherwise could. But recollect that this is not legitimate farming. What is our gain is others loss. And as long as the Western and all farmers who are remote from the great markets are kept poor, so long will they crowd upon us most all products at such a rate that our exhausted land will give little or no returns for the labor.

It is generally supposed that the first quality of beef cannot be made, unless the oxen are stall fed several months. Calling a yoke of oxen weighing 3,000 pounds, worth \$100 the first day of June, let us see at what price a good article or extra beef can be made.

<i>One Yoke Oxen.</i>		<i>Dr.</i>
June 1,	To cost.....	\$100.00
Sept. 1,	" pasturing, driving, salt, &c..	10.00
Nov. 1,	" fall feed, cow corn, &c.....	5.00
March 1,	" 2½ tons hay.....	50.00
"	" 22½ bushels meal, at \$1.....	22.50
"	" interest.....	4.50
"	" rents of stable.....	2.00
		<hr/>
		\$194.00

Cr.

March 1,	By 2,100 pounds beef, at 7½.....	\$157.50
		<hr/>
Net loss.....		\$36.50

This is beef making. If it is claimed that part of this loss should have been made up by work, then let me say, that the cost of keeping must have been more, or the quality of the beef would not have been so good, and the price would have been less.

And although the beef has fell short of paying the

cost by \$36, it must be recollected that the man who raised the oxen must have lost more than this.

To raise a yoke of oxen, I should make these figures :

First year.....	\$44.00
Second year.....	30.00
Third year.....	40.00
Fourth year.....	50.00
	<hr/>
	\$164.00

Allowing that the work has paid for the training, this will give us about fair compensation for the labor, investment, &c. After this, they must pay for their keeping by their work.

Four years old oxen have been selling for from \$60 to \$100 a yoke for the last one or two years. If \$80 is taken as the average price, then a loss of some \$84 must be sustained.

Perhaps some will not be able to see clearly how it is that the first year costs more to raise cattle than either of the next two. The way that I explain this is, that the first year the labor to tend them is more, the manure is worth less, and more nutritious food is required.

THE COST OF WOOD.

Perhaps there are few crops produced upon the farm upon which greater errors exist, in regard to the cost, than this. 'Tis true that the labor to grow this crop is comparatively light, but the growth is so slow that the per cent. on the capital eats up the growth several times over. I have known but little wood to grow sufficiently fast to keep pace with the per cent. on the

cost, and then only when it is located in close proximity to some other business but farming, and depends upon this for its value. And then this kind of property is not as safe as many people suppose. The last few years has abundantly proved this. The devouring element and storms often destroy much of this property.

If an acre of sprout land costs \$10, in less than 36 years, at compound interest, it would cost \$80. Most all classes of men are smart enough to get compound interest on their capital but farmers. And though farmers often pay interest that is compounded oftener than once a year, they seldom make their capital pay any per cent. at all, or throw their labor away to get it.

FARMING IN THE WEST.

The following is an estimate on wheat raising in one of the Western States, which I take from the *New England Farmer* of April 28, 1860.

My object in introducing this here is to show how they reckon in the West, which will furnish some reason, I think, for their great distress in their pecuniary affairs.

Plowing 30 acres of land	\$30.00
Sixty bushels seed wheat.....	60.00
Two days one man sowing.....	2.00
One man and team 6 days dragging.....	12.00
Reaping 30 acres, at 60 cents per acre.....	18.00
Binding " " " "	18.00
Hauling and stacking 3 days.....	9.00
Threshing 420 bushels, at 4 cents per bushel.....	16.80
Hired help in threshing.....	10.00
Rent on 30 acres of land.....	90.00

\$265.80

Cr.

By 420 bushels, at 70 cents	\$294.00
-----------------------------------	----------

Leaving clear profit.....	\$28.20
---------------------------	---------

Thus it seems that our Western friend has got a dollar a day for his labor, and \$28.20 besides, according to his figures.

We will suppose our friend's figures to be all right but those we know to be wrong.

The first charge of \$30 for ploughing 30 acres of land. He says he did it with a span of horses. Can a man plough 30 acres of land with a span of horses in 15 days, and have them and his labor and the plough worth but \$2 per day? I know of no reason why a man cannot plough as much land in the East as in the West. Take our plains land here, which will compare favorably as far as ploughing is concerned with their land after it has once been ploughed, and an acre per day and follow it is enough for man or beast. It is true that for a single day a man might plough his two acres. It would not be wise or economy to do it even for a single day. Then he has called fourteen bushels per acre his crop, which is three bushels more than the last census returns make it. Therefore, if we increase the cost by \$30 ploughing, and deduct from the product three bushels to the acre, ninety bushels, \$63, his crop would run him in debt \$64. This is supposing all the figures to be correct but the two items named.

In the interior towns, where land can be hired for about \$3 per acre, wheat is often sold for from fifty to

sixty cents per bushel. Particularly this is the case when a large yield is obtained.

From the same paper from which the above was obtained, I find another little item, which to my mind explains how delusive is this mode of reckoning.

“Some of the Western States are still severely oppressed for the want of money. In Iowa, Minnesota, and some other States where speculation was most rife, and every description of property was pledged at exorbitant rates of interest, for the repayment of borrowed money, the condition of things cannot be easily imagined.”

I want to say here that my friend's statement is very modest compared to some in the Eastern States. According to his figures, he makes a profit of a little more than ten per cent., while here a profit of several hundred is often figured up. But on ploughing he beats us all hollow. When will the time arrive that the farmer will learn to make a truthful and intelligent estimate on the cost of farm products? I feel very sure it will never be as long as a premium is awarded to those only who out-general all others in bone and muscle, having the faculty to persuade others to rely on what is improbable, if not impossible. It will not answer for a man to do two days' work in one, or cause his men and team to do it, and set that up for a standard; for a man may deceive himself if he likes, but he has no right to deceive his neighbor. And any body or class of men who pursue this as a business or trade are not friends to the people.

Illinois, although comparatively a young State, has

out-generaled all her sisters in the number of her Agricultural Societies, having some 86, while Massachusetts has but 34. No wonder her crops are among the lowest average per acre of all the States in the Union. Her soil is becoming exhausted, and her people have not the means to improve it. And my friend who has made the above calculation, has done much to show us the cause of her trouble.

The following table shows at a single view, the cost of many farm products. The first column shows the cost of the stock, manure, or raw material out of which crops are made. The second the cost of, or per cent. on the capital. The third the cost of the labor, at one dollar per day. The fourth the total cost of the product.

	Raw Material.	Interest on Capital.	Cost of Labor.	Total Cost of Products.
Ton of English Hay	\$8.60	\$6.66	\$4.50	\$19.76
“ Green Clover Hay	2.10	1.75	2.00	5.85
“ Swale “	2.86	2.00	3.00	7.86
“ Rye Straw	1.94	2.00	4.25	8.19
“ Oat “	4.41	2.50	4.25	11.16
“ Dried Ind. Corn St'ks,	2.15	2.00	2.00	6.15
“ Millet,	3.41	4.50	7.50	15.41
Bush., or 60 lbs. Potatoes,	.12	*.25	.30	.67
“ 40 Beets,	.08	.06	.12	.26
“ 40 Mangold Wurzel,	.05	.04	.08	.17
“ 40 Com. Turnips	.03	.04	.06	.13
“ 40 Carrots,	.06	.06	.09	.21
“ 56 Rye, Grain,	.44	*.35	.30	1.09
“ 60 Wheat,	.57	*.42	.40	1.39
“ 46 Barley,	.36	*.25	.24	.85
“ 32 Oats,	.23	*.15	.12	.50
“ 60 Peas or Beans.	.57	*.50	.45	1.52
“ 40 Buckwheat,	.26	*.20	.15	.61
“ 56 Indian Corn,	.42	*.34	.28	1.04

Those products marked with a *, the cost of the seed is included.

In this table, on the total cost of the crops, the writer has made no calculation on marketing, therefore, if the farmer should make additional expense by teaming, it must be charged to the goods sold.

It will be noticed that oftentimes the various products sell higher than this table makes the cost to be, making a profit above all cost. But it will be admitted that a large majority of all sales made, fall below this cost table, making a net loss on the gross amount of sales. Every one ought to know that in doing a losing business, the less amount there is done the better. But the moment a per cent. over the cost is obtained, then the larger the better, for the size of the profit is not very materially important if the business can be so extended that the gross amount of profit, makes the business lucrative.

All who are disposed to demur at these figures, must recollect that locality will very much change them; and as no similar table can be made to suit all places, therefore the writer desires to suggest that all farmers do what they can to establish a correct list of cost prices to suit their locality, and all who believe that the "laborer is worthy of his hire," should do what he can to establish them. That thought, study, investigation and mind, may enter more largely into the business, is the highest ambition of the writer.

CHAPTER X.

MARKETING.

The Sale of Goods — Market Places — The Value of the Loads Carried to Market — The Country Stores — Barter — The Farmers Duty — Harmony among the Workers — The Earnings of Capital — The Difficulty at the West — Experts and the Farmer — A Rebellion — The Statute should be Repealed — The Alpha and Omega in Agriculture — The Shoemaker's Strike — The Rich and the Poor — The Farmer a Merchant — Debit and Credit — Proverbs and Sayings — No one Made a Fortune at Farming in New England.

THE existing system of disposing of farm products is the most cunningly devised to defraud the farmer, of any plan that could well be conceived of. All that the farmer wants to buy, has to be bargained for on the venders own premises. From a cotton hat to a wheelbarrow, — from law to medicine, — from theology to a stick of candy, all has to be met at the threshold of him whose office is to smooth over, gloss up and blend together the light and shade, that the imperfections may be covered up in such a manner that the worse may seem the better article. All this can be better and more cheaply done at home than any where else. Of all this I find no fault. But how is it with the farmer's goods? His articles have to be by him carted to market, where some select locality is especially appropriated to huddle all together, where every load will come in direct competition with each other load, that all mishaps, accidents, or calamities, obliging the weaker

and less thoughtful to give way, that the unscrupulous may establish the price for the day.

Cold and stormy weather, exposing the team, the driver and the load, to peculiar hardships, a distance from home, the expense of prolonging the journey, the impossibility of storing the load, the perishableness of the article, its great bulk and weight; these, and many other causes, tend to keep down the price, exposing the farmer to the taunts and the jeers of the low and cunning, if not of a baser class, as the so-called aristocracy always employ some one to do their marketing; seldom coming in contact with the hard hands that fell the forests, plough the land, harvest the crops, ditch and drain the swamps, shovel the manure, make the beef and pork, &c., &c., unless it is at some cattle show, on the eve of an election, or when the load has been converted into the pittance of cash, (if it has not been bartered away,) gentility, then, is full of smiles and twinkles, till the pocket is exhausted, and our farmer is homeward bound, congratulating himself on his good luck, and ready to hurrah at every turn for the independence of farming, and the privilege of showing to the world to what endurance the physical and mental capacity of man can be subjected. The reader must bear in mind that all this time some broken-down politician, under sanction of law, has been following our farmer at his heels, with a four foot pole, a pair of balances, and a peck measure, to see *fair play*, and that soft hands don't get cheated.

With far greater propriety and fitness of things,

would it be for the farmers in each of their towns, to appropriate a place where the merchant, the lawyer, the doctor, the tailor, the tinker, the loafer, and all of citydom, that wanted to, could assemble and expose their wares for sale or barter, that the farmers could meet them with their experts, that justice might prevail in the land. The most serious objection to this arrangement would be a sufficient police to keep the peace.

Seriously, the present arrangement is full of important objections, having a tendency to degrade the farmer, not only in the public estimation but in his own. It makes and keeps him poor, drives his sons to the cities and distant places, his daughters to the factories and to the lowest grade of needle-work, exposing his farm and buildings to decay, and himself to reserve, low spirits, closeness, and too often, insanity. Thus we often see long lives of the severest industry, economy and self-denial, end in penury and want. If there was a profit in the business, the evil would be less, but even then, aside from this, the arrangement is full of wrong. But when we see that one-fourth of the gross amount of sales made in this way hardly pays the expense of marketing, all things fairly reckoned, it will be seen that as poorly as the farmer is paid, this greatly reduces the wages of his toil.

It usually spoils the day for a man to go to market, if he has but a few miles to go, unless his load has been previously sold. Then, the receipts are so meager, that allowing for the expenses, comparatively little is left to pay for the labor, capital and material, that has produced

it. If we should allow \$4.00 for an average value of all the loads that are carted to market by the farmers, then reckoning the positive expense to them of doing this, the labor and board for the man, the keeping and loss on the team, the wear of the wagon or vehicle, with the interest on the capital, it would not fall short of \$1.00, or one-fourth of the whole amount of receipts. As it is well known that many farmers go to market with but one or two dollars worth, and most loads do not exceed six dollars in value, excepting the single article of hay, it will be seen that these figures are a tolerable approximation to the facts as they exist.

This is farming within ten or fifteen miles of the market. But how is it more remote? In all towns at a considerable distance from the market, a different state of things exist. There the country stores take the farmers products in exchange for goods. This also, takes a good deal of time, to keep up the system of bartering that here prevails. And although our country friends get rid of the constable and the four foot pole, yet they are subjected to the "scales" (perhaps of justice,) and the peck measure of the merchant. It is needless to say, that all this arrangement tends directly to cheapen the farmer's goods. Because, a man always feels more independent and better guarded against imposition at home, where his goods show to the best advantage, he is free from the expense of calling upon others, and here the scale is turned, as he is up and dressed, ready for the smartest of them.

How often we hear it said, that admitting these

things to be so, how can they be altered? They exist, always have, and we must submit to them. Now wait a moment and let us see. The country is abundantly supplied with all the things needful, is it not? Yes. The earth produces in abundance, does it not? Yes. Farming is the foundation upon which all other kinds of business rests, is it not? Yes. All trades and callings are dependent upon the farmer, are they not? Yes. If the earth ceases to produce, man would starve, would he not? Yes. For to provide against hunger, man will barter all he possesses, will he not? Yes. All our institutions, systems, rules, laws, customs, habits, inclinations and governments, are what we (the people,) make them, are they not? Yes. Nearly all our woes, wrongs, evils, mishaps, adversities, frauds, cheats, and the like, are for the want of right reason, are they not? Yes. Then admitting all this to be true, there is no good cause for the state of things that exist.

If the quack doctor can become a millionaire by the sale of his nostrums, — the lawyer can ride in his carriage, — the merchant can enjoy the fat of the land, — the jockey can ride with whip and spurs, — the loafer can snap his fingers at honest industry; if all this can be fastened upon the people, I know that the working farmers can live, if they can agree upon this, that they *will* have pay for their LABOR, a PER CENT. upon their capital, and pay for the MATERIAL of which their crops are made. There is no need of any combination, excitement or demonstration, but let them fully resolve

upon this, and the work is done. Let each make his own figures, being careful not to cheat himself, and the object of this work is obtained.

Then there is no warring of the West upon the East, the North upon the South, one section upon another section, the country upon the city, the seaboard upon the frontier. All is harmony and success. Our lands will increase in value, our towns will retain the young men and women, our schools will become larger and better, our meeting-houses will be better filled, our centres will become full of life and prosperity, our homes more happy, our old men will cease to be a burden, our poor better cared for, and the poor-houses, in a measure, depopulated. All this, and much more, would immediately grow out of this arrangement. When the farmers learn to cease the production, if the crops cease to be remunerative, then, and then only, will they be respected, and take that position among men they ought.

There are but few things more simple than this. Our capital has already been earned. The wisdom of ages have said this, that capital may earn a certain per cent. All civilized nations act upon this principle. The laws establish what those earnings shall be. The farmers know too well how this is. But they seem to forget that *their farms* should earn as well as their hands. This should be done without deterioration to the soil. Therefore, let this be fully understood, and it will be seen, that one section of the country can produce, all things being equal, about as cheaply as an-

other; the material to make the crop, in quantity and quality, always being the same. It requires no more in the East than the West, the North than the South. It is true, that the value attached to the land affects the cost of the crop, same as the value of the labor. The price of labor should be nearly equal, one section with another. And the study of all should be to increase this price everywhere. There is no fears of getting the standard of labor too high. For as the laborer becomes well paid, he will become intelligent, independent, more of a man. But, oppress, distrust, starve him, and he sinks to the lowest grade of humanity.

Therefore, as we see that the cost of crops in two of the requisites are nearly equal, — that is, labor and the material out of which they are made, — then it follows that the per cent. on the capital is the principal reason why crops can be raised lower in one locality than another; and as the expense of transportation will generally balance this, we then come to an intelligent conclusion, why the people who cultivate new States, the virgin soil, in the second generation always become poor and involved in difficulties, unless other business comes to their relief. This is the cause of the present difficulty in the great West. A few years back it was so in Ohio and western New York. It will always be so till the people learn that farm products, like all other products, are made of something, and they cannot be separated from the soil with impunity.

Now, after these brief explanations, we will return to the subject more particularly under consideration,—**MARKETING.** We have seen that it costs us twenty-five per cent. to market most of our products. This has to come from somewhere,—if it is not made in profits, it must come out of the labor or capital. There is no escaping it. Then the question arises, are the profits equal to this? We have before seen that in farming there is no such thing as profit. It does not enter into the farmers' vocabulary. They have no such word in their language.

We have seen what has been said about this. Large profits are sometimes figured up on paper, by designing or deceived men, whose interest is to keep the farmers poor. This we have seen. But, when these men are asked in plain terms if *such is the fact*, the unanimous answer is, *No!* They have *not* made a profit. If we should go through the State, putting the same question to each farmer, viz: *Have you made a profit at farming over a fair per cent. on the capital invested, and a reasonable price for the labor performed?* Let this question be put to all farmers in the State, and the universal answer must be, **NO.** If I go among the fishermen of Swampscot,—the clam-diggers of Nantasket,—the rag-pickers of Boston,—the stevedores upon Long Wharf,—the shoemakers of Lynn,—the factory operatives of Lowell,—the apple and candy merchants of the streets,—the jobbers, jockeys, tradesmen, lawyers, clergy, doctors, and all, among some of each class I

shall find those who have earned their capital at their business, and many who have (if not fortunes,) something handsome besides.

If all these things that I say are true, had not the people ought to know it? If they are not true, then it is easy to refute them. The figures can be easily made, and the facts brought forward to establish them. Are not the farmers men, like other folks, having the same capacities, and are subject to the same influences? Then why select them out and employ experts to watch, catechise, and stand as arbiter between them and a customer, when going to market? It cannot be because the business is so lucrative that their success needs to be checked, and I do not believe it is because they are so dishonest that no confidence can be placed in them, because this would be, to say the least, impolitic. Is it because they are not sufficiently intelligent to measure a load of wood correctly, or weigh a load of hay, or measure a peck of apples? I should like to hear an intelligent reason for this.

Every year millions of dollars' worth of property are packed up in tight boxes, nailed, strapped and marked, and transported to the most distant sections of the country, by rail, by water, by express, and who ever heard of a case coming before our courts where a false invoice was made to appear? There are no experts here, no measurers, no weighers, no cullers, no one to stand by with a long pole to see that somebody don't get cheated. Establish such, and a rebellion that would put the Revolutionary "tea-party" entirely

in the shade, would be about your ears. A "strike" that is a strike, with blank cartridges, perhaps, at first, but unless a repeal was sounded, what would follow can easily be imagined. Are all trades-people, merchants, manufacturers and mechanics less intelligent or less honest for this? I think not. But the reverse is undoubtedly true. In a word, then, why subject the farmer to insult or annoyance, making him less a man than he otherwise would be, by such old and musty statutes, that had their origin among despots, to make serfs of the people?

Repeal the law. I repeat it, repeal the statute, and then the farmer will see that a reputation is worth something, that success has some connection with integrity. Let this be the starting point, the *Alpha* of better days, and when all statutes, such as establish "Boards of Agriculture," "Agricultural Societies," and the like, are repealed, whose origin was with the enslavers of the people, then, and not till then, can the *Omega* of oppression be written. I entreat of all laborers, and the agriculturists in particular, to speak freely upon these things; think, study, reflect and agitate, for

"He who would be free, himself must strike the blow."

The people themselves would not be opposed to a repeal of all these laws. They know that they had a monarchical origin, and are not in unison with our institutions. And the only reason we submit to them is, that they were made before we knew what laws were.

In fact, they were handed down to us, coming across the water, and our policy is to get rid of them fast as possible, as "*that people are best governed who are governed the least.*" The *professed* friends of the farmer, the fancy, undoubtedly would oppose it, as "Othello's occupation would be gone." Who is there, that does not have an infinitely higher opinion of the shoemakers to-day, than they did before the recent strike was commenced? And who are to be the losers? Because the object is to raise the price of shoes. They desire to live by their business, earning a living by their work. If there is a man so mean as to think or wish them unsuccessful, there is no one who has the courage to say it, although at the commencement of the strike, thousands were loud in their denunciation. All, it is true, cannot in the present tense be benefited. But humanity has been elevated. The toiling masses have got a stronger grasp at the tyrant, and he is stilled for a season.

"The price of *liberty* is eternal vigilance."

Our farmers must not think that because they have good and comfortable farms, with all the conveniences for making themselves comfortable and happy, that they can lay down, regardless of the future. This will not do. No man lives entirely for himself. In all civilized and organized governments, we give up some rights to that of community. The State has some claim upon each, and each has some claim upon all. Therefore it will not do to stand aside, and say that we are all right, the poor must take care of themselves.

Because the poor of to-day may be the rich to-morrow, and *vice versa*. Then it is the duty of all to try to elevate labor, for labor is respected only as it is paid. That that is cheap, is thought but little of, and that that is dear is prized as it costs. A man who inherits property is neither the better nor the worse for that. But he who uses such to oppress his fellow-man, has but little claim to the respect of the people, and should never receive the emolument or honor of office.

Every farmer should be a merchant as well as farmer; keeping a regular set of books, with plenty of leisure to keep his accounts, make his figures, study the principles of his business, investigate the science of Agriculture for himself, instruct his children, tend to the sales of his goods, which should always be done at home, on his own premises, be his own expert, keeping a four foot pole, a set of measures, scales, &c. His study should be to make his *own home* pleasant, himself and family happy, enjoying the conveniences of life, working as much as is needful to accomplish this; knowing the cost of everything he produces, that which he consumes as well as what he sells; giving the farm credit for all that he consumes, the increased value of the same from year to year if any, the whole amount of sales made, and charging the farm with all the labor performed, the interest on the capital, the taxes, insurance, and the depreciation in value, if any. I know that this will take time, but what of that? Do you desire to be serfs, and your children slaves? If so, then neglect these things, work yourself and

family into the doctor's hands, or poor-house, cart your goods to market and sell them for less than you could have done at home, make and sell pork and beef for two-thirds the cost, do all you can to depopulate your own towns, administering to the comfort and enjoyment of those who undertake to control you, build up the cities, increase the value of other's property. In a word, "do just what you ought not to do, and neglect those things you should do."

As long as those laws of which I have spoken remain upon the statute books, so long, brother farmers, everywhere, let us stay at home, living upon our own resources. If others can do without us, we can do without them. Establish ourselves upon principle, demanding nothing but what is clearly right, and submitting to nothing that is wrong. This is *your* duty, as it is my duty. For the good of the cause let us suffer if need be. Not that I would say a word or think a thought to separate one interest from another, to have a clashing among the various interests; but if our rights can be obtained in no other way, then and only then, would I advocate this. "*Dum, vivimus, vivimus.*" While we live, let us live. A Roman philosopher once said, "*Show me the laws of a people, and I will read you their character.*" "*Audi alteram partem.*" Hear the other side. This is what we want. "Hear the other side." Look the facts in the face, and if wrongs exist, right them.

It is often said that all business but farming is "overdone." I think I have proved that this, if not the

only business over-done, it certainly comes pretty near to that conclusion. I know very well that no portion of the people are so poorly paid for their labor as the farmers. It cannot be said that they live by their labor, since no man thinks of farming on borrowed capital. When three-fourths of all other kinds of business is carried on by borrowed capital, the farmer finds it up-hill work when he owns his capital. Where this capital came from, has been shown in these pages. No one will claim that any considerable proportion of it came from the *profits* of farming.

Out of the 200,000 farmers in New England, not one solitary individual can be found who has earned a fortune at farming. Let this statement stand till the contrary is proved, as it is not my business to prove a negative. Those who think differently, I hope will be kind enough to let me know when they find their man, who has more than two letters to his name. How I define farming, is several times expressed in these pages.

CHAPTER XI.

THE FARMERS' SONS.

New Hampshire a Good State to Emigrate From—The Sons of New England Should Stay at Home—Killing Two Birds with One Stone—Husbands for the Country Girls—The Prodigal Son—A Supposition—Mr. Wiseman's Children—Wiseman a Reasoner—John Wiseman Repairs his Father's Buildings—The Miller's Rule—A Grocery and Shoe Factory—Tenements Wanted—Great Time Getting Married—Ann and, the Shoemaker—Earning a Living—The East and the West—A Balance of the Sexes—Concentration of Business.

MR. WEBSTER once said, that "New Hampshire was a good State to emigrate from." "Its principal articles of export were young men and granite." The same can be said of this and all of the New England States, in regard to the young men. Although the export list has been greatly increased of late years, both in the human and other commodities, and we still continue to manufacture the article, yet we cannot afford to *export* it. If the young men of this and other New England States are a good material to build up distant States and cities, they are just as useful to stay at home; and that although it is bad policy to export any Agricultural commodity, unless the returns are sufficient to reinstate them, and pay for the labor in doing so, yet *this* commodity can never be fully compensated.

No farmer should think of exiling his children. It

would be infinitely more wise to bring business to them than it would to send them to seek business elsewhere. Business, trade, the value of property, &c., are what the people make them. There is no chance, luck, or happened-to-come-so about it. Most farming towns could double their population, business and wealth, every twenty-five years, if they would make half the effort to do this that they do to make each other poor. It is just as easy to go up hill as it is to go down, after you get used to it, in this respect. I would not have the number of farmers increased, there are too many now for the population. But what I would do is this: I would distribute much of the trade, business and manufactures of the cities among the country towns. This would be "killing two birds with one stone," as the saying is. The increase of population and business would enhance the value of the lands, and the extra population would make a home market for our products.

There are many other advantages arising from this, besides a mere dollar and cent view of the matter. Among which are an increase of means to support public worship, a higher order of, and increased facilities for schooling, a purer moral and social condition of the people, a higher order of intellectual attainments, &c., &c.

But, says the reader, "how is all this agoing to be brought about? It undoubtedly would be a good thing if it could be done, but, that is the rub." Let us see. We must keep the young men at home, and

they must do something besides farming. Then the question arises, what shall they do? Or perhaps it would be better to say, what *can* they do? Or better still, what *would* they do? Answer: They would furnish husbands to scores of the young maidens, who otherwise would be obliged to go to some factory, or other place, to earn a scanty living in single blessedness, wearing themselves out in the service of others. This is one thing they would do, and if this were all, it would be a gain. But this is not all, for if they could earn a living anywhere else, they could here, if they have had the right training. If shoes can be made in Lynn, and sold in Boston, New York and other places, at a profit, they can be made here. And if the farmers' capital can build factories in Lowell, railroads in New Hampshire, buy bank stocks, &c., it can furnish all the capital wanted to do this. But, all are not agoing to be shoemakers. Other things can be made and sold as well. Farm implements, furniture, clothes, hats and caps, carpenter's work, blacksmithing, &c. All these will be wanted to a considerable extent at home, as the population increases. Then all the farmers and others must learn to patronize their own, letting the city folks take care of their own affairs, and if the poor among them who are willing to work, find it hard to live there, let them start for the country, for that is just the place for them.

The farmers have, and are, committing great errors in regard to the education and habits of their sons. They too generally intend to make farmers of them.

This is their mistake. They have all their lives been laboring under a delusion themselves, and seldom ascertain the cause of their embarrassments, till their sons finding it impossible to live by following the occupation of their fathers, embark in some kinds of business for which they have had no previous training, and a failure is too often the result. How often we see these young men, like the "prodigal son," returning to their fathers, broken down, disheartened and discouraged, who would have made useful members of society, if they had had a suitable training before embarking in their effort at trade or business.

Perhaps I can better illustrate what I want to say, by a supposition, than in any other way. A farmer, whom we will call Mr. Wiseman, has five children, three sons and two daughters, a farm with a hundred acres, with fair buildings, in the town of C——, Middlesex County, Massachusetts.

John, the eldest son, is apprenticed to a carpenter, at the age of seventeen, to stay till twenty-one, with the understanding that he is to go to the high school three months each winter, in his native town.

Smith, the next son, is sent to Lynn, at eighteen, to stay till twenty-one, with a shoemaker, and learn thoroughly the business of shoe-making, cutting, the general management of workmen, books, &c.

Jane, the next, stays at home and *helps her mother*, excepting when at school, or when on an occasional visit among her lady friends. It is not improper here to state, that on these occasions she never denies a

familiar acquaintance with the wash tub, nor considers it unlady-like to recognize one of her old friends, the cow.

Daniel, the next, is sent to Lowell with Mr. A., to learn the grocery and variety store business.

Ann, the baby, follows in the footsteps of her illustrious predecessor, Jane.

When neighbor Wiseman is interrogated by his neighbors in regard to his affairs, and what is agoing to become of his farm, and himself and wife, in their decline, he answers in this wise: "As to the farm, if it will not take care of itself, let it go. I do not desire to waste my *own* time, much *less* that of my children. I have generally failed to get pay for my own labor when at work upon the farm, and I have too much regard for the good of my children, to desire them to do what I have always been poorly paid for doing myself."

It is needless to say that Mr. Wiseman takes an intelligent view of the matter. He knows that when he removes a crop from the soil, he has either got to return its equivalent in plant food, or deteriorate it; and unless he gets his pay for the labor in doing so, it is time worse than idly spent. He takes time to make the figures upon the crops, calling this a part of the labor of the farm, knows when he sells a product whether his labor is paid for or thrown away, thinks he has no moral right, because somebody gave him a farm, to use that in such a way that it would be detrimental to the interest of his poor neighbor, who has been less fortu-

nate. He knows that a thing (in a business point of view,) that he cannot afford to *pay* for doing, is not worth doing. He can see no reason why his own labor is not as well entitled to pay, as that of the Irishman whom he employs. In a word, he looks down into the bottom of things. He knows that when a lot of sharpers in the great city get together to concoct measures to bring the farmers with their products there to please them, that it is for nobody's good but their own; and if they fail to make it pay, they will vote them a twenty-five cent picture for a ten spot, instead of the hard cash they promised. In fact, friend W. has been a close observer of human *natur*, and he knows that when some of the city folks are bragging about a profit of several hundred per cent. on the corn and other crops, that it is about time to give the sheriff a call, as "forbearance," in that direction, "has ceased to be a virtue."

He cannot see the consistency of the fancy, by continually harping upon the almost sure bankruptcy of all who engage in any kind of business but farming; and at this, when such monstrous profits are made, why farm property is deteriorating in value, and no one is willing to risk their capital in it. It does not look exactly clear to him, that when these disinterested sympathizers with the farmer who double their capital every year on their corn and other crops, are not content with this; but are continually before the Legislature asking for appropriations to send them into the farming districts to lecture the people how to throw

mud out of the bottom of a ditch, to drain their meadows, and whether the water will run down or up the hill. Now we will see how Mr. Wiseman's children get along, and the consummation of his long-cherished plans.

The winter before John's apprenticeship is out, the neighbors are somewhat surprised to see friend Wiseman teaming logs to the mill. These are put into the various kinds of lumber, and carefully stuck up around our neighbor's buildings.

On the fourth of July, (1852,) John spends the day with his parents and brothers and sisters, at the old homestead. After dinner, when the family are sitting around the centre-table in the parlor, and Ann is drumming out a few tunes on their familiar friend, the piano, Smith asks John "where he is going after his time is out, and what he is going to do?" "He has not fully decided upon that," says Mrs. W. Mr. W. stops all controversy upon this point, by saying, "My plans are all made. I have work for a carpenter for the most of a year, and if the wages are satisfactory, John can take the position." This settles the worsted.

The last of August John returns home, with a full set of tools from Mr. L., his master, who deems no other expression of satisfaction necessary, inasmuch as the tools were a gratuity, or additional to the bargain.

In less than one year, Mr. W.'s buildings have been modernized, thoroughly repaired, painted in two colors, with green blinds, &c. Although they always looked neat and pretty, yet now they are the admiration of

all. Neighbor S., who knows a thing or two, declares, with a twinkle of the eye, "that they look as though friend W. had been round lecturing on *humus* and *impee*, at five dollars a lick, with the scrapings." It is needless to say that this is a mere take-off by friend S., who is fond of a joke, as no one ever thought there was a particle of hypocrisy in neighbor W., as he would be the last man to preach one thing and practice another; and when he cannot live without persuading others to do what he cannot do himself, he will stop.

John W. is now a great favorite with all the *old* ladies of C., who have got a full share of the feminines around the breakfast table, and it is remarkable how all at once, their buildings have got into a dilapidated condition, and must be repaired right off. John has to adopt a kind of miller's rule, and in this way goes through the village, and O! what a change.

Presently, outsiders are attracted to the revolutionary scene, and really, the old town presents new beauties at every turn, and the wonder is why these attractions have never before been discovered.

Mr. W., the senior, calls round one day where his son is at work, holds a short confab with him, and leaves.

Presently, a large lot of lumber is seen piled up on the corner of the old turnpike and the Boston road. The town is now all agog, and over goes neighbor S. to see what is the next move. Friend W. has no secrets, and it soon gets round that a grocery store and shoe factory is going up, right on Mr. W.'s farm.

Some think he had better go into the village, but Mr. W. thinks he had better bring the village to him. They are too old-fashioned to suit his notion. He thinks it wiser to build new than to remodel the old.

In due tim, a neat and tasty building, 24 + 50, two stories high, is seen, where a short time before was a potato patch.

. About one year after Mr. W.'s second son, Smith, went to Lynn, a young man came to C. to go to the high school there. He boarded with friend W., and although it was some distance from the village, yet he was philosopher enough to know that exercise was one of the necessary concomitants of a school education. Some of the old ladies of C. looked a little askew, when they saw the family of W. going to the village church on Sunday, and declared they saw W.'s oldest *gal* drop her handkerchief, and young Alley picked it right up, and they had quite a laugh over it. This was enough. That point was settled.

In due process of time, a heavy baggage wagon passes through the village with a load of shoe goods, and they are unloaded at the shop of Wiseman and Alley.

Young Wiseman goes through the village and among the farmers, and engages what spare tenements can be found, and also board for a few shoe-binders and workmen.

Business now commences. The old people seem to have obtained a new lease of life; all is animation; the streets are alive with well-dressed and well-behaved

young men and girls, who are regular at their work ; and the goods of the new firm of Wiseman & Alley are sent forth as a living advertisement, to their value and credit.

While all this has been going on, John W. has not been idle. He has taken two apprentices, hired one journeyman, and is at work on a dwelling for Mr. Alley.

Carpenters, masons, and other mechanics come here to obtain employment. Some have bought a few lots, intending to put up buildings as soon as things get a little better established ; although there are a few old fogies round with a pail of cold water, who have some apprehension that the smell of leather may disturb their olfactory nerves a little ; and as for a shoemaker, they can never bear the mention of one since it has become generally known that their old grandfather used to go round " whipping the cat."

In less than three years from the day that Wiseman & Alley raised their shingle, three dwellings have been built, three weddings have taken place, all on the old homestead, viz : John, the carpenter, is settled down in a fine looking cottage, keeps a cow, pig, and horse, and Henrietta W., formerly Miss S., the village school teacher, declares she never was so happy in her life.

Mr. Alley and Jane have consummated just what the old ladies surmised at the time the handkerchief was dropped.

Smith has taken home this very day, Miss E., the village belle. She will soon be a wife, and a prize as well.

Parson M. has got three V.'s, and what Dr. H. has made out of the brush, "mum" must be the word.

Daniel, the youngest son, has changed his mind in regard to going West; has concluded to take a partnership with his employer, establish a branch of the Lowell house at C., and has taken the first floor of the shoe-shop for this purpose. John is putting him (Daniel) up a house on a vacant lot on the old turn-pike, and all declare it to be the neatest place in town.

Already, Parson M. has got another V., and neighbor S.'s family is one the less.

Ann, the baby, is beginning to show the ribbons, and report has it that a shoemaker from New Hampshire is particularly attracted in that direction, and Parson M. thinks he can afford a new hat on that, if the merchant is not particularly in a hurry for the "rocks."

It has now been eight years since John Wiseman left his old master. In that time he has repaired nearly half the houses in the east part of the town, built a grocery and shoe factory, and four dwelling houses, with some outbuildings.

Mr. Wiseman, the elder, during all this time, has had a good deal of care and anxiety. Of his means he has not been sparing. He has deeded to each of his children ten acres of the homestead; considers the fifty acres left worth more in the market than the hundred was when he commenced; has discovered that he has made some mistakes; yet, as a whole, is often congratulated on his efforts, and has the proud satisfaction of knowing that his children have learned

how to *earn a living*. If reverses should befall them, it will not be likely to dishearten them. They know how to work, and are not ashamed that all should know it.

Perhaps C. will never become a city, but who can say but what a nucleus has here been formed around which various kinds of business will gather; and so long as the people are wise, and think and act for themselves, it will grow and prosper.

Although the preceding is a tax upon the imagination, yet who is there that cannot draw a parallel from real life? And let me say that there are but few towns in New England but what can do as well, — many better. This is what will stay the everlasting emigration from the East to the West; is what will balance the cities with the interior, — rid the former of its surplus population, and make the latter more inviting to the young, and the decline of the aged less burdensome and sad.

The only hope of the farmers is to draw in and mix up with them the traders, mechanics and manufacturers. In this way, the sexes will be more equally balanced, not having one end of the county filled with old bachelors and the other with the opposite, to the injury of both, and detrimental to the best good of the country, as a whole.

The writer desires to suggest that if the farmers all over New England can see anything practical in this, and useful to the people, is it not their duty to themselves, their children, the public, and the country at large, to practice up to this duty? Never wait to have some rich man or incorporated company come along to

do what the farmers themselves can do much better. Learn your children to do what will be useful and remunerative, if you would desire to make them happy, and your country great.

It is well known that mechanical business is being crushed out of the country towns. In 1845, there were 20 scythe factories distributed over the State. Now, although the gross amount of the business has increased, yet the business has become concentrated in a few cities and large towns. In the same time, the number of plough manufactories has been reduced from 73 to 22; the number of shovel establishments from 39 to 21. The same is true of most kinds of mechanical business. Although the business has been increased, it is continually becoming concentrated, greatly to the injury of the farming communities.

Everything we want to buy, we have to go to the cities for. If we want our lands drained; if we want a pipe laid; if we want a pump made; a well dug; a house built; a barn raised; a wall built; a cow doctored; a horse nicked; a harness repaired; a wagon built; a pair of cart wheels tired; a tree trimmed; a graft set; a few pumpkin or squash seeds; tomato plants; or no matter what, it must all come from the city. And for all these, and much more, we must pay the *price asked*; when all we have to sell we must *team to them*, they are such good fellows, and consider it fortunate *to have them fix the price*, and then set an *expert to measure or weigh* the article, for which they are kind enough to exchange some of their goods.

THE DUTY OF YOUNG MEN.

Although the writer has mainly confined himself in this work to the pecuniary affairs of life, yet he wishes not to have it understood that this is the whole duty of man, or his main duty ; but as society is constituted, that it is one of the duties there can be no question. Although it may be unpopular to say it, no man thinks it unpopular or wrong, by honorable and fair means, to do it ; for without money, a man will always find the means of doing good extremely limited. And I have yet to learn that with it a man need in any particular be less a man, or less useful in society ; since most of the good deeds of life are accomplished by it, and usually by those whose earnings are in excess of their expenditures. These are the men who mainly lighten the burdens of society, support the gospel at home and abroad, build the places of learning, pay the teachers, who instruct our children, build the cities and towns, envelop the land with the iron rail, transverse the ocean with the lightning cord, plough the deep with a power, the bones and muscles of which are made of the ore which it has excavated the earth to possess ; and that although it is the duty of most young men to earn more than they spend, yet let no one think to make money by reducing their expenses below the useful things of life, for the earth produces sufficiently for the good of all, and when the people become sufficiently numerous, every rood of land will abundantly support its man.

Then how absurd the idea that the good of the

farmer is to keep the supply greatly in excess of the demand, that the minority may control the majority, or the few luxuriate on the toil of the many. Has it not been one of the great errors in most farming communities to study out some way to live cheap, rather than to earn enough to live well; to sell the best and consume the poorest; to discourage trade and business rather than encourage it; to treat those just commencing life and the poor with distrust, parsimoniousness and jealousy, rather than with liberality, encouragement and equality; to make the people poor rather than rich, in their anxiety to reduce taxation and keep what they have by withholding from their own the means of enterprise and thrift, thereby greatly enhancing the former and reducing the latter to the idea of the most querulous; to people the poor-houses rather than to supply the means of learning the poor and unfortunate how to earn a living; to trudge off to the cities and distant places for their stores and conveniences of life, rather than furnish their own citizens with their patronage and encouragement?

All these evils the young men in the country towns have to contend with, and to succeed, these influences and this opposition must be overcome. But "where there is a will, there is a way." It is true, but few men in farming communities have the means of aiding young men, save by an encouraging word, a little timely patronage, and a sympathising interest in their success. And oftentimes these are all that are needed to establish the desirable object, by creating a nucleus

around which, with favorable influences, a permanent position is established.

In all country towns exist a considerable class of half-grown boys, the sons of poor, sometimes indolent, parents, who too often have been made what they are by the influences, a part of which I have named above. And as inactivity, passiveness and innocence, in the young, whose mental and physical training and habits are neglected, are not to be looked for, therefore to open some industrial pursuit by which these boys, before they are old enough to form vicious and idle habits, can be trained to a business that will afford them a living by their labor, and inculcate in them habits of industry, oftentimes relieving the town of the expense and the friends the disgrace of a public charge. Although all that is desired in this way cannot be done, yet every observing man knows that much may be accomplished if the people would strive to assist each other in their own neighborhoods, believing that the interest of each is the good of all.

How often we see the people in compact and closely populated localities doing all they can,—leaving no stone unturned to introduce trade, industry and thrift in their midst; and although we see and know this, yet is it not just as common to see farmers do all they can to drive these from them; looking with a jealous eye and often with an insinuating speech upon any who dare to presume to make an effort for their own and the public good?

All these the young men have to contend with, yet

they should not dishearten them, for a few years of industry, promptness and perseverance will give them a position that shall last for all time to come, and their most bitter opposers will become their most servile friends.

Therefore, taking the whole subject as it stands, and viewing the matter in its true light, I can see no remedy for the evils that exist but this: for all young men to firmly resolve upon what they desire to do, and spare no time or expense to prepare themselves to prosecute this with an understanding and will that knows no such word as fail.

CHAPTER XII.

HIS EXCELLENCY GOVERNOR BANKS. LEGISLATION.

THE CATTLE DISEASE. AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,
&c., &c.

Extracts from Governor Banks' Message—Cattle Disease Calamity—Public Money used for Sectional Purposes—Farming and Pauper Making—Insanity and Suicide—Experts and the Farmer—Law and Farming—Rewarding Dishonesty, Watching the Victims—Premiums and Machinery—Worn-out Pastures—Refinement, Civilization and Rustics—Guardianship, Industry, and Value of Property—Earnings of Massachusetts, Vermont, and Wisconsin—Combination of Capital and Labor—Premiums to keep down the Price of Shoes—Conscience of the Merchant—Taking the Backward Step—Repeal of Statutes—Young America and Her Markets—Cost of Agricultural Products—Per cent. for Labor—Agricultural College—Americans Emulating the Serfs of the Old Countries—Concord River Meadows—Mr. Holbrook's Letter—Reply—Inquiries—Correspondents and Replies—Science of Humbug and Agricultural Warehouses.

At the close of your recent message to the Legislature, on the prevailing cattle disease, I recognize some very important suggestions as regards the industry of the country.

The extract to which I refer is here inserted:

“No greater calamity will have fallen upon the industry of the Commonwealth than the present, if its course cannot be checked. But every public calamity has in some form, and to an extent which we unwillingly recognize its compensations. It is impossible to avoid or to mitigate the individual distress, or the pub-

lie inconvenience that it occasions. But it may lead to such changes in the traditions of agricultural industry as will in the end greatly benefit the country. In our own case, it forces upon the attention other methods of culture than those upon which we have exclusively relied. It is not possible now to say how soon the farms that have been desolated by slaughter and disease can be restocked with neat cattle. It may be necessary that we should return to some customs long since nearly abandoned.

“It is a singular fact, exhibited by the census of 1850, that the number of neat cattle in the United States was nearly equal to the number of sheep. In our own State, until recently, sheep culture, one of the most profitable modes of agricultural investment, for a country like our own, has very greatly diminished. It is probable that there are half as many dogs as sheep in the Commonwealth. If, in consequence of the present disastrous contagion, such changes shall occur as the careful consideration of the true and solid agricultural interests of the Commonwealth may suggest, like all the occurrences in human life that are directed by the hand of a wise and merciful Providence, it may not be found to be altogether unmixed with private and public good.”

It seems by this, that the Governor recognizes this “disease” “as a public and individual calamity;” but at the close of this extract, it will be observed, that he anticipates it to be a less evil than is generally apprehended. And I would particularly call the attention of the reader to the idea embraced in this paragraph.

“If, in consequence of the present disastrous contagion, such *changes* shall occur as the careful consideration of the *true* and *solid* agricultural interests of the Commonwealth may suggest, like all the occurrences

in human life that are directed by the hand of a wise and merciful Providence, *it may not be found to be altogether unmixed with private and public good.*"

It is often said and I think truly, that an "ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

If Governor Banks can see that this calamity, supposing it to be as general as a few apprehend, will not in the future be so paralyzing, if it places the agriculture of the country on a "true and *solid*" foundation, how much more wise it would have been to have avoided the evil altogether, and saved the treasury untarnished, by allowing the interest of agriculture, like all other industrial interests, to its own merits—its rewards and its privations, and preserved uncontaminated, public affairs with private interests.

I do not *know* that this calamity would not have happened had a dollar of the people's money never have been taken to import "*blood stock*," (as it is termed) to this country. But I firmly believe such would have been the fact, and to reason from analogy, from history, from political economy, and upon the law of supply and demand, I can see no reason why private funds would ever have been invested in that direction, had not the public money been used to manufacture a false theory and a false sentiment, to foster favoritism, and ape foreign aristocracy, and bring foreign servilism upon these Western shores.

Let us reduce the stock of cattle in the country to the wants of the people ; let us keep the public chest sacred from private interests ; let us rely on the law

of supply and demand, to meet all the requirements of life, and, above all, let us stop looking across the water, with complacency, upon those institutions and that policy for which our fathers struggled so hard to eradicate. And let us give the cattle we have, that care and attention which will be conducive to our good and interests, and who shall say but what in a few years, as Yankee-dom brooks no superiors, foreign capital will find its way here, to replenish their degenerated herds, and as our cattle shall make their mark in a foreign land, perhaps our institutions will be looked upon with more complacency. Monarchy being repulsed, Democracy will take a stride Eastward, and, as an ancient city was preserved by the "quack" of a goose, so may Republican institutions, Republican policy, and Republican compensation for labor, throughout Europe and the Continent, owe its rise to American cows and bulls.

What we want, Governor Banks, in this country, is just this. For our good and the glory of our country — for the freedom of young and old America, looking down into the future of free principles, to the solution of the problem of universal equality, existing among the people, which was fought for at Bunker Hill, at Yorktown, at Saratoga, and at Concord, to be carried down to posterity as long as the Saxon blood shall flow in the veins of Americans, is to separate public polity from individual aggrandizement and individual contamination. For as surely as existing public sentiment is harbored and fostered, just so surely will phy-

sical and mental imbecility obtain and grow with the masses, and the desire and the power also, to tread underfoot the rights of the people, by the few. One class looking to the treasury for the means to squander, the other for bread.

And since the idea embraced in the above extract from your recent message to the great and General Court of Massachusetts, harmonizes with views barely hinted at in this work; and as you have had the sagacity to see them, and the honesty to proclaim them in an important State Paper, and as the principle involved in that idea is of incalculable importance to the agriculturists of this State and country, and through them, to all classes of the people, I have thought it well to spend a few moments in familiar chat with you, upon a few of the important principles, (as I believe) embraced in this work. Hoping that if you are favorably impressed with the means taken, and if the evils under which we labor are to be remedied only by a cessation of legislation, after having placed all industrial pursuits upon an equal footing, that at a proper and convenient opportunity, the attention of the freeholders, or their representatives, will be called to the subject.

I feel the greater liberty to speak with you upon the various matters involved, inasmuch as you stand nominally at the head of the Board of Agriculture in this State, and to whose attention a considerable portion of this work is directed. Also, it being the most feasible way of calling public attention to the various subjects

presented, if thought to be of sufficient importance. I only intend to briefly allude to the principal points here, the argument will be found elsewhere.

In the first part of the work I have presented some statistics showing that a very much larger per cent. of the people in this State become paupers, who were brought up to look mainly to agriculture for support, than all other classes combined. If this is a fact, is it not worthy the attention of all good minds? For, it is plainly evident that if agriculture was equally remunerating with other professions and business, there would be far less pauperism among them, for, as a class, it will be admitted that they are more prudent, both of time and money, more industrious, and less given to excesses, than other classes of people.

If it is claimed that those who work upon the land are less intelligent than other classes, and to this cause, these facts are to be attributed, then I should say why this ignorance, and has the active and discriminating laws had anything to do with it? The statistics to which I have referred do not indicate the exact proportion of pauperism, but sufficiently clear to show what I have said. Also, these same statistics show that an excess of insanity and suicides is traceable to this interest.

Then, I think I have clearly shown that the earnings of agriculturists (by instituting various classes of statistics) are far below the most economical cost of living. If we allow that farm property should pay a per cent., such as is recognized by the civil laws of the

State, and then subtract the earnings of the farmers from that, it will leave but little as compensation for the labor. It will plainly appear from the facts presented, that the raw material of which crops are made, has not been fairly reckoned, and this is no less the cause of evil here than in the great West. Then I think I have shown by evidence that is incontrovertible, that the Board of Agriculture have not acted in good faith towards the farmers — that the measures they have advocated and claimed for their good, have had the contrary effect, and they *profess* not to see it.

I have alluded to some of the ancient laws of the Commonwealth, as also those more recent, showing that they have always borne heavily upon the farmer, inasmuch as they place an expert between him and a customer, when he goes to market, subjecting him to insult and annoyance, depriving him of the privilege which is granted to all other classes of men, to put up, weigh and measure his own goods, thereby having no inclination to earn a reputation for honesty, integrity and the computation of numbers, which shall protect him from the sneers of all classes of customers, as he cannot be his own salesman only to a limited extent, as the law says this man whom he despises, shall be umpire, and dictate the amount and quality of the article presented.

If the farmer wants to purchase a pair of pants, his daughter a dress, or his son a watch, articles, the quality or cost of which, neither know but little, the law makes no provision for an expert to stand between

them and the dealer, and although his pants may be made of matted rags instead of pure wool, his daughter's dress principally of cotton, with traces only of the article she supposed, and his son's gold watch, of copper and zinc, and yet the law in neither case protects them. But when he exposes a load of wood for sale, every stick of which is in view of the customer, so that a knot or worm hole can hardly be out of view, and the market price is as familiar to the purchaser as the indication of the hands of his watch is to the hour of the day; the measurement also is easily calculated, as the most simple computation of numbers can be adjusted, and yet the majesty of the law in one case is always active, insinuating and efficient, in the other, none is required or thought of. For, as it is the genius and glory of American jurisprudence to presume all men innocent until proved guilty; but that class *ironically* termed the free and independent yeomanry, these the law presumes to be scoundrels, and does not even admit the poor privilege of proving the negative.

I have claimed that the agricultural press, in conjunction with the Board of Agriculture, and perhaps the popular sentiment of the State and country, are at work in manufacturing principles, the tendency of which is to place the wages of labor on a level with the rewards of toil in the old countries. And let this work go on as it has for a few years back, and it will not take much of a prophet to see, yea, and feel it, too. They hold out and publish to the world in their papers and reports, and in

public harangues, the immense profits of agriculture, advising all young men to engage in the business, recommending all farmers to keep the boys drilling upon the farm, the effect of which is to totally unprepare them for the ability to earn the conveniences of life; consequently, when they arrive at man's estate, they find the only business they understand, does not afford them the means of supplying their most reasonable wants, and they then have to strike out anew, in anything that turns up, and this is a prolific cause of filling the country with poor mechanics, poor traders, poor preachers, and poor loafers, the effect of which is, shoemakers' strikes, increase of pauperism, panics in the business world, and at no distant day, soup-houses and lodging-houses will be nearly universal, and the masses will look to the treasury, and not to their own right arms, with an unbending will, for support.

It is no argument to say that it is often the farmers themselves who make these statements, for you tax the people's treasury for the means to offer premiums to those who can show the greatest product at the least cost; thereby encouraging deception and illy requited, persistent toil. For when it is claimed that the material of which the crop is made costs little or nothing, the interest on the capital is not reckoned, no allowance is made for accidents or mishaps, a total or partial failure of all other crops and products not going into the estimates, the herculean labor to produce it, at a reward that would starve a nation, not considered; to all these no rebuke is offered, but the people's money

rewards the whole class of deception, and that man who can bring the greatest amount of physical power, with the least amount of honest integrity and love for his kind, gets the premium.

Also, that while you offer a premium to those mechanics who will make a machine or implement that will cheapen the products of the farmer's toil in the market, you never reward him who will produce it to the farmer at the lowest figure; thereby, while you encourage the lowest possible price of farm products while in the farmer's hands, you make no effort to cheapen those manufactured articles he is obliged to buy.

I do not wish to be understood as advocating a spirit of retaliation, or an effort made to cheapen the price of manufactured articles; for the natural law of which I have often spoken—the law of supply and demand—is all the law that is needed to regulate all industrial interests; but merely refer to it to show how far the analogy is carried. I have no objection to a mowing-machine paying a profit of nearly a hundred per cent., and other implements in proportion; but I do object to the use of the public money being taken to keep down the price of farm products and farm property.

“But every public calamity has in some form, and to an extent which we unwillingly recognize, its compensations.”

I presume the “compensation” to which you here refer is this. The country is now overstocked with cattle; consequently, the price of them and the price

of their products is below the cost to produce them; hence, their destruction would not be so serious a "calamity," for it would give our worn-out pastures a chance to revive, and for a few years the cost to produce them (cattle) would be compensated. If this is your meaning, then as far as it goes, we agree. But, as I before said, an "ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure;" so if the destruction is sufficiently general to make it a paying business to produce them, then it would seem to follow that although it would be an individual "calamity," it could not be termed a "public" one. It must be admitted that it costs as much to produce cattle at one time as at another; and I hold that the supply of this and all other products would not at any time get very much ahead of the demand, were it not for the action of the various machinery, which has its head-quarters in the great cities, and using the public money to promote sectional interests, to the detriment of the general good.

Now, your Excellency understands where I am, and how I view matters. The bane of this country is an excess of legislation; and if free principles are ever entirely crushed out, and our democracy is continued in name only, it will be brought about by this eternal hankering after the "flesh-pots" of the public crib, building up monopolies, forestalling public opinion, using the people's money for sectional and individual interests, keeping the people in ignorance by making them believe that constant toil is the remedy for the evils that exist, and every year increasing the hungry

herd at the public crib, till the people have no time or inclination to judge for themselves.

Thus your Excellency will see that all I have claimed for the earnings of agriculture in this work is six per cent. on farm capital and one dollar per day for farm labor. If this is thought to be too high a figure, then I would remind your Honor of the earnings of city capital and the earnings of city labor. I know of no reason why locality has anything to do with creating or diminishing the needs of physical or mental wants. And if plum pudding, roast turkey and champagne,—swell-front dwellings, Brussels carpets, and rosewood furniture,—fast horses, splendid turn-outs, and silks and laces,—an occasional trip to the White Mountains, innocent amusements and an indulgent clergy, are conducive to a high state of civilization in one place, why not in another? We country folks do not object to your eight or ten per cent. on your capital,—to your two or ten dollars per diem; but we do object to all special, discriminating, anti-republican and monarchical enactments which empower you to hold the rod of guardianship over our backs, dictating our industry, squandering our earnings, and reducing the value of our property.

Your Excellency recollects that at the commencement of this brief interview, I spoke of an excess of pauperism in the farming districts. The statistics of the country indicate other processes of reasoning in regard to the meagre earnings of the farmers. In order to show the actual and comparative earnings of the mechanics and farmers, I have taken the statistics of the industry of three States, Massachusetts, Vermont,

and Wisconsin, presuming these to represent fairly the earnings of the Northern States; Massachusetts representing the mechanical, Vermont the Eastern agricultural, and Wisconsin the Western agricultural.

These statistics plainly show that the earnings of agriculturists in the East and West, is about one-third as much as the mechanics,—that farming in the West is no more profitable than in the East. That in neither, are the earnings of agricultural labor sufficient to supply the most economical wants of the people. That the farmers have to combine capital with labor, and then earn less than mechanics by labor alone. Plainly proving, that a trade of some kind, is a surer guarantee of supplying the wants of the people than a farm. That while mechanics wages are hardly sufficient to meet the reasonable wants of life, farmers wages would not supply the most prudent.

A great part of the difficulty grows out of the absurdity of the farmer's process of estimating the cost of his products. The farmer estimates the whole product as pay for the labor, and the mechanic only that part which is above the cost of the raw material. Thus: a shoemaker, in estimating the cost of his goods, reckons in this way:

Cost of a Pair of Ladies' Fine Gaiter Boots.

Outside Material,.....	17
Linings,	02
Trimmings,.....	07
Leather,.....	23
Binding,.....	16
Making.....	27
Manufacturing,.....	05

Thus it seems that this pair of boots has cost 97 cents. Now if any one supposes that a man can live and sell them for this sum, he is much mistaken. For there are many things that have not gone into the cost that must be paid by the sale price above this estimate, or the maker must fail. The time when of course depends on the extent of his business, the amount of his capital and private expenses. Now we see the propriety of that little word *profit*. Out of this profit all losses must come, interest on investment, travelling and family expenses, shop rent, fuel, postage, and the numerous other items that every man but the farmer has sagacity enough to provide for. It will be well here to remark, that in reckoning the cost of a manufactured article, the outside of all the items are put into the estimate.

Now suppose all shoemakers had been fools enough, to have allowed for a long series of years, the scheming aristocrats, who hover around the public crib, and use the people's money, hypocritically professing to befriend them, and all the time to their utmost endeavor trying to cheapen the price of shoes in the market, and to more successfully accomplish this object, the people's money, and criminal labor without reward, had been used for this purpose.

This cannot be brought about at once, — only by small degrees it is matured. If when shoes had first been made, a law had been enacted placing an expert between the shoemaker and the purchaser, and the law of custom also, had kept a surveillance over all work-

men, then in time premiums had been instituted to keep down the price, by rewarding with the people's money, those mercenary persons who would make the best shoes at the smallest cost. All these things have a direct influence on the rewards of labor, and although this system would make shoes cheap in the market, yet would it not also make shoemakers cheap and less men than they are? For it would be hardly possible to make a pair of shoes so cheap, but what some one would be mean enough to make them cheaper still, even if it come to the fact of stealing the stock, and cheating the workmen out of all pay for the labor. This would make shoes cheap enough in all conscience, but who would get the benefit? For the retail price of shoes, like all things else, does not depend upon the producer's receipts, near as much as upon a manufactured money market and the flexibleness of the merchant's conscience. Now your Excellency will see at once that to introduce this system into the shoe business would be impossible. An exact counterpart now pertains in the farming business. And' although shoes are as necessary to a civilized, yea, and a savage life too, as bread, then if it is the duty of all men to keep up the price of one, why not the other?

Now as Massachusetts was the first State to put in force this anti-democratic, anti-republican, anti-free trade and equality among men, principle, let her be the first to set the glorious example, now and forever, break the bonds and establish the principle embraced in the declaration, "that all men are created equal."

Let all societies granting premiums to cheapen labor, and using the peoples' money to promote sectional interests, that are inconsistent with free principles and the good of the working masses, be at once repealed; the government administered in its original purity; then Young America will make her mark in the earth.

In my estimate on the cost of agricultural products, I have allowed something more than two-thirds of the gross amount of sales as belonging to past labor, and should in no case be estimated into the proceeds of present wages. This shows the absurdity of the universal practice of estimating the total amount of products as the earnings of the year. Therefore, in all our census returns as far as I have seen, the whole product is credited to present labor, when less than one-third should be.

Thus, if the farmer estimates his gross amount of products in the fall of the year, after his crops are all harvested, at three hundred dollars, what proportion of that sum represents truly this year's earnings for labor? In our census returns the whole amount is given. Then farm capital earns nothing, and the products are made of nothing. For if the gross value of the products simply pays for the labor, what is termed farm capital has no intrinsic value. But, allowing farm capital six per cent. net, then *farm labor* has no value. If it is claimed that according to the cost table on page 274, that those products often have a market value above the cost, then my reply is that farmers do not sell grain and vegetable products only to a limited

extent, but convert them into meats of various kinds, and dairy products, thereby shrinking fifty per cent. by the operation, allowing for the labor to do this.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS.

Your Excellency is aware that an effort is being made in this country to establish schools or colleges of agriculture. Some of our citizens are highly charmed with this idea, having witnessed their beauty over the water. They have been long established in those countries, and their influence has had a marked character upon the habits, industry, position, wealth and intelligence of their people. *Do we want to emulate such in Republican America?* I repeat it. Do we desire the condition of those people to be fastened upon us? Would it be an advance or a retrograde movement? Do we not see landed upon our shores almost every day, pupils from these institutions? And is their position, habits, morals, education and social inclinations worthy of emulation among our people? If an affirmative answer to these questions can be found in the hearts of free Americans, then build your colleges, sap the industry of the people to maintain them, increase the revenue, pile up the taxes, making a moiety of the people lords, the masses serfs. Multiply legislative enactments, cramping industry till the people have not the time nor the stamina to breathe a noble or an independent thought. Make the science of agriculture a hobby to cheat the people of their rights, and fasten upon the treasury a voluptuous, imbecile, domineering aristocracy.

Schools of Agriculture do we need? then why not schools of shoemaking? Establish these, and "*strikes*" are at an end. The shoemakers are made of no better stuff. Twenty-five years of *sympathetic* legislation, and the harness can be put on, spurs, bits and all. Then turbulent and stiff-necked shoemakers would be where the farmers now are, broke to the traces, ready to hurrah for every cockney that can ride into aristocratic circles. Colleges for shoemaking, — colleges for tailoring, — colleges for coopering, hooping together for a brief period the leaky, rotten, and broken fragments of the once free and independent principles that the blood of our fathers so profusely fertilized this Western soil to establish.

Agricultural colleges do you want? Then let the agriculturists establish and maintain them, without any resort to the treasury of the people. This is the rock upon which all industrial interests must plant themselves. When this principle is broken, then woe to all free and independent thought and action with those whose support is lodged in their right arms, and not the public chest. If the farmers want colleges, let them make them; and if they are too poor or too imbecile to do this, stop legislating to increase this poverty and imbecility, and they will soon learn whether they need them or not. It may be good sport to the public loafers to dictate the private interests of the farmers, but like the fable of the boys and the frog, "it is death to us."

The following is the bill that became a law of this Commonwealth at the winter session of 1860 :

AN ACT to provide for the extirpation of the disease called *Pleuro-Pneumonia among Cattle*.

Be it enacted, &c., as follows :

SECT. 1. The governor is hereby authorized to appoint *three commissioners*, who shall visit without delay the several places in this Commonwealth, where the disease among cattle, called pleuro-pneumonia, may be known or suspected to exist, and shall have full power to cause all cattle belonging to the herds in which the disease has appeared, or may appear, or which have belonged to such herds since the disease may be known to have existed therein, *to be forthwith killed and buried*, and the premises where such cattle have been kept, cleansed and purified ; and to make such order in relation to the further use and occupation of such premises as may seem to them to be necessary to prevent the further extension of the disease.

SECT. 2. The commissioners shall cause all cattle, in the aforesaid herds, *not appearing* to be affected by the disease, to be *appraised before being killed*, at what would have been their fair market value if the disease had not existed ; and the value of the cattle thus appraised shall be allowed and *paid out of the treasury of the Commonwealth* to the owner or owners thereof.

SECT. 3. Any person who shall knowingly disregard any lawful order or direction of said commissioners, or who shall sell or otherwise dispose of an animal which he knows, or has good reason to suspect has been exposed to the aforesaid disease, shall forfeit a sum not exceeding five hundred dollars.

SECT. 4. The commissioners shall make a full *report to the secretary of the board of agriculture*, of their proceedings, and of the result of their observations and inquiries relative to the nature and character of the disease.

SECT. 5. The commissioners shall duly certify all allowances made under the second section of this act, and other expenses incurred by them, or under their direction, in the execution of their service, to the governor and council; and the governor is hereby *authorized to draw his warrant therefor upon the treasury.*

SECT. 6. This act shall take effect from its passage, and continue in force for the term of one year thereafter, and no longer. [*Approved April 4, 1860.*]

CONCORD RIVER MEADOWS.

As I have referred to the statute taxing the people to drain these meadows, perhaps it would be well to place it on record here for the future inspection of the tax-payers of the Commonwealth. What influences were brought to bear upon the law-making power of the State to fasten upon the people this statute, outraging all principles of justice, establishing a precedent the tendency of which is to monopolize private interests to public favoritism. I hope the people will scrutinize this law closely, recollecting that the end is not yet.

AN ACT *in relation to the Flowage of the Meadows on Concord and Sudbury Rivers.*

Be it enacted, &c., as follows:

SECT. 1. The governor is hereby authorized to appoint, with the advice and consent of the council, three commissioners, who shall have power and authority to take down and remove the dam across the Concord River at North Billerica, erected by the Proprietors of the Middlesex Canal, to a level thirty-three inches below the top of an iron bolt in a rock marked on plan number two, annexed to the report of the committee of the legislature of eighteen hundred and fifty-nine,

on the Sudbury meadows, at any time after the first day of September next; and when the same is so removed it shall not be again rebuilt.

SECT. 2. Any person injured in his property by the removal of such portion of said dam, may apply to the county commissioners for Middlesex County to estimate his damages occasioned thereby; and the proceedings thereon shall be the same as are now by law provided in the case of damages occasioned by the laying out of highways, except that notice of the application shall be served on the attorney-general of the Commonwealth fourteen days at least before the time appointed for the hearing; and he shall thereupon appear and answer to such application in behalf of the Commonwealth. Either party aggrieved by the decision of the county commissioners shall be entitled to have a jury to determine the matter, if applied for at the meeting at which the decision of the commissioners is rendered, or at the next regular meeting thereafter, but not afterwards; and the proceedings thereon shall be the same as are now provided in the case of highways.

SECT. 3. *Any damages that may be recovered on such application, together with legal costs, shall be paid out of the treasury of the Commonwealth; and the Governor is hereby authorized to draw his warrant therefor.*

SECT. 4. The removal of such portion of said dam, under this act, shall operate as a bar to any suits by the proprietors of lands flowed by said dam for any damages sustained thereby, and may be pleaded and proved as such in any court.

SECT. 5. The commissioners appointed by the governor shall, after said dam is taken down as provided in this act, cause a permanent mark of the height thereof to be made, and a plan and description of the height thereof to be made and recorded in the registry of deeds for Middlesex County at Cambridge and Lowell; and the services and expenses of the commis-

sioners shall be paid out of the treasury of the Commonwealth, and the account shall be audited and allowed in the manner now provided for by law.

SECT. 6. The supreme judicial court, or any justice thereof, shall have power to set aside any verdict rendered under this act, upon the petition of either party thereto for the reason that the damages are excessive, or for any legal cause, and exceptions may be taken to the rulings in matters of law by either party, at any trial under this act, which exceptions shall be decided by the supreme judicial court, as in other cases. [*Approved April 4, 1860.*]

Brattleboro', June 18, 1860.

T. J. PINKHAM, ESQ :

Dear Sir—Your favor of April 3d, was duly received, and I certainly owe you an apology for so long delaying a reply. I intended to answer you at once, but was called from home for a fortnight, and since that have been exceedingly occupied.

Your inquiry relative to the profits of farming, as I have found them in my own experience, opens a wide field, and I have neither time nor space now to enter upon a full reply.

For a number of years in former life, I did no other business than farming, and that was my only reliance for a subsistence.

Sudden fortunes, or a rapid accumulation, through the legitimate business of agriculture, cannot be expected, and are not realized. But I have found by experience, that moderate profits, above a good substantial, but not extravagant living, may be realized from a good system of farming. Land will, in my experience, pay for being tilled liberally and well,—far better, indeed, than if the old skinning system of shallow plowing, scant manuring, and close cropping is practised. The surest way is to feed the soil highly, and give it thorough tillage.

Deep plowing, at once, where the subsoil is favorable, and a gradual deepening where the subsoil is

feeble, in either case accompanied with high manuring, has been my practice, and I have succeeded well with it, where I should on the same land have run behind by the old traditional system of shallow plowing, and light or no manuring. When young and poor, I gradually advanced to a better condition of affairs by the above mode of culture. Every available means for increasing manures, within a reasonable expense, was resorted to, — feeding out the crops wherever I could get as much, and sometimes even not more than three-fourths as much for them in other forms as though they had been sold off for cash and the land robbed of the manure they would make.

I could write many pages, and ought to do so to convey my whole meaning, and fortify it by my reasons. But I have not the time. Respectfully yours,

F. HOLBROOK.*

COMMENTS. The reader will please give this letter of Mr. Holbrook's a careful perusal. If I understand him, he carefully avoids answering the interrogatories embraced in my note, viz.: 1. Have you so kept the figures as to be able to say if your farming has, or has not, been profitable? and 2. Have you made it profitable?

It must be inferred from this letter that Mr. Holbrook has not kept the figures, but that when young, he was poor, but is now the reverse. All this may be, and he never have done anything but farm; that proves nothing. The question is, has your *farming* paid a fair per cent. on the capital invested, and living wages?

* This letter of Mr. Holbrook was not received till the most part of this book was in type, which is my apology for not placing it in connection with the favors of my other correspondents, whose notes are published.

It strikes me that these are very simple questions, and it need not hinder a man long to answer them. Have you kept the figures? Yes. Have you made money? Yes. If this is the fact, that is all I want to know. In this connection, I care nothing about your philosophy of agriculture. "But I have found by experience, that moderate profits above a good substantial, but not extravagant living, may be realized from a good system of farming."

This comes nearly to the point, but not quite. If a man inherited a farm when young, and the land was of but little value, and he felt poor then, but in time, foreign capital run a railroad through the town, outside capital built up manufactures there, and from these reasons, wood, timber, stone, and the soil itself became valuable; and our once poor man found by looking over the assessors book, that this same property made him rich, does that show farming to be profitable?

This whole letter of Mr. Holbrook's is a strong argument, as I understand it, in favor of my position, viz. that the only hope of the farmers, is to encourage and build up mechanical business in their midst. Keep the young men and the young women at home, give them all the means in your power to cultivate the mind, learning them to be good merchants, traders, mechanics, schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, dress makers, milliners, &c., with just enough farm work to develope the system. Learn them to be good livers, making them believe that the earth produces bountifully, and it is a duty they owe to themselves and the race, to consume liberally all the useful things of life, and also, that

they *must* learn to bring their income up to this. Above all, learn them to abhor the idea that for them to live well, somebody else must half live. Could the farmers of this country get rid of what is ironically called the *agricultural* press,—all this humbug legislation, and vote a leave of absence to a portion of the quack farmers who in order to till their lands, farm the public chest, leaving all industrial interests free, then, and not till then, can farming be made remunerative. For a few years you Vermont farmers sold your labor and income for a little more than a living, on the growth of your stock, but the last two years has placed you back again, and from this crisis, the recovery must be slow.

If you are wise in time, from this you may recover, but if you would have farming a paying business, and honest labor rewarded as it should be, stop in season all legislation for any and all industrial interests. This is more important to inland than commercial States. For if our farming suffers, our commercial and mechanical industry at brief periods will be prosperous, and from this cause we shall make some progress, although from constant fluctuations, it must be unhealthy and demoralizing.

In speaking of this redundancy of legislation, it reminds me of a remark of Ex-Governor Colby, of New Hampshire, in the discussion of the humbug “cattle disease,” in their legislature, who is reported to have said :

“I fear this superabundant legislation a thousand times more than any cattle disease. I am a farmer,—

have a stock of cattle, and think I can take care of them without any help from the State."

This, I presume, was intended as an honest rebuke, from an old man and a farmer, to our mushroom, *treasury* farming fraternity, who have passed an edict, compelling many farmers in this State to go to the "Board" or their deputies for a written permit to drive their cows to pasture, and giving them authority to grant or refuse it. O, that we had the spirit, the sagacity, and the honest integrity of this old man, in the young farmers scattered all over this State, who should manage their own affairs without any help from the quacks of monarchical invention, and would rise up in their might and "shake the dry bones," like Belshazzar of old.

Thus I have wandered a little in my reply to your epistle, and will conclude by saying that I regret that you had not so understood my request as to have given me a dollar and cent view of the matter in plain terms, for you imply that your successes are to be attributed to the causes to which I have briefly alluded, and not legitimate farming. Then why not in plain terms have said so? For you must see that if a rich man can hardly live and hold his own by farming, an honest poor man must be put to extremities. And at no distant day, in Free America, the second part of the same policy will be established throughout our midst, soup houses for the populace, and a standing army to keep them in subjection. If this is what is wanted, then multiply the statutes and pile up the taxes, till the revenue monopolizes a large part of the industry of the people.

INQUIRIES.

I have often been somewhat amused at the interrogatories sent by farmers to editors of city papers, asking of the city gents all sorts of questions upon matters relating to the farm. So completely have the cities got control of the country farming interests, if not of the country farmers, that it would seem that the cultivation of the soil, and the *cultivators* of the soil, too, are but a mere adjunct to city cultivators of country farm machinery.

I speak of this because it involves an idea, and such an idea as I want to see eradicated. Because, if farmers do not understand their business, it is a mighty poor plan to learn it by going to the cities. For the cities use their money like water, to farm you out of your farm products, and are doing all they can to farm you out of your farms. These are what they want, and they care no more about the living, moving, breathing, toiling farmers and their welfare, than they do about a last year's almanac.

As evidence of this, behold the impositions they have heaped upon you by the free use of funds in lobbying bills through recent legislatures; the direct tendency of which is to make paupers of the people, and cheat the sun-burnt farmer of his inheritance. Where is the farmer that does not believe that the hundreds of cattle that city doctors, for the want of a job, plunged their long knives into, would have grazed peacefully upon your hills, had the tiller of the public chest been kept closed from hypocritical invasion?

As further evidence, look over the letters published in this book, and see if they show that the quacks un-

derstand the business after all, any better than the regular doctors. Look at their reasoning, their philosophy, and their motives. One says, "I have not kept the figures, and my experience would not be valuable to you."

Another says, "I do not claim to have received a profit," &c., &c. Another, "I have not, however, kept an account of receipts and expenditures. It is my purpose to do so in future." Another goes up into New Braintree, and finds some things "as proof of my (his) assertion," that facts does not warrant, and holds this out as *the* "banner town," worthy of emulation, that is going down hill every year, and is remarkable for nothing but old maids, misers and gradual depopulation. No wonder that some doctors are looking outside the "profession" for means to farm their "large investments." And if a general unthriftiness that pertains in my friend's "banner town" prevailed, I am thinking that more of the profession would have to look to some kind of doctoring outside of the regular practice.

And since the Commonwealth has taken up "blood letting," on a rather magnificent scale, who can say but what the science of pharmacy is to be revived and the four-legged, or bovine animals are to take their turn at being "*pilled* and *powdered*," while the two-legged are "*bled*" to repletion; just for the fun of the thing, and to keep business moving.

I submit here a few of the inquiries to which I referred at the commencement of this article.

“MESSRS. EDITORS : — I wish to inquire of you the proper way of preparing a light soil for the reception of onion-seed — the distance between the plants, and the best mode of culture. Also, which is the best and most productive kind ? The same with regard to carrots ; and which is the most profitable of the two ? (a)

A short time since, I purchased a colt 6 months old. He is badly afflicted with worms. Can you inform me how to rid him of them ? (b) Can you purchase for me the best work extant, on the rearing and management of horses and remedies of their various diseases ? (c) It will make no difference whether the above subjects are combined in one volume or separate

Attleboro,' Mass., Jan. 8, 1857.

a. Our Essex county friends are well qualified to answer these questions, and we shall be pleased to have them do it.

b. Feed with carrots and early cut-clover or rowen hay.

c. Buy Youatt's treatise, on *the Horse*. The English edition is best, but as it may be difficult to get it, buy the American edition edited by Skinner. It can be had of J. P. Jewett & Co., 117 Washington street."

Isn't it funny ; going down to Boston to get information in preparation of soils, — sowing onion seeds, — feeding colts, &c. ? If it had been an oat crop about which my friend from the country had been in a quandary, doubtless any desired information might have been obtained, as the city bucks understand sowing this crop perfectly, particularly if they are inclined to be a little "wild." And then they have a peculiar faculty of coaxing the dear people to foot the bills. So the old adage that "those who dance must pay the fiddler," is in a measure obsolete, as it now refers mainly to rural "break-downs."

Another country friend inquires for information on the following subjects, and is politely replied to by the editor, as is seen by his "remarks :"

HORSE RAKES — MOWING MACHINES.

"What is the price, each, of Bradley's and Whitcomb's Horse Rakes, and of Wood's Mowing Machine ?

Rockville, June, 1860.

REMARKS. — We have made inquiry, and cheerfully answer the questions of our correspondent, but wish to say that *we have no connection with any agricultural warehouse*, and when we answer such inquiries, are obliged to go purposely to get the information.

Bradley's horse rake is \$10; Whitcomb's, with wheels, is \$22, and without wheels, is \$16. Wood's one-horse mower is \$70, and the two-horse, \$80. All for sale by Nourse & Co., 35 Merchants' Row, Boston."

My friend of the *Farmer* says, "We have made inquiry, and cheerfully answer the questions of our correspondent, but wish to say that we have no connection with any agricultural warehouse, and when we answer such inquiries, *are obliged to go purposely to get the information.*"

When my friend from Rockville visits the city, perhaps he can see for himself *how far* the editor had "to go purposely to get the information."

At the head of the first column on the first page of the editor's paper, in display type, are the following words: "New England Farmer. Published every Saturday, at No. 34 Merchants' Row." At the close of the editor's "remarks," are these words: "All for sale by Nourse & Co., 34 Merchants' Row, Boston."

I have always supposed that it was the same "Nourse" that stands at the head of the Boston Agricultural warehouse, that stands at the head of the *New England Farmer*.

I have always supposed that it was the same Nourse that *nurses* the stubborn iron into ploughshares, that nurses the brittle ash into rake stales, the flexible hickory into ox-bows, and the unyielding oak into various farm implements, that nurses the *New England Farmer* into this living, humbugged world.

I have supposed that at No. 34 Merchants' Row, a farmer can buy tools, seeds, *New England Farmers*, and other wares to his liking, for cash.

I have supposed that in one corner of the above agricultural warehouse was the *New England Farmer* office, same as the farmer's calf-pen is in one corner of his tie-up. And although there may be little "connection" between the two, yet when the farmer takes down the bars to let his *calf* out to *nurse*, the separation would not be considered very essential. Farm implements and farm literature, one as flexible as the other, made to order, and warranted to suit; and none of your common stuff, but the real *simon* pure article, cheap for cash, and warranted not to cut in the eye.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE FUTURE.

Farmers' Sons and Daughters—Anecdote of a King—Number of Men who Fail—Comparative Earnings—Blacksmithing and Farming—How to tell when a Crop will pay—Farmers' Daughters—Gov. Brown and the Girls—His Tour Through the State—Mr. Wiseman's Example—Degradation of Foreign Labor—Emperor of Russia and the Serfs—Cause of Labor being Degraded—Market Days—Cattle Disease—Appropriations—Conclusion—Right Position—St. Paul and the Christians—Harmony of the Calculations, and the Sentiment Expressed—A Farmers' Organ—Questions for the People.

I WANT to have a little chat now with the farmers' boys and the farmers' girls. Young America. The future of the land of the Pilgrims, and the home of LIBERTY. It is no mean position to be a native born citizen of this Republic. And you ("Young America,") are to write its future history. Then look to it, that the home of Washington and of the Revolutionary fathers, never becomes desecrated. As labor fails of meeting a suitable reward, so that the masses lose their independence, and as the products of labor are its representative, therefore, as they are cheap or dear, it is recompensed.

To illustrate what I want to say, before I say it, allow me to relate a little anecdote :

A certain King wished to show to the world that much that passed for wisdom and intelligence, as ema-

nating from authority, was often vague and shallow. Therefore he summoned the lords and nobles of his empire into his presenee, and propounds to them this question. Filling a vessel with water, he says, "Why is it that if I place a fish in this water, the whole will not weigh any more then than before the addition of the fish?" The senior among the learned heads of the crown, commenced in a very grave and dignified manner to give a philosophical and learned explanation of the fact, which was listened to with a good deal of attention by the audience.

The next in seniority took up the subject in a similar manner, till it went round the "board" to the junior of the company, who was a very young man, and whose reputation for sagacity and wisdom was then supposed to come to the test, that a record of his future might be made. He delivered himself in this wise: "My lord and my seniors, would it not be well, in the first place, to ascertain if *such is the fact?*"

"Enough," exclaimed the King, "it is not a fact. My only purpose was to show that much that passes for 'wise sayings,' and the doings of the functionaries, is, at best, rather shallow and untrue in fact, and pernicious in principle."

My object in relating this little story was to show to the young men the importance of examining all subjects for themselves. Take no man's "*ipse dixit*," but inquire if "*such is the fact.*" As in buying a farm, it is quite as essential to examine the subsoil as the surface soil, so in an examination of the professions or the-

ories of men, it is quite as important to look down into the motive which prompts them to action and speculation ; as the play behind the scene, if exposed to view, would often greatly mar the exhibition, and expose the actors to that place in the public estimation which their merits or demerits would consign them.

Thus, when we hear the oft-repeated tale that ninety-nine men out of every hundred who engage in business outside of farming, fail, just ask the interlocutor where he got his information, and look closely at the motive that prompted the "insane" assertion. It is not to be denied that many men who engage in trade fail, but who are these men ? This is the question. If we divide the business community into three classes, placing all those who engage in business, trade or manufactures, having previously learned to do what they desire to do, and prosecuting this business with honesty of purpose, with industry and economy, how many of this class of men fail to succeed ? This is placing the question where it belongs. For when we desire to draw a comparison between two classes of men, having an honest purpose in view, desiring to come at truthful conclusions, then let the parallel between the parties be in unison with each other.

Another class of men who engage in trade, constituting a large per cent. of the whole amount, although honest, prudent and industrious, yet they fail from the very fact of having had little or no previous training ; undertaking to do what they do not know how to do. And I regret to be obliged to say, that a large per cent.

of these are the farmers' sons, who having been worked upon the farm till their majority, having had no other purpose but to follow the business of their parents, till arriving at man's estate, then finding that this fails to meet their expectations, and furnish them suitable means of support, branch out into the first opening that presents itself, and no wonder that a disappointment is the result.

Another, and the last of the three classes, are those who engage in trade, having, perhaps, many of the requisites of the other two, but lack all of their virtues. These men are that reckless portion of the people who are up to anything and everything, that will minister to their selfish natures, regardless of principle, or the rights of others, inasmuch as their own interests and animal propensities are satiated. If they fail, they fail, it is but a week's job any way; and they often come out glossed up, improved, and ready for another move that will distance the preceding, as their 2:40 nags, does the farmer's pacer.

I am not a going to say that none of the first class to whom I have referred, fail, but will say this much, that were it not for losses sustained in consequence of the rascality or the misfortunes of the other two, seldom would there be a failure among them.

Forty-nine men out of every fifty who fail, can show an excess of assets over disbursements; consequently, their failure was in consequence of losses sustained, and not for a want of a per cent. on their goods. If I were asked to name the original cause of a large proportion

of all the failures in the country, I should answer by reiterating what I have said in another place; that the farmers become in debt to the traders, and when their products become so abundant that the sale price hardly pays the labor bill, then their payments are so tardy (often being obliged to mortgage their real estate,) that the retailer is obliged to have his paper extended, and often re-extended, and this running all the way through to the jobber, wholesale dealer, and the mechanic, causing a stoppage, and one extension paving the way for another, till they get agoing, then it may be likened to a row of bricks, and a general panic is the result. Vide the panics of '43, '49 and '57.

As to the per cent. of all business men who fail, I can not tell, but am perfectly clear in saying it is generally set far too high. For the last twenty years in the city of Lynn, I do not believe it would come up to five per cent. annually. In fact, for long periods of time, a failure is unheard of. And let me say here, that a large per cent. of the shoemakers of Lynn, when young, commence business for themselves, and generally with what capital they have saved from their earnings over their expenses. And while I know of many who have succeeded, I never knew but few who did not. It is true that many do not like the perplexity of business, and such give it up, but to say they have failed, would be a libel upon their reputation and the craft.

Then let me say that business men generally are entire strangers to any such economy as is practiced by

the farmers. In their business transactions they are far more exacting and particular, but in their private affairs more liberal and profuse. The farmers have no successes, — every dollar they get costs them two, putting the value upon their labor that other classes get. When a tailor's clerk can ride in his carriage, and boast of a higher salary than many of the governors of the States; when the salary of a shoemaker's foreman will buy a good farm every other year; when a dry goods clerk can take his family to the theatre three nights in a week, and go to the White Mountains or Saratoga in the warm season; then let no farmer's boy begrudge the time or the pittance of expense to prepare for something more congenial to his inclination and pocket, than tilling the soil.

There are scattered all through the country towns more or less traders and business men, whom the farmers know. Does ninety-nine per cent. of them fail? I think not. A majority of them succeed, and sometimes become wealthy. Then what is the object of retailing this slander upon the people? Simply to increase the products of the soil. Three-fourths of the people are farmers. One-fourth, at least, too many.

A blacksmith will make the shoes and nails, and shoe two horses a day, earning from \$2.50 to \$3.00. The stock, the coal, the shop rent, with six per cent. interest on the capital, could not be called more than 70 cents per day, or 35 cents a set or horse. What one smith asks, all the others in the vicinity ask. In the fall or spring, summer or winter, it is the same. With

all this we find no fault. The wages are none too high, the uniformity of prices are worthy of imitation. The farmer knows when he wants a job done, what the price is, and there is no bantering about it. But when the scale is turned, and the farmer desires to pay this bill in his way, then a long parley is to be instituted. If the farmer can persuade the smith to take a quarter of beef or half a porker, in part payment for his bill, it will take more than three days labor of the farmer to pay one of the smith's. If we institute a comparison between the farmer and other mechanics, the result will be none the better. If the comparison is drawn between the farmer and either of the professions, then the difference is more glaring. These are some of the reasons why I advise the young men to learn *how* to do something but farming. There will always be farmers enough. The danger is, that there will not be enough to consume what is produced, and make it pay to produce it.

One of my neighbors said to me the other day that he agreed with me, but he did not see how my theory can be reduced to practice. I asked him why not, and his reply was, "because we do not know but that our products will pay till they are matured." I take this opportunity to thank him for the suggestion, as that opens an important inquiry, and is just the question I am glad to meet.

Can we tell before producing a crop whether it is a going to pay? How does the blacksmith know when making his shoes, but that the market will be overstocked, and his labor will be lost?

How does the tailor, the shoemaker, the cabinet-maker, the tinsmith, and all trades people know, but that their goods will lay on their hands uncalled for, and their labor and capital will be lost? How does the doctor, the lawyer, and the preacher know, but that their professions will be over-stocked, the pay reduced, and they left to starve?

These considerations are all important, and should be carefully met. A considerable portion of this book is a direct answer to these various subjects. When the people can be induced to *stop legislating* upon any and all interests, the prosecution of which is a means of living to them, then these evils will subside. The antidote, — the pound of cure, for all the evils of our industrial interests, is, *stop legislating!* Rely upon the natural laws of supply and demand, and our country is safe, the people free, and industry rewarded.

You ask the blacksmith to shoe your horse for a dollar, — tell him that he made the shoes himself, consequently he had to pay out nothing for work, his shop is full of shoes, and they will soon go out of fashion, iron is on the fall, coal is down, the times hard, and money scarce!

“Admitting all you say to be true,” says the smith, “my price is eight shillings, and for no other price can your work be done at this shop.”

“Then I will go somewhere else. I have been a good customer to you, always had my work done here, but am going to have it done cheaper in future.”

“You can go where you please, but mind me, no smith in this vicinity will do the work for less. We

have but one price, — what I ask they all ask. When we work we intend to have pay, — you will be used just as all others are. I presume I know my business, the price of coal, iron, &c., and what the fashion is, as well as my neighbors, and when a man expects to see the craft *scabbed*, he has got to go to another shop.”

“You talk well, but look here, neighbor, I have to sell milk for two cents a quart, butter, beef, and many other things at that rate, and how am I a going to live?”

“That is your business and not mine. I calculate I know how to make my own figures, and if you don’t, you had better go to school.”

“But I get what other folks do.”

“You have no system, — you don’t know what a single article you make costs, you are controlled by a few designing men, every thing is *hap-hazard*, *hilter-skitler*, — hard work and poor pay. At one time, 1½ bushels of potatoes will pay for shocing your horse; at another, it will take four. Your prices are not uniform, — greatly fluctuating, when you get a good crop, you call it lucky, and never reckon the losses on the part or total failure of other crops, into the cost of this. You say you are selling milk for two cents per quart. No wonder you want your horse shod for a dollar. I do not see how you can afford to have him shod at all. It is true your farm was left you, you work hard, live poor, and if you die in any kind of season, and without much expense, there may be a little left for the widow and little ones. I speak thus plainly, because I feel to sympathize with you. I was brought up on a farm, my father was a farmer, and I have lived

in a farming community all my days. If you want me to make you a present, I will freely do so. But as for working under price, I will not. I have too much respect and regard for my brother craftsmen, my own reputation, and the feelings of my children and family, even if there were no principle involved, to earn the reputation of a '*scab*.'"

"Do I understand you by this, that I am doing a bad, a wicked, an unchristian act, by selling my products at a price that gives but little return for the labor to produce them?"

"Most certainly, you do. You are virtually saying to all poor men, you shall not earn a living by your labor at farming. You are driving them to the cities, into something they do not understand; to become jockies, speculators, loafers, and in the end, to the poor house or the penitentiary. You virtually abscond the scriptural injunction, 'the laborer is worthy of his hire.' You not only keep down the price of labor, but are doing all you can to reduce the price of your neighbor's property. As long as you crowd the market beyond the necessary wants of the people, so that the price of products is far below a reasonable compensation for labor, of course capital will be constantly receding from the farming districts to something that will pay; and were it not for the profitableness of trade and commerce, the whole country would be bankrupted. You are mortgaging the country towns to the cities, the producers to the non-producers,—making serfs of one class, and lords of the other."

“ You still talk well, but look here, did you hear that man* from Boston lecture the other day ? He said that science had improved our breed of cattle, — that for some crops our light soil was too rich, — that cattle might be fattened on swale hay and turnips alone, — that our children should be educated for farming as a profession. And many other things that were very nice, only he wound off by saying something about farm labor and slave labor, that I did not exactly like.”

“ That was Mr. Flint, Secretary of the Board of Agriculture. I heard that lecture, and although I do not remember anything he said ; but let me tell you, that if he said what you say he did, I am in no wise disappointed. He is paid for going round lecturing, — has a salary of some \$2,000 a year, and when asked in plain terms, by farmer Pinkham, to state what his own experience in the matter was, he backed down, — was ashamed, I presume, to reply, as he does not know but little about agriculture, only what some one has told him. And you know that a man cannot sit down in the parlor and do land farming to advantage. His farming, — treasury farming, — of course can there be done the best. As long as the people will pay liberally to have a public sentiment, farmed upon the farmers, to induce them to sell milk and other things, at half the cost to produce them, so long will men enough be found, — being well stocked with “ *brass*,” — to engage in the business.”

* Flint's lecture before the Hampshire Society.

“Now, I desire that you and all other farmers should set up for yourselves, ascertain what you can *afford* to do, and allow no man or body of men, under *profession* of friendship, or for any other cause, to influence you a particle in the matter. It does *not* follow that because you have got a farm and a family to support, that you should waste your labor, excessively work your wife and children to feed at small cost the sharpers of our cities and market places. The way to make your farm pay is to do nothing that will not pay to do. Pay no attention to what ‘Mrs. Grundy’ says, I know of but few farms but what will pay without labor six per cent. interest, crediting the rent of the buildings to the farm. Then the only question is, what shall you do, what shall your wife do, and how shall the children be occupied? These are very important considerations, and which every man should investigate for himself. To be idle is out of the question. To work at a loss will not do; to make yourself useful at home and abroad is a duty. I have seldom seen a man of intelligence, with good habits, at a loss to know what to do. Then, this opens a vast field for thought, study and reflection. The whole country teems with fit occupation, worthy the consideration of free, intelligent, earnest effort, by all her people. Every man must study, reflect, investigate, plan, prosecute and encounter for himself. I cannot tell *you* what to do but if you desire to profit by my example, you can do, so. I hope I have too much principle, — too much regard for my kind, to throw my labor in the market at

a price that will drive all poor men to extremities. And it would make no difference to me what idle, brassy men had to say, who fatten upon sophistry, and indulge upon the credulity of an over-worked populace.”

Thus all young men will readily understand the practical effect of the principle of our friend, the blacksmith. If he has spoken truly, then adopt his reasoning, imitate his example, and reduce to practice his philosophy. And my word for it,—the word of a farmer who drains his own meadows,—all will be well.

This is the idea that I desire to firmly impress upon the minds of all young men. The old I do not expect will heed it much. I understand human nature too well for that, although I desire their co-operation, and to profit by their practical observation.

We have almost universally practiced upon the idea that the only cheap way to keep up the fertility of our land was to keep domestic cattle. Thus, we have kept all we could, often more than we could keep well, and yet our lands have been all the time growing poorer. I am now speaking generally,—the general practice. Look at it a moment, and see how it is. Our virgin soils are exhausted. What has exhausted them? Certainly, we have kept all the cattle we could, and yet they are exhausted. Then again, what made them rich? Was it domestic animals, or were they made so before animals were introduced to them? Was it not the cultivation of the Red-man?

Recollect that the principle of natural philosophy is, that nothing is lost. And it is equally true that noth-

ing is created. *Change* is all there is to it. When I say that animals exhaust lands, I do not mean as a whole. One man's farm becomes exhausted because he keeps more animals than is for his good. Another keeps few animals, and his fields and pastures are constantly increasing in fertility. What exhausts land is cropping! cropping!! cropping!!! It makes no difference whether it is done with the scythe, or the hoe of the farmer, or with the ivory of the horse or cow. Everything that is carried off leaves the land to that extent incompetent to reproduce its counterpart.

The great West is becoming exhausted, and it certainly is not for lack of cattle. Ohio, New York, and New England are already exhausted, and it is not because we have no domestic animals. My neighbors are selling milk all around me for about two cents per quart, in order to keep up the fertility of their farms. We have been making beef and pork for the same purpose. All these things have a positive, direct, and unmistakable influence to make and keep the land exhausted, and the purse-strings from wearing out.

As well might our blacksmith have exhausted his shop of iron and coal, and his purse of the shiners, by shooing at half-price, as the farmer to rob his family and his shop or soil, by acting upon a false and pernicious principle, to cater to the unhallowed desires of a scheming clique.

It will now be seen that there is no need of throwing our labor away to get interest on our capital, or

waste the per cent. on the capital to get pay for our labor. Neither is it necessary to exhaust our physical or mental energies to live; for every one can set up for himself, independent of all monopolies or cliques. Yet it must not be overlooked that as long as the general price of products are too low, the universal price of farm lands must be so, too. Then plant yourself upon principle, — ascertain what a fair price is, and below this allow no man, under any pretence, to entrap you.

Always remember that a sure way to exhaust your soil, is, to sell your labor or products below a reasonable price. Nothing else will do it; this surely will.

THE FARMERS' DAUGHTERS.

I have had a good deal to say to the young men, but do not intend to neglect the young women. I presume, however, that if I can persuade the young men to stay at home and learn to do something by which they can *afford* to set up a partnership, which recognizes no such word as *fail*; the articles of agreement being written with ink indelible; then I shall say the very best word I could say to the acceptance and advantage of that class, whom I now address.

I intend to preface my remarks to the ladies by introducing one of the statutes of the State. For although they have but little to do with making the laws, yet, in them they have an equal interest with the sterner sex; and anything that has a special bearing upon a certain domestic institution in which they are seldom *silent* partners, of course it must interest them in no small

degree. Therefore, the ladies will please carefully read this law, for there is no knowing what may grow out of it.

AN ACT *relating to Farmers' Clubs.*

Be it enacted, &c., as follows:

SECT. 1. The Secretary of the Board of Agriculture may appoint one or more suitable agents to visit various towns in this Commonwealth, under the direction of the Board of Agriculture, for the purpose of inquiring into the methods and wants of practical husbandry, ascertaining the adaptation of products to the circumstances of soil, climate, markets; encouraging the establishment of farmers' clubs, agricultural libraries and reading rooms, and of disseminating useful and valuable information by means of lectures and otherwise; and it shall be the duty of such agents to make detailed reports annually in October, to the Secretary of the Board of Agriculture.

SECT. 2. Every farmers' club, properly organized by the election of officers, and holding regular meetings of its members, shall, upon application made in November of each year to the Secretary of the Board of Agriculture, receive copies of the Report of said Board and of its other publications, in proportion to the number of its members, and of the applications so made; and said farmers' clubs, receiving such benefits from the State, shall, annually, in October, make returns to the Secretary of the Board of Agriculture of the reports of committees, and of agricultural experiments made by such clubs.

SECT. 3. *A sum not exceeding two thousand dollars is hereby placed at the disposal of the Secretary of the Board of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of this act.* [Approved April 6, 1859.]

As a tax payer and citizen, I supposed I had a right to know what became of this money. I therefore

penned a note to the Secretary, and here insert a copy of my letter :

Chelmsford, Mass., July 4, 1860.

DEAR SIR: By an act of the legislature of 1859, the sum of \$2,000 was placed at your disposal, to employ suitable agents to visit various towns in this Commonwealth, to disseminate useful and valuable information on agriculture, by means of lectures and otherwise, among the people.

I fail to find in your recent report what action was had in this matter.

Therefore, as I have nearly ready for the press a work expressive of my views of the influence all such moneys have upon the agricultural interests, I respectfully address you this note, to inquire what disposition was made of the said grant?

Please state how much of said money (if any,) was used, and to whom said money (if used,) was paid?

Also, please say if it was the design of the law that the agents should be taken from the "Board" of which you have the honor to act as Secretary?

A reply by return of mail would greatly oblige your friend and co-laborer,

T. J. PINKHAM.

CHAS. L. FLINT, ESQ.,

Sec'y State Board Agriculture, Boston.

To this letter I get no answer.* Mr. Flint seems remarkably gifted with the faculty of keeping "mum," and possibly this is the *sinequanon* — *par excellence* — that to a remarkable degree makes his services as Secretary and servant of the people, so extremely valuable.

Therefore, I shall have to look round and see how it is with his agents. I find it. Now listen girls and you

* See appendix.

will learn what use was made of the money, unless I labor under a mistake.

In the discussion of the subject upon which this book is written, viz., "Is there any profit in farming?" before the Legislative Agricultural Society, the Hon. Simon Brown, editor of the *New England Farmer*, made these remarks:

"He said he felt encouraged by the interest that was manifested in regard to the subject under discussion. Two things operated as a hindrance to good and pleasant farming; one was, that agriculture was looked on as an *unprofitable* employment, and the other, that it was not so *respectable* as other occupations. He had travelled extensively among the farmers of this State, and he knew that there was no better plan to find this out than by conference with women, and in conversing with them it will be found that nearly nine-tenths of the girls would prefer a man for a husband in almost any other business than that of farming.

The question as to how farming may be made profitable and pleasant is not merely of importance to us, but to those who are to succeed us: and in considering the matter, our first object is to secure happiness, and then profit."

It seems that by these remarks of Mr. Brown, he has been round over the State consulting the girls about whom they "prefer for husbands," considering this, undoubtedly, one branch of agriculture. And it must be presumed, that in this department of the examination, his industry should not be questioned, for he seems to be very accurate in his figures, and his labors must have been extensive, as he has arrived at the conclusion that "nearly nine-tenths of the girls prefer a

man for a husband in almost any other business than that of farming." As he advises all young men to "stick to the farm," and when he knows from actual "conference," that the girls will not marry a farmer, preferring "single blessedness" to this, I hardly see how he can reconcile his philosophy with his philanthropy, for by recommending the young men to "stick to the farm," knowing if they do so, increase must stop, which will have a direct influence on the market price of the products of these young men. Therefore, his friendship to the farmer must be feigned, or all these girls would not so readily make a confidant of him, as to open their hearts upon so delicate a subject.

At any rate, it must be presumed that the Legislature, when they voted the \$2,000 to send men over the State for "consultation," and to "disseminate useful and valuable information," they did not understand that this was the purpose, or their agent would have sent a younger man.

On mature reflection, however, I cannot say that this money was unwisely spent; for if what Gov. Brown says is true, that farming is so "*unprofitable*" and (dis)-"*respectable*" that the "girls will not marry a farmer if they can help it," (knowing the keenness of perception and discriminating faculty of the gentler sex,) is it not one of the strongest arguments in favor of my position that could be instituted? And if the money is not all absorbed, I would recommend one or two more *tours round the State*, which would settle all controversy in the matter; and would further sug-

gest whether it would not be well to instruct the Governor, after consulting the girls in the parlors, to spend a few moments with the mothers in the kitchen. Possibly he might there arrive at a solution of the problem which seems to trouble him so much, and is so expensive to the people.

As a majority of the girls who marry at all must marry a farmer, and as only "ten per cent." of them "prefer" this, perhaps the Governor can figure it up, how many marry in antagonism to their "preferences?"

If the girls will read carefully the story of Mr. "Wiseman," in a previous chapter, I think they will there find a practical remedy for the evils that exist; and if they can persuade their parents to put it in practice, then their fond hopes will be realized.

Further on in Mr. Brown's remarks, he makes use of this language:—

"The man is the most happy who has a farm of fifty acres, *paid for*, with a house and necessary outbuildings on it, and with *a little more than will make both ends meet.*"

Those words in italics in the preceding, are suggestive of where the happiness comes from; and let the word "little" be construed liberally, and the man would be quite as "happy" without the "farm." These are the farmers—constituting one tenth part of the whole amount—it must be presumed, "who have a little more than will make both ends meet," that the girls do *not object* to "marrying."

I do not see how any one can blame the girls for not

“preferring a man for a husband” who is a land farmer, as long as they are under guardianship to the treasury farmers, who monopolize most of the good things of life, and by a kind of legerdemain, make the land farmers pay the bills. This is what the girls have keenness enough to understand, and they well know that if a “*kiss me quick and go,*” or a kiss me quick and stay, my dear, can only be enjoyed outside of farming circles; then the Governor should have credit for one good thing, by bringing it to the consideration of the people.

Perhaps our traveller said more than he intended, but all are aware of the softening influence of a “conference with women,” and it may not be out of the way here to suggest that the rest of the Board take a *tour round the State*, holding “conference with women,” as the dear people would not in the least object to paying the bills. They are getting used to it.

FOREIGN DEGRADATION OF LABOR.

I have several times in this work referred to the inclination that many entertain in regard to foreign degradation of labor. It seems to me that we are running directly into a similar channel. And let us pursue this to its finality, and how can we hope for any better result? For, twenty-five or fifty years hence, when it costs Massachusetts half a million dollars to support the various machinery to which her Agriculture is subjected, then soup-houses and lodging-houses will have to be established all over the State; and that

although the State may be great and rich, the people will starve. As "straws show which way the wind blows," so the following will explain the tendency of things in this country.

WHAT ENGLISH FARMERS WANT TO KNOW.

At a late meeting of the "Royal Agricultural Society of England," the following list of prizes for Essays was adopted. Possibly the re-publication of the subjects may furnish topics for brief dissertations to New England farmers, who, if they should miss the "sovereigns," might enjoy the satisfaction of having stirred the minds of others in the right direction.

1. Fifty sovereigns for the best report on the agriculture of Berkshire.

2. Twenty sovereigns for an approved Essay on the best period of the rotation, and the best time of year for applying the manure of the farm.

3. Ten sovereigns for the best Essay on the alterations rendered advisable in the management of land of different qualities, by low prices of grain, and high prices of meat.

4. Ten sovereigns for the best Essay on recent improvements in dairy practice.

5. Ten sovereigns for the best Essay on the proper office of straw on the farm.

6. Ten sovereigns for the best Essay on the amount of capital required for the profitable occupation of a farm.

7. Ten sovereigns for the best Essay on the conditions of seed best suited to the various agricultural crops.

8. Ten sovereigns for the best Essay on the adulteration of agricultural seeds.

9. Ten sovereigns for the best Essay on any other agricultural subject.

The following is taken from a speech by the Emperor of Russia to the "serfs:"

"Gentlemen: I shall begin by once more expressing my gratitude to the three governments of Lithuania, which instigated the discussion of this interesting question. I think it necessary to repeat to you, gentlemen, what the marshals who are among you have already learned from me. You are aware, gentlemen, how much this affair interests me, and how much it affects my heart; and I am certain that it is as dear to you as to me. I have but one object — the happiness of my empire, and I am convinced that you have no other. I desire that the improvement of the condition of the peasants may shortly become an accomplished fact, and that this reform may be effected without violence. But this cannot be obtained without certain sacrifices on your part. My desire is to render these sacrifices as little onerous as possible to the nobility."

I hope the reader will look these things carefully over, and see if there is any connection in the old countries between the awards of their Agriculture and the fostering care of the Government. This may make the nation great by making the people poor; but is it wise? is it humane? is it Christian? Undoubtedly, to this cause more than any other, can the distinction between the people and the lords be traced.

These are the things we want to avoid in this country. For let them continue, increasing as they will, we have the one man power, building up an aristocracy, prostrating the people, and we have a democracy in name only.

MARKET DAYS.

It is well known that a strong effort is being made to fix upon the people of this country, institutions similar to those long established in Europe and on the Continent.

These market days have for a brief period been in operation here. That they have been a total failure in almost every instance, seems to be no reason for their relinquishment by the *treasury farmers*, as it furnishes additional reasons to bleed the people.

By Mr. Flint's last report, it seems that the "Board" have raised a committee, consisting of Messrs. Fay, Davis and Sutton, to specially consider the subject, whose report Mr. Flint seems to have plenty room for, but could not find a place for informing the tax payers what become of the \$2,000 placed at his "disposal" to supply "agents" to take the census of the marriageable females in the Commonwealth.

As I briefly analyze this report, I want the reader to keep in mind with what pertinacity the endeavor is being made, to fasten the institutions of monarchical Europe upon the people of this country.

The committee say, that,

"Unlike most projects of amelioration and improvement, this involves no expense, and no working system or machinery, requiring money or time to put it in operation, and but little change in the existing order of things. It amounts simply to this: that the farmers of a neighborhood, larger or smaller in extent, according to circumstances, shall agree to meet together on certain days, and at certain places, for the disposal of

their agricultural products ; that instead of peddling them out as they do now, or selling to such chance customers as may come along, they will conduct their business generally with reference to these market days."

As far as the practical operation of this system upon the farmers is, in nine cases out of ten, if a sale is effected at all, it will be at a greatly reduced rate. I know that some sales at these "fairs" have been made, but generally at the tail end of the day, and then by being auctioneered off, at about one-half or two-thirds of a fair price. This is what all farmers who have attended these "fairs," will tell you, if they have no "axe to grind."

Again:—

"These market days have been established for a long time over the continent of Europe, and all agricultural products are sold or bargained for upon these occasions. In England they have existed since the time of Alfred the Great; and to their greater frequency and number in that country, may be ascribed, in a great measure, its superiority in the art of agriculture over all other nations. They have made the English farmer a man of business as well as a mere cultivator of the soil. They have been the means, by bringing him constantly in contact with those engaged in the same pursuits with himself—each seeing what the others were doing—of spurring him on to improvement, and of preventing that isolation, the natural tendency of agricultural pursuits, which is the bane of all progress. One of the undersigned has resided in an agricultural district in England, and has familiarized himself by careful observation with the general system of English agriculture, and he could find nothing to

account for its greater profitableness as compared with ours, except in the fact, that every farmer has a ready market close at hand for what he may produce, and the power of adapting his cultivation to the knowledge he has of his market."

I want to ask my friend one or two questions in regard to some other things that he probably saw in his "residence" over the water, that he has forgotten to tell us about.

Is there any such institution over there, the "rank and file" of which stands ready at the "tap" of the drum to "wheel into line," Mr. Fay? Tell us all about this; which institution dates furthest back, the "standing army," or the institution of serfs and lords? Have these "market days, regulated by law," had anything to do with establishing these "institutions?" Disband the English army, and how long would the nobles sustain the cheap luxury of "regular market days?"

If those institutions of which you speak are for the best good of the people of our country, then liberty is a "humbug," — the Declaration of Independence a "farce," — the Revolutionary war a "cheat," and universal inherent equality, a monstrosity.

"Massachusetts is as favorably situated as England is for the establishment of markets."

Did my friend, in his admiration of "British aristocracy," ever witness any of its necessary concomitants, "soup and lodging houses?" Does he desire to establish such here? If so, go on with your "market

days," and all the other "machinery," that you have seen over the water. Establish a standing army to keep the people in awe. Pile up the revenue till the taxes monopolize the industry of the citizens, keeping them in subjection by the "bayonet," at the "tap" of the drum.

"The value of farming property depends very much upon its proximity to a quick and ready market, and hence it is that farms in the neighborhood of large cities bear so much higher prices than those which are remote. But even those most favorably situated in this respect would be benefited by regular market days. Even the little county of Middlesex, in England, of only half the size of our own county of the same name, with the city of London and its two million of inhabitants in her borders, has five regular markets, besides the great ones at Smithfield and Covent Garden. So, too, notwithstanding the great manufacturing towns all over England, each a daily market of itself, yet every thirty-five thousand square acres of agricultural property in that favored region is blessed with regular market days. It is sometimes said that a man may walk through England, and attend a market fair every day in the year."

The value of farm property is rapidly decreasing in the vicinity of all New England cities but Boston, where it is only valuable for farming purposes.

The sale of a farm is almost an impossibility, unless they are "knocked off" for a song, same as my friend of the committee's cows were at one of the "fairs," with which he is so much in love. And even at such prices, the purchaser will seldom get value received,

unless the land farmers exercise freely the right of suffrage, and vote the treasury farmers into retirement.

“The industrial products of Massachusetts are more than two hundred and ninety-six millions of dollars, of which forty-nine millions only come from the soil, including two and one-quarter millions in stone, coal and marble, and in some countries the proportion of agricultural to industrial products is much less than is shown by the aggregate of State products. We have, therefore, a large and near home market for our agricultural products, — a market for much more than we raise; and at higher prices to the consumer in the large towns and cities, than obtain in any quarter of the world.”

If any man outside of the Board of Agriculture should make such a statement as this, his wife would apply for a bill of divorcement, — *A mensa et toro*, — and she ought to have it, too, with alimony.

I can hardly believe that my friend, Mr. Fay, penned the above paragraph, although I find his name attached to it. Absurd as his statements and philosophy are shown to be, yet this statement on the earnings of Massachusetts beats old England all hollow.

The total valuation of all property in the State, in 1850, was \$597,936,995.46.

I presume that every one knows that the system of agriculture in some of the old countries is very fine; that they have all the machinery the committee tells us about, with a poor, half-starved, half-clad, ignorant, servile, wretched population. I saw it the other day on the arrival of a boat-load at the wharf in the great

city. Specimens of the lowest grade of humanity, coated all over with filth and rags, with an intellect also besmeared with the fruits of centuries of cruel and unjust decrees, market-days, Boards of Agriculture, &c.

Witness the thousand specimens from these "market fairs," scattered all over our country. Like cause will in time produce like effect in the land of the pilgrims. But, do we want it? I know our mushroom aristocracy, perhaps, by this system of policy, might grow into consequence, with a pack of blood-hounds at their heels; but working-men of America, do you want it? Do you want to sacrifice the future of our country, to the vain ambition of a few fortune hunters, who ape the glitter of foreign nabobs?

In a word, let me say to the farmers, shun *market days* as a pest, — as a great sore upon the body politic, — as a manœuvre to cheat you of your rights.

CATTLE DISEASE.

Perhaps, for the future inspection of the people, it would be well here to state that the number of cattle killed and buried, hides, tallow and all, by our wise, sagacious, discreet, penetrating, fraternizing, treasury-farming fraternity, up to the assembling of the *Pleuro-Legislature*, was 842. To pay for all of these, would take \$21,050, at \$25 a head.

But it will be seen by reference to the law* passed at the winter term of the Legislature, appropriating

* Published on page 325.

\$10,000 for this purpose, that only those cattle were to be paid for that did not "appear" to be diseased. Therefore, as our city experts pronounced them mostly diseased, I hardly see how that the farmers whose herds have been *scientifically* slaughtered are going to realize any great benefit directly from the speculation, out of the treasury, unless to keep them quiet and make the job as extensive as possible, the law is violated, and they are hushed for a season, with the hope that the dear people having got used to it, are ready to *bleed* quite as freely as the bovine race whose rights have been violated.

So completely had the "Board" fastened this outrage upon the people, that at the *Pleuro-Legislature* of fourteen days duration, for which the members voted themselves \$50 each, besides the scrapings, and to prove to the people their love of *progress* and industry, they also placed in the hands of our *scientific commissioners* the snug little nest-egg of \$100,000, as a memento of regard for their somewhat protracted incubations.

What proportion of these various sums will finally go to the commissioners and their experts, at this time of writing I have no means of knowing. But, if we are taxed to the fullest extent of the appropriations, let me, in all kindness to all concerned, say, that this is but a drop in the bucket to the wrong we shall suffer. 'Tis true that our herds mainly remain upon our hands, but of what use are they? Can we dispose of them or their products? Our bills and liabilities

are to be met, and we must live. Our wives and children must be fed, clothed, go to church, schools, &c. All these cost money, and how shall we get it? This is a question which our duty is to examine. It is true, we have our cattle, but is there any value attached to them? We can keep them, perhaps, but is there any hope for the future? Can we look upon a yoke of oxen or a cow, and say, these will meet the note that is coming due, or pay the Saturday night operatives? Yes, our cattle will sell; but for what? Who can figure up the cost to the farmers of Massachusetts and New England, this outrage upon their interests?

CONCLUSION.

I have now gone over the ground that I intended when I commenced this work, exceeding greatly my prescribed limits, but the subject is in no wise exhausted; in fact, it is but fairly opened. A volume might well be written on the late-named subject, viz: the principle involved in the foreign policy of degrading labor under the pretence of honoring it.

We are doing no better here. Our country is new, and the people ambitious. Far too many are too eager for the crumbs of office; and as long as this is considered more genteel than honest work, and the credulity of the people can be worked upon, being persuaded to believe that they were born to work, consigning all else to those who preach one thing and practice another, talking about the dignity, the virtue, the happiness, and the emolument of labor, when they are doing all they can to degrade it, by taking from it its awards, encour-

aging persistent toil, thereby destroying the mind of that keenness of thought which is ever watchful lest its rights should be invaded and liberty hampered. That those who manufacture our Agricultural literature, write the books, make the speeches, print the papers, compile and translate works from foreign authors, are supposed to be honest and good men, being above any low or sordid inclination, free from any taint of cant or hypocrisy, is not the question. St. Paul thought he was doing "God's service, when persecuting the Christians."

The question is, whether these men are doing a good *thing* for the people? In this light they and all others should view the matter; for a bad man *may* do a *good* thing, and *vice versa*, a good man *may* do a *bad* thing. This is placing the subject where it belongs. And that although through these pages I have spoken freely, I think honestly and truly, censuring where censure was due, and honoring where credit was due, yet I desire to make no enemies, entertaining no enmity to any, my only purpose being to place the industrial interest of which I have spoken, in its true light, believing truth to be better than error, and the good of a nation above that of a clique.

The reader cannot have failed to notice the harmony and consistency of all the calculations that have been made, — the figuring, I think, is in harmony with the sentiment expressed, — the statistics of the State and country, with the calculations made, — the comparative value of labor in the East and West, the North

and South, — farm labor and other labor, all harmonize with the expressed views, if I understand them. Hoping that a more comprehensive view of labor and the rights of the laborer, may be entertained, is the only desire of the writer.

What the farmers now need is an organ through which they can express their views, and counteract the influence that is disseminated by the various modes of forestalling public opinion, making the worse appear the better side. Let one or two truthful and ably conducted papers be started, advocating the cause of the farmer, against all the combination of professedly agricultural journals and other bogus farming literature, having the cause of labor at heart, meeting, as they emanate from the press, all those absurd and wild statements many of them coming professedly from the farmers, but without doubt being manufactured for the occasion, having no responsible source, but like the quack medicines of the day, being so labeled and puffed up, that the uninitiated are likely to be deceived.

Such a paper or papers, if rightly conducted, ought to be supported, and that if the farmers desire such, believing that their cause is now falsely presented, and pertinaciously conducted to all who oppose them, there is no doubt that plenty of talent can be found to meet all that may be said on the other side, as all the statistics of the State and country are with this position.

What is wanted is to separate all legislation from each and every industrial interest. Letting all the trades and labor interests stand upon their own merits,

trusting to the law of supply and demand to meet the wants of the people. Believing all trades are best protected when entirely unprotected, leaving all to look to their own energies, and not to the people's treasury for support. Repealing all laws that have a tendency to create distinction among the people, such as the wood law, and the sale of hay, and other agricultural commodities. All National and State laws creating Boards of Agriculture, Agricultural Societies, appropriating the people's money, to the pretended interest of any class, is wrong in principle, unwise in policy, unjust and unworthy of a free people.

When agriculture pays better than other business, there will be enough to engage in it, and when it cannot be done at a profit, it is not worth doing. What the farmer wants to know is, how to earn a living at his business, not how to produce a large surplus of commodities; and if let alone, this is what he can better do for himself than any one can teach him. For mind, thought, keenness of perception, mental activity and power, are never engendered by circumscribing the physical energies of the people, or contracting their mental capacities.

QUESTIONS.

The following questions, if presented with the right motive, may be discussed with profit in the field, the shop, and the club :

1. Is there any antagonism between the various industrial classes ?

2. Is it for the good of all other classes that the products of the farm should be sold below their cost ?

3. Should the farmer, in estimating the cost of his products, allow for the raw material, a per cent. on his capital, and pay for his labor ?

4. To what extent can we crop the soil and not deteriorate it ?

5. Are farm products generally sold at a profit ?

6. Is there as much plant food in animal manures as in the food the animal consumes ?

7. Can the cost of an agricultural product be estimated ?

8. Should the cost of an animal be estimated at the value of the food it consumes, the value of the labor to care for it, and interest on the investment ?

9. Is it for the interest of the East that the people of the West should sell their products at the cost of their labor only ?

10. Would the people have been poorer had there never existed any such thing as an Agricultural Society ?

11. Is it the object of the prime movers of the various Agricultural Societies to benefit the producers or non-producers ?

12. Is the Board of Agriculture a benefit to the people ?

13. Is it right to appropriate the public funds for individual purposes ?

14. Is the buying up of the Concord River Meadows by the State, establishing a good or bad precedent ?

15. Have not other portions of the State as good a right to its bounty, as the owners of the meadows on Concord river?

16. Would an immediate disbandment of all Agricultural Societies, and the Board of Agriculture, be an injury to the farmers?

17. Is the Agricultural press a benefit to the farmers?

18. Have the farmers as good a right to a profit on their goods as other classes?

19. Should a farmer team his products to market, or sell them at home?

20. Is it for the farmer's interest to increase or diminish the supply of farm products?

21. Would the natural law of supply and demand regulate the agricultural interest, better than any legislation can?

22. If the agricultural interest of the country was left to the law of supply and demand, would a famine be likely to ensue from this cause?

23. What is the cost to the people to support the various Agricultural Societies, Board of Agriculture, and the Agricultural press?

24. Are any of the statute laws unjustly burdensome to the farmers?

25. Has the law making it obligatory on the farmer to employ an expert to measure or weigh his products, or any portion of them, a tendency to degrade him?

26. If the farmer is incompetent, or so dishonest as to be unfit to measure or weigh his products, is the law, or his capacity or integrity, at fault?

27. Is a person, in buying a load of wood or hay, more likely to get cheated, than in purchasing a coat, pair of shoes, or settling a doctor's or lawyer's bill?

28. Would any other class of people submit to the many legal annoyances of the farmer?

29. If farm labor is as well rewarded as other labor, why is there more pauperism, more insanity, and more suicides among this class than any, or all others, according to numbers?

30. If the girls prefer being married to any other class of men than farmers, what is the cause?

31. Can a man earn a comfortable living at farming, by his labor?

32. If public agricultural exhibitions are for the farmer's good, why do the city folks contribute liberally to institute them?

33. If the legislature should discontinue making appropriations for what is termed to "promote agriculture," would the farmers *particular* friends continue their friendship?

34. If a general discussion of any of these various questions would have an evil tendency, which are those questions?

35. Is it for the farmer's interest to produce small crops at a profit, or large ones at a loss?

36. If our people ever lose their independence, what will be the probable cause?

37. Should a *Board of Agriculture* be composed of professional men, money brokers and treasury farmers?

38. Would the establishment of a Farmers' Journal be a good thing?

39. Has the importation of foreign breeds of cattle, horses and other stock, been a benefit to our people ?

40. Can we export agricultural products without either deteriorating the soil, or making paupers of the people ?

41. Is not the exodus of the young men from the farming districts, *prima facie* evidence of the unprofitableness of farming ?

42. Is the circulation of the stories by the Secretary of the Board of Agriculture, in his reports, in regard to the farmers making several hundred per cent. profit on their crops, doing a good or bad thing for them ?

43. Do those farmers who make those statements referred to in question No. 42, do it for the good of the cause, — to see their name in print, — to gratify their vanity, or to obtain a premium ?

44. If a premium were offered to those mechanics who could make the largest per cent. on their work, and they should present quite as extraordinary cases as the farmer does, would that prove anything ?

45. If a farmer in making a statement to obtain a premium, should claim that the material of which his crops are made costs nothing, should he obtain that premium ?

46. Does the last statistics taken by the United States reveal the fact that the mechanics earn more than three times as much as the farmers in this State, according to numbers, by their labor ?

47. Did the statement of Hon. R. S. Fay, in a public lecture, that if the hay crop of Massachusetts were in-

creased five times, it would not reduce the value of the article, show that he understood what he was talking about?

48. If there had never been any special legislation in regard to agriculture in this country, would the farmers and the farming interest have been more on an equality with other interests?

49. Is it not the only hope of the farmer to establish trade and manufactures in their midst?

50. If all agricultural products were sold at a small per cent. above their cost, reckoning fairly, would pauperism, insanity and suicides, greatly decrease?

51. Can any other New England State present a better view of its agricultural interests than Massachusetts, and if so, what is the cause?

52. Is agriculture more degraded in those States and countries where its interests have been specially an object of legislation?

53. Has the *potato rot* been a damage to the farmer or any other class of men?

54. Would a remedy for the potato rot be a national blessing or a calamity?

55. Would Market Fairs throughout the country, help the farmers?

56. Should all farmers keep their products at home till sold?

57. If the State should again go to slaughtering cattle, would it be advisable to employ *green hands* or journeymen butchers?

58. Is it good or bad husbandry to kill and bury stock, hides, horns and all?

59. Has the Board of Agriculture been any more successful at butchering, than farming at Westboro' ?

60. When the products of industry become so cheap that honest and persistent labor fails to supply the reasonable demands of life, is a remedy to be sought for by an increased or diminished supply ?

A P P E N D I X .

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Agricultural Department.

State House, Boston, 11 July, 1860.

DEAR SIR: I owe you an apology for my few days delay in replying to your favor of the 4th, which did not come to hand, by the way, till Friday last. I have been absent on business a part of the week, and my office is up in arms with painters, &c., in the midst of spring cleaning. I am glad to hear of your progress in the work of which you informed me some time since. I shall welcome its appearance, and have no doubt it will be the means of great good.

With regard to the question as to the success of the legislation for farmers' clubs, I would say that the appropriation was not made till just at the close of the Legislature of '59, and that no steps were taken during the summer following, as the operations of all clubs were suspended at that season. The Board appointed a committee to consider the subject, and their report, and the circular sent out for information, are given on pp. 128, 129, of my last Report. The Report went to press too early in the winter to enable me to get any fuller statement of what had been done. I think the plan has given very wide satisfaction, and been the means of waking up a wide-spread interest. But a small part of the appropriation has, as yet, been spent, as but very small pay (\$5 a visit and lecture,) is al-

lowed. The agents are not, by any means, confined to the Board of Agriculture. In many cases, a club (in most cases, in fact,) requests to have a particular man sent, like Gov. Brown, for instance, or some other, and then, if consistent, I have complied with their wishes.

I have great confidence that this will be the means of doing a great deal of good, as it certainly is very rapidly multiplying the number of clubs all over the State. Very truly your obedient servant,

CHARLES L. FLINT, *Sec.*

T. J. PINKHAM, Chelmsford.

The above letter from Mr. Flint, is in reply to my note published on page 353. It is proper here to state that I delayed my book a little in hopes to obtain this reply. My letter was mailed on the 4th of July, and I delayed closing up the book till the 14th, supposing then, I should not receive this favor. Had I have known, however, that he was so very busy doing up his *spring* cleaning, (*mid-summer*,) I should have been less in a hurry. However, I see nothing in the letter but what corroborates my remarks, excepting, he *did* reply, but did *not* answer my interrogatories. By the way, this letter is dated the 11th, and post-marked the 13th, two days after.

I want all who read this book to read this letter, and I regret that I am obliged to publish it as an *Appendix*.

The Secretary says that only "\$5.00 a visit and lecture is allowed." That is cheap, certainly. Then the \$2,000 will pay for 400 visits. What an amount of "good" will be accomplished. The thought forces itself upon my mind to suggest, that the price be raised

to \$10.00 a visit, as this would command a *different* grade of talent, if not a higher.

And then this thought occurs to my mind: Why is it that those who are not farmers, consent to being taxed to pay these bills? They not only consent to it, but, rather, do they not urge it? Are they not the men who lobby these appropriations through the Legislature? They are pretty smart men,—understand tolerable well what they are about,—know when and where the shoe pinches, and yet are anxious to be taxed to send city experts into the rural districts, at five or even ten dollars a “visit,” and what is their motive? Look to it, farmers. Ask yourselves this question: Why do they do it?

A writer from the town of Ashburnham, in this State, to the *N. E. Farmer*, says that thirty of the best farms are lying vacant,—tenantless. No one wants them. The “buildings, fences, &c., are going to decay,”—the “fields are growing up to brush and briars.” The “citizens are leaving every year for sections that are not cursed with the burden of excessive legislation.” What is true of Ashburnham in this particular, is true of most farming towns; perhaps, however, not all to that extent. Yet, this is a good farming town,—the crops are among the highest average in the State, excepting their mowing lands.

He does not agree with me that farming is not a paying business, generally, and thinks that were it not for the high taxes they could get along. Our taxes are much too high,—there is no doubt of that.

This is not the principal cause of the calamity, however, for we submit to being taxed by designing men, to dictate our earnings, to control public opinion, to monopolize our industry, and keep down the price of our goods to a level that admits of but little return for labor performed. Of course, as long as this state of things exist, farms will become vacant, mortgages will increase, — those who have invested in farms will suffer, industry will be paralyzed, panics and distress, excepting at brief periods, will be the order of the day, liberty will be hampered, and the principles of our fathers, among the things that were. This writer was abused for saying what he did, — told that “he must have written in a fit of the blues,” &c.

I expect the same from Maine to Georgia, for writing this book. I care nothing, however, for the opinion of this class of men, but, for the opinion of all working men, I do care. As far as I am right, I ask to be sustained. My errors, I shall be most happy to correct, — honorable criticism, I court; free discussion is the bulwark of liberty. Tyrants fear it, — wickedness shuns it, — the enslavers of a people smooth and slick it over.

“He who feels the halter draw,
Has a poor opinion of the law.”

“I shall welcome its appearance, and have no doubt it will be the means of doing good.”

This is the language of my friend, the Secretary. For that purpose alone, I have written. And if it

does one half the good it ought to, my friend, and all of like ilk, will take the hint, resign their commissions, allow the land farmers to prosecute in their own way, the trade of their choice, save the treasury from unjust speculations, the people of a burden, and Monarchy of an unanswerable argument against the freedom of America, and the folly of inherent liberty.

Again: "The agents are not, by any means, confined to the Board of Agriculture."

Have any others been employed? This was the idea I wished to convey in my note. Does the Board presume to monopolize all the useful talent of the State, in Agricultural matters?

Once more: "I have great confidence that this will be the means of doing a great deal of good, as it certainly is very rapidly multiplying the number of clubs over the State."

That is a good thing, truly. Multiplying clubs all over the State. For this purpose, I have introduced many questions at the close of this book, each and all of which, may well be presented for discussion, as having a direct bearing upon the present and future prosperity of the country.

Farmers, generally, have not the "gift of gab" very largely developed, yet, if we can manage to keep clear of those Boston "talking machines," and the treasury of the V's and X's to encourage them, I honestly believe that "great good" will be the result. You know how it is, those agents will talk a farmer "blind" in a little while, set the women all agog by their "confer-

ences," keep down the price of the farmers' toil by sophistry, and hasten those halcyon days when the people become serfs, and the treasury speculators their masters.

According to your published accounts of the farming operations at Westboro', they do not show a high degree of skill in the business, nor a great amount of honest integrity. For, while on the one hand, you encourage a compensation for labor that will not meet the most prudent wants of life; on the other, you fix a fancy and unreasonable price upon the products of that labor.

If a well-grown boy cannot earn "five cents a day" and find himself, at farm labor, should a bull calf produced by that labor, be worth \$100? These are your figures. One is as unreasonable as the other. If the State, in her corporate capacity, was going to set up farming to introduce and establish a correct system in the business, all extremes should be avoided. A fair compensation for labor should be encouraged, and a fair compensation for the products of that labor only, should be demanded. This, alone, could be fairly termed *good farming*.

It is just as wrong to require an unreasonable profit on an article, as it is to produce the article at a price that allows an inadequate compensation for the labor to make it. What is now wanted is to ascertain for what sum agricultural products can be produced, allowing for the per cent. on the capital, and suitable wages, with all the etc., to make them. When this is

ascertained, then all good men should encourage and sustain these prices. If this system had been adopted at Westboro', then the tax upon the treasury would have been less objectionable. But the entire reverse of this was instituted. For while, in order to make the thing appear plausible to the public, fancy and fictitious prices are established. Thus, no prudent farmer or cattle dealer could afford to take the stock of cattle at the prices fixed upon them in the schedule, at more than forty cents on the dollar. This may deceive the public, and help to crowd bills through the Legislature to appropriate money for the indulgence of a few ; but is it right ?

I want you to understand me, that it is not essentially the direct tax upon the people (although this is wrong,) of which I complain ; but it is the fact of this money being used to reduce the price of our labor or the products of that labor, (which is the same thing,) to an uncertain, fluctuating standard, that allows of no adequate compensation, and is fast reducing the value of our investments, creating an apathy among the people, and distrust, uncertainty, and want of confidence in community. This is not all ; it is building up an imbecile aristocracy in the country, who fasten upon the public chest, which will in the end subvert the genius of American principles, and degrade labor and the laborer, under the false pretence of honoring it, and them.

The reason I dwell upon this idea is, it is the only branch of our government that is aiming a direct blow

at the liberty and freedom of our people. Her industry should be free, untrammelled, unpolluted, uncontrolled by public or private munificence; earning according to the tastes, inclination, habits, and intelligence of those who labor. For if at any time one branch of industry becomes less remunerative than others, the sagacity of the people will soon establish that equilibrium among the trades, if no outside influences are thrown around them; and any other system will in the end subvert those principles we love to cherish.

Thus you plainly see how I look upon the whole matter, and will excuse language that would ordinarily be considered impolitic, if not indecorous. Therefore, I have used such language and arguments as seemed to me best adapted to arouse public and general interest and attention, in a matter which I deem of such vast importance. For you are paralyzing the industry of a nation, and striking an irredeemable blow at American liberty. This can in no light be viewed as an innocent, harmless or justifiable position, occupation, or profession.

I want to thank you for this favor of the 11th inst., and must say that I exceedingly regret that you did not deem my other note of sufficient importance to have merited a reply. For as this favor has furnished me much argument sustaining my position, then a reply to the other, if sustaining your published declarations, would have been of much more importance, as showing how utterly futile all such puny arrangements are, as accomplishing the end professed,

Whenever the administration of the laws of a people have a tendency to subvert the fundamental principles of the Government, and tend to the degradation of the governed, then it is the right and duty of the people to institute such measures as will tend to place them upon their original position, and bring to mind the original compact, that the institutions which they love to honor and cherish, may be preserved in their purity. When a long train of abuses, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce the inherent rights of the masses to the condition of serfs, then it is the right of the people to throw off the burden, and establish that equality which alone will preserve all that is dear to a free, intelligent, and Christian people.

INDEX.

A

A. B., The Barre Correspondent.....	192
Action of the Board in.....	173
Action in relation to.....	326
Agricultural College.....	323
Agricultural Warehouses.....	336
Agricultural Societies.....	15
Agricultural Exhibition.....	16
Analysis of Oats....	119
Analysis of Manure.....	114
Analysis of Wheat.....	113
Amount of Manure of a Cow.....	115
Amount of Grain in the Country.....	258
Anecdote of a King.....	339
A new Agricultural Society.....	81, 82, 83
Antagonism of Industry.....	54
Appropriations of the Legislature.....	58
Autographs	96

B

Banks, Governor.....	306
Bible Injunction	177
Board of Agriculture.....	47, 145
Boutwell George S., His Letter.....	201
Brown, Simon, " ".....	198
" " refuses to publish.....	169

C

Census of Marriageable Females.....	355
Concord River Meadows.....	194
Corn and other Crops, by S.....	185
Cost of Oats.....	119

Cost of an Acre of Corn.....	250
Cost of Farm Products.....	242
Cost of Hay, Corn, Wheat, Carrots.....	255
Cost Table of Products.....	274
Cost of Marketing.....	279
Cost of a Pair of Boots.....	319
Cost of Shoeing a Horse.....	343
Cost of Wheat	116
Columbus and his Outfit.....	257
Clashing of Sections.....	281
Contemplation of the Law.....	111
Crocodile Tears.....	99

D

Degradation of Capital and Labor.....	54
Degradation of Labor.....	358
Disposing of Farm Products.....	276
Difficulty at the West.....	282
Duty of Young Men.....	303

E

Earnings of Farms.....	281, 322
Earnings of Massachusetts.....	129, 130
Earnings of States.....	318
Earnings of Wisconsin.....	127, 128
Enactments of the Pleuro-Legislature.....	240
Emerson Ed., His Talk.....	174
Experiments in Agriculture.....	66, 75
Experiments in Calves.....	84, 88
Experts	277
Experiment in Wheat Raising.....	102
Exhibition of 1860.....	98

F

Fay R. S., His Letter.....	198
“ “ and the Hay Crop.....	100
Farmers' Organ.....	367
“ Earnings in Massachusetts, Vermont and Wisconsin	127—131
“ Daughters	352
Flint, C. L., His Lecture.....	348
“ “ How he Uses Money.....	352
“ “ Letter, (see Appendix).....	
Future of America.....	338

H

Hay and Grass Crop of the Country..	101
Happiness Defined.....	26—28
Habits of Youth.....	305
How the Farmers Live.....	229
Hopkinton, and How to Raise Carrots	141—143
Holbrook F., His Letter	328
How to Tell What to Do.....	344

I

Industry of Carlisle and Natick	34—38
Inhabitants of This and Other States.....	44
Inquiries	333

J

Jubilee Year, by Governor Brown.....	239
--------------------------------------	-----

L

Laws, Customs, &c.,.....	221
Law and Cattle Disease.....	325
Letter to Farmers.....	197
“ “ C. L. Flint.....	353
Loss of Manure,.....	64
Loring Dr., His Letter.....	202
Looseness of Farming.....	346

M

Market Days.....	360
Marketing	276
Massachusetts, Society Formed.....	15
Meeting at the State House.....	81
Members Constituting the Board of Agriculture.....	60
Men who Fail in Lynn.....	342
Merriam, H. C., His Ideas.....	186
Message of Gov. Banks.....	307
Minus, Mrs. Minus, John and Jim.....	131

N

Neat Stock.....	260
No Profit in Farming.....	283
New Braintree and Her Industry.....	204

Number Agricultural Societies.....	25
“ “ Exhibitions.....	59
“ “ “ Massachusetts and Illinois.....	274
“ Farmers in New England.....	289
“ Cattle in the State.....	100
“ Bushels Grain in the United States.....	107
“ Men who Fail.....	340

O

Oppression at the West	273
------------------------------	-----

P

Panic at the West.....	21
Pau erism, Insanity, Idiocy....	31—40
Peopling the Poor-houses	304
Poor and Good Farming.....	237
Price of Cows.....	108
Premiums at the State Fair.....	95
Production at the Farm at Westboro’.....	64
Profit of Farming.....	16
Profit and Per Cent.....	234
Philosophy of Agriculture.....	258
Policy of England.....	362
Profits of an Oat Crop.....	92

Q

Questions in Arithmetic.....	179
Questions, &c., for Agricultural Clubs.....	182
Questions for the People	369

R

Raw Material Defined.....	52
Revised Statutes.....	223
Reply to Mr. Emerson	178
Revolution in C.....	279

S

Schedule of Property at the Farm at Westboro’.....	75
Secretary Flint in account with the State.....	77
Serfs of Europe.....	365
Sherman, B. F., and His Address.....	138
Speech of the Emperor of Russia.....	359

Statement on the Cost of Rye.....	117
“ “ “ Corn.....	120
“ by the Author.....	149—152
Straw for a Hen's Nest.....	93
State Fair.....	94—98

T

The First Convert.....	210
The Farmers' Duty.....	280
The Farmer a Merchant.....	287
The Farmers' Sons.....	290
The Institutions of the Old Countries.....	102
The Philosophy of Growth.....	105
The Position of a Blacksmith.....	349
The Shoemaker and the Farmer.....	103
The Young and Disgusted Farmers.....	90

V

Value State Property at Westboro'.....	63
Valuation of Wisconsin.....	128
Valuation of Farm Property in Massachusetts.....	245

W

Want of Confidence in Farmers.....	284
Wages of Labor and the Professions.....	56
Webster, Daniel.....	290
What Deteriorates Land.....	351
What the Farmers Want to Know.....	101
What the Young Men Would Do.....	292
What English Farmers Want..	358
Wiseman and His Family.....	293
When and How Fancy Farmers Dine.....	97

3477 4

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

0 003 006 151 2