

Service and is equipped and maintained by the Bureau of Animal Industry. Each year 25 or 30 head of cattle and about 50 sheep are provided by local stockmen under a cooperative agreement similar to that used at the Mount Carbon and Greycliff stations. These animals are kept in good pastures, and, so far as they are not injured by the experimental work, are under much better conditions than are animals on the range. Other animals like horses, swine, and chickens are obtained as needed.

It has been found that most of the stock-poisoning plants retain their toxic properties after drying. It has therefore been possible to study harmful plants brought in from other localities. Most of the experimental work with poisonous plants on the larger animals has been carried on at these field stations; however, certain experiments have been conducted at a number of other places.

The Salina experiment station is situated on the western slope of the Wasatch Range, on Gooseberry Creek, in an aspen grove at about the lower limit of the growth of that tree and of aconite and high larkspur. This station, which is very well equipped for summer work, has been occupied since 1915.

During the years in which these field stations have been occupied many bulletins have been published giving the results of the experimental work.

C. DWIGHT MARSH.

POPULATION Loss from Farms Ascribed to Variety of Reasons Twenty thousand men living in cities, towns, and villages on January 1, 1926, who had previously been farm operators living on farms were asked why they left the farms. Of these 20,000, 2,745 made reply, and the following is virtually the story of these men as told by themselves:

We represent every State in the Union. Some of us were farm tenants, some farm owners. In fact, one out of six was a farm tenant. None of us was a hired man at the time of leaving the farm. Two-thirds of us owners still own our farms. We have 9,000 children, and somewhat less than half of them are still in our homes. Over half of us left farming in the years 1924 and 1925. We were by no means new at farming, for many had operated farms as owners for a period of 10 to 14 years and even more for a period of from 30 to 39 years. A third of us had been farming from 100 to 174 acres. One-sixth of us had farms with from 175 to 249 acres, and 24 of us had farms of 1,000 acres or more. Most of us were born in the United States; only 1 in 10 was born in a foreign country.

Various reasons for giving up farming prevailed with us. In fact, our number may be classified into five main groups, each group having a different principal reason for moving to town.

More than a third of us found farming to be a poor business. This group could not make ends meet. High prices for the goods bought, low prices for the things sold, and high taxes finally convinced those in this group that matters could be no worse in town and might be better.

The next largest group contains fully a quarter of our number. Most of those in this group are elderly. They needed considerable hired help in the house and on the farm in order to carry on farming. This help could not always be obtained. Afflicted with growing physical disabilities and feeling the strain of advancing years, the members of this group decided the best solution of their problem was to go to town. This is our real retired farmer group, quite a different set of people in age and aims from Group No. 1.

One out of eight of us who were farm owners and 1 out of 18 of us who were tenant farmers came to the conclusion that the schooling for our children was too poor in the country and did not go far enough. This group left farming and went to town to work and live in order to give the children the benefit of town schools.

A small group, 1 out of 50, gave up the farm to a son or son-in-law. This number belongs also to the retired farmer group.

The last of the five significant groups is composed of moneyed farmers. Seventy-six of our farm owners and three of our farm tenants—that is, nearly 1 out of 40 of our total number—find themselves economically able to go to the city, lead an easier life, and enjoy for a while the things which they have always craved but never before felt able to have.

Such is the plain story told by these 2,745 townsmen who had once been farmers. The picture presented is a human one, convincingly showing that there are still social and economic problems to be solved on our farms.

C. J. GALPIN.

POPULATION Moving Ten thousand farmers—owners, tenants, and hired men—who were to Farms Includes Many Farm-Bred Men living on farms January 1, 1927, but who had recently moved to the farm from city, town, or village, were asked why they exchanged town life and work for farming. Eleven hundred and sixty-seven of these ten thousand new farmers gave their reasons. Apparently if they had elected a spokesman to present their case, he would have spoken much as follows:

We are a group of 776 farm owners, 344 farm tenants, and 47 hired men. Our homes are scattered through 45 States, the three not represented being Arizona, Delaware, and New Mexico. Ninety of us live in Pennsylvania, 86 in New York, 80 in Missouri, and 70 in Michigan. Considerably more than half our number left city, town, or village for farming in the years 1925 and 1926; 1 in 7 of us left in 1924.

It will doubtless occasion no surprise to learn that nearly all of us were either brought up on farms or had had some previous farm experience. In fact, only 155 of us were totally new to farming. Three hundred and eighty-nine had owned farms, 330 had been farm tenants before, and 153 had been hired men.

We have as a group a good many children. One-fifth of us have 1 child to the family, another fifth have 2 children to the family, while an eighth of us have 3 children to the family. As to age, our group falls about equally into four divisions—aged from 30 to 34; from 35 to 39; from 40 to 44; from 45 to 49.

The great majority of us like farm work, after all, better than town work, and we consider farming a good occupation, although a certain number of us view farm work and city work as about equally desirable; farm work being perhaps a little harder, but usually more healthful. The fact is that half of our number make a better living on the farm than we did in the town; especially is this true with the tenants. Some of us expect to make a better living on the farm, but have not yet had time enough to prove out on it.

It is a mystery to many why we left town and went back to farming in precisely those years when so many other farmers were leaving the farms for city, town, or village. The reasons were very clear in our own minds, for you will remember that most of us had had experience on farms before and were able, therefore, to compare farm life and city life. The main inducements which won us back to farming were the basic advantages of the farm for health and living conditions, especially for our children. We highly valued the closeness to nature and the spacious character of country life.

Some of us who are hired men found out to our sorrow that the cost of living in cities ate up all our wages; and that we could really do better on the farm and save more money. A considerable number of us owners and tenants feel the same way as the hired men about the opportunity in the country.

The fact is that, more or less, we all got tired of city life; and it is no small advantage to us that we can live on the farm an independent life.

This short story from our supposed spokesman, in the words of this group of farmers, as their replies came in to the department, indicates some disillusionment in the experience of these men with city living, and leads one to believe that a part of the large group of