

HARTFORD COUNTY, CONN.

Hartford County, Conn., in addition to Worcester County, Mass., was selected to represent a manufacturing area in New England with varied occupational opportunities. Hartford County is in the north central part of the State and borders on Massachusetts, but is somewhat farther west than Worcester County. In 1930, the total population of Hartford County was 421,097 persons and that for Worcester was 491,242. The largest incorporated place in the former was Hartford city, with 164,072 inhabitants, and the next largest city was New Britain with 68,128 persons. The rural population in Hartford County numbered about 113,000 persons as compared with about 95,000 in Worcester County. Further, since Hartford County has an approximate land area of 466,560 acres (729 square miles), or less than one-half the land area of Worcester, the rural area is much more densely populated than the rural area of Worcester.

The number of males 10 years old and over in this county employed in an industry other than agriculture in 1930 was 121,834 distributed as follows:

	Num- ber	Per- cent
Nonagricultural	121,834	100.0
Manufacturing and mechanical industries.....	69,202	56.8
Building.....	11,419	9.4
Food and allied.....	1,709	1.4
Metal.....	32,111	26.4
Lumber and furniture.....	1,544	1.3
Paper, printing, and allied.....	2,869	2.4
Textile.....	5,571	4.6
Electrical machinery and supply factories.....	1,849	1.5
Other manufacturing and mechanical.....	12,130	10.0
Transportation.....	9,068	7.4
Trade.....	26,255	21.6
Public service.....	3,151	2.6
Professional service.....	5,541	4.6
Domestic and personal service.....	5,900	4.8
All other and industry not specified.....	2,717	2.2

The 6,172 farms recorded in 1935 comprised 67.2 percent of the county land area. The average size of these farms was about 51 acres and the median size only 25 acres. The average farm value was slightly under \$9,100 and the median value was \$5,500. About one out of every three (32.1 percent) of the operators of these farms spent some time at outside gainful employment, and four-fifths of these (79.9 percent), or about one-fourth of all farm operators, spent 100 or more days at such off-farm pursuits. Most of the time off the farm was spent in another industry, as of the reports on occupation at outside jobs which could be classified only 13.2 percent were classed as agricultural work on another farm. As might be expected for a rural area so thickly populated as this, the median size of farms was extremely small, being but 14 acres for the part-time farms and 34 acres for the non-part-time farms. Owner-operated farms represented a high proportion of the total farms, as 83.4 percent were operated by full owners and another 8.1 percent by owners who rented some additional land from others. The proportion of

full-owner operators who were part-time farmers was 33.4 percent, of part owners 18.9 percent, and of tenants 38.8 percent. Not only was a lower proportion of part owners engaged in off-farm work but their farms were considerably larger as witnessed by a median size of 46 acres as contrasted with 14 acres for full owners and 10 acres for tenants.

The average size of family (total farm population divided by the total occupied dwellings) was 4.5 persons which is identical with the average size for Worcester County. However, in Hartford County families on part-time farms averaged 4.7 persons and on non-part-time farms 4.5, whereas for Worcester County the corresponding averages showed a wider spread, being 4.9 and 4.3. The unusually wide difference in the average size of family of the two main groups of tenant-operated farms in Worcester County, viz, 0.9 of a person, also prevailed in this county. Twenty-one percent of the part-time farms in Hartford County reported that some member or members of the families living thereon had moved there from a nonfarm home during the previous 5-year period and that these migrants represented 14 percent of the population. This compares with 17 percent of the farms and 10 percent of the population for the other group. All of these percentages are identical with those shown for Worcester County.

The agriculture of Hartford County was somewhat diversified but on many individual farms was highly specialized. It consists of some general farming with dairying, market gardening, orcharding, poultry raising, and tobacco production as specialties. All of the tobacco is of cigar type, some of which is shade grown requiring a considerable investment and therefore tends to be grown by large operators.

Twenty-six percent of the land in the part-time farms produced crops in 1934 as compared with 32 percent of the land in the non-part-time farms. Ninety-six percent of the farms in the former group produced a crop of some kind and 97 percent of the latter group. The percentages of the part-time farms and of the non-part-time farms growing the various crops or keeping different classes of livestock follow, the first figure representing the part-time farms: Corn 31, 48; hay 65, 75; tobacco 7, 18; Irish potatoes 47, 52; fruit orchard 56, 50; vegetables for sale and strawberries 28, 35; farm garden 78, 70; horses 25, 53; cattle 47, 58; hogs 15, 18; and chickens 61, 64. Likewise, the percentages of the crop acreage used by each crop were: Corn 11, 15; hay 58, 52; tobacco 6, 11; Irish potatoes 5, 7; fruit orchard 10, 6; vegetables for sale and strawberries 6, 6. And, the averages for the various kinds of livestock per farm reporting were: Horses 1.7, 2.1; cattle 5, 11.5; hogs 4, 9.5; chickens 67, 93. Since percentages of the total crop land and arithmetic averages per farm are materially affected by large reports, some of the differences shown may not be strictly representative

of the actual conditions for the two main groups of farms. Caution is also given that the difference in the median size of the farms in the two groups may materially affect the arithmetic averages for numbers per farm even though there might not be substantial differences in the general type of organization.

Tables 17, 18, and 19 were designed to present the information for the nonagricultural group according to a narrower interpretation of the occupation. Before interpreting these data, attention is directed to the general comment at the head of this chapter relating to these suboccupational types of work.

HARTFORD CO., CONNECTICUT

