



Ball Players Salaries No Larger™

It seems to be the universal idea that salaries of to-day are so vastly superior to those of long ago that there exists no real comparison. Nay, nay, not so. Here and there a conspicuously huge salary looms up, and this makes the modern critic imagine that such money is common enough to dwarf the old-timers' stipends to utter insignificance. It is true that the salary list of a team to-day is far greater than was the case in 1889, for example, but the difference is mainly owing to the number of players. As an honest fact, the salary list of 1889—as shown in an old Spalding guide—reads strangely like the salary list of to-day.

There were a few men at \$1,200; a few at \$1,500; many more at \$1,800, and a raft of them from \$2,000 to \$3,000, with a few stars getting \$3,500, \$4,000 and even \$4,500. Isn't that pretty close to the prices they pay to-day? It may be safely stated that men of a quality good enough to draw \$2,000 now drew \$2,000 in 1889, and when you consider the advance in the cost of living the ballplayer hasn't much of a shade—his salary, in fact, has kept just about even pace with changes in money conditions everywhere.