



THE KANSAS UNION FARMER

Organization

Education

Co-Operation



VOLUME XX

SALINA, KANSAS, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1928

NUMBER 25

EQUALITY FOR AGRICULTURE THE NATION'S CONCERN

A Frank Discussion of the Farm Problem Presented Before the Recent Session of the American Institute of Politics at Williamstown, Massachusetts
By Geo. N. Peek.

(Continued from last week's Union)

No Panacea for Agriculture

I scarcely need to point out that no one act of Congress or any other agency constitutes in itself a complete national program. No such action can be a panacea for agricultural difficulties. Need for agricultural self-help, for efficiency in production and distribution, and for common sense in adjusting production to meet changing demand conditions, will always be paramount.

In addition to any constructive legislative proposal that may be adopted to give agriculture concentrated bargaining power, a sound national program for agriculture must deal with many other factors, some of which I merely mention in passing.

For the present we should remove the Government from its historic role of stimulating competition in farm production through its reclamation and land settlement policies, since in the major cash crops farmers are already suffering from excessive competition.

Not only to offset that which has already been done by government for coast regions, but from every consideration of national welfare, we need intelligent and far-reaching interior waterway development.

The spirit and intent of the Federal Farm Loan Act and Rural Credit Act both aim to establish a farmer-controlled credit system of constantly expanding usefulness. We must safeguard against the instruments of credit being used against agriculture, whether thoughtlessly, ignorantly, or intentionally.

Co-operative marketing and distribution of farm products and supplies should be expanded to the extent that such new agencies lessen the cost of distribution and shorten the route from producer to consumer. Agriculture needs tax adjustment, so that other forms of wealth and earning power will share equitably with real property the cost of school, local and state government.

All these are important. They are obtainable under aggressive agricultural leadership as incidents to the main program for agriculture, which as I conceive it should be this: The farmers of the United States need a rallying point—a nerve center—organized agricultural leadership to lead in bringing order into the inter-relationships of the chief acreage crops, and to help producers of the most important cash crops to achieve concentrated bargaining power through control of their supply in the market.

Proposals Coming This Fall
Congress will be confronted this fall with the necessity of choosing from two or three alternative proposals which are reasonably assured of strong backing.

First, there is the proposal for effective surplus control financed by funds drawn from each marketed unit of the commodity dealt with by means of the equalization fee. This principle was embodied in the McNary-Haugen bill, which passed both Houses of the last Congress. It has been briefly discussed in the foregoing paragraphs.

Second, legislation will be urged to create a farm board similar in form to that established by the first appropriation by the Government for loan purposes only. The theory of such a bill is that by loaning money to co-operative associations, they will be enabled to handle surpluses for the producers. The terms of the bill will permit only such operations as will result in profits, not losses, to the co-operative, hence to the loan fund. This was the central idea of the so-called Fess or Tinscher bill recently before Congress. The ineffectiveness of such a plan to offset existing inequalities is generally recognized among agricultural co-operators and farm organizations.

The third proposal also will be similar in form to the first, but instead of financing the risks, costs and losses involved in handling surpluses to the advantage of agriculture from the agricultural industry itself, it will propose to draw the funds directly or indirectly from the Treasury of the United States. For such a proposal it will be urged: "There shouldn't be any large losses; but if there are, let the Treasury stand them." This appears to be the theory of the bill lately emanating from the Black Hills. Wheat co-operators will recognize it as the bill decisively rejected by them recently when presented by Secretary Jardine in Kansas City and later in St. Paul.

In appraising this plan, it must be understood that marketing is a practical operation in the market places, involving costs and risk of losses, and cannot be accomplished by theorizing or talking about it. Proper control of market surpluses will require the administrative agency to assume larger risks than would be justified in the case of a private, profit-seeking enterprise.

Last Plan a Subsidy

The last plan, if it is operated to do what is claimed for it, is a subsidy to agriculture, either open or disguised. This the farmers do not want. The very suggestion is dis-

tasteful to the American mind. It offers the spectacle of thirty millions of the people, when in need, reaching their hands into the Treasury, and suggests the spectacle when another group, in similar straits, may demand a dole also and they will not be denied if the precedent is once established. This plan compels an involuntary contribution or "equalization fee" paid by the whole people, since it draws from the public Treasury, as contrasted with the McNary-Haugen bill, which would secure its contribution or "equalization fee" from the particular growers benefited.

Neither the second nor third proposal offers any suggestion of making the tariff effective on our surplus farm crops. No matter what may be claimed for them, neither would effectively operate to prevent violent price fluctuations. Neither would fasten the responsibility of caring for surpluses upon those responsible for the creation of the excess supplies. In them either the Government or the progressive few who have joined co-operatives would be held for risks and losses incident to surplus control—a responsibility in which all producers of a commodity should be made to share.

Finally, either of the two last proposals would impose a penalty upon membership in co-operative associations, while the operation of the plan that compels all to share alike in the cost of surplus control could not fail to encourage the growth and effectiveness of co-operative organization.

Present Order Not Perfect

The common failing of all ages has been to regard the existing order as perfect, ignoring even the most conspicuous danger signs. On the eve of a war that grew to threaten the very life of civilization, we were assured by the most respectable expert opinion that was impossible. When Edward Gibbon was writing the third book of his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" about 1780, he could see nothing in the decadence of the Roman Empire but little imperfect in the system of princes and powers surrounding him. Europe was on the brink of the French revolution when he referred to it as:

"One great republic, whose various inhabitants have attained at almost the same level of politeness and cultivation. The balance of power will continue to fluctuate, and the prosperity of our own or the neighboring kingdoms may be alternately exalted or depressed; but these vicissitudes cannot essentially injure our general state of happiness, the system of acts and manners which so advantageously distinguish above the rest of mankind, and the European and their colonies."

There is one lesson taught by history, it is that the permanent greatness of any state must ultimately depend more upon the character of its country population than upon anything else.

Yet today, notwithstanding the visible operation of forces that tend to drive the virile and the ambitious from the farms into the cities, we find men in positions of great responsibility who not only regard the present with indifference, but even mildly applaud it.

In this paper I have endeavored to discuss as briefly as possible the policies of our Government that have contributed to farm distress; the resultant duty of Government to agriculture, and the peculiar features of agriculture because of which devices so well adapted to other industries are unsuited to its needs. I have endeavored to suggest what a broad policy for agriculture must cover, and to analyze not only the plan approved by Congress, but the alternative proposals that now are being urged.

In conclusion I want to say that as a nation we have a moral responsibility for the agricultural situation which we cannot escape. The work of deliberate national policy has brought farming to its present crisis. The question is no longer: Shall we do something? It is: What shall we do? We must try to see clearly and weigh carefully the alternatives that are before us, because a deliberate choice of direction with consequences of the utmost national importance will have to be made soon—probably within a year.

Political Aspects of the Farm Question

That the agricultural question in America has become distinctly political there can be no doubt. Neither is there any doubt that it is an orphan child of our organized society as represented by political parties; while eligible for adoption by either major party, it has been denied admission by both, or at least by leaders in both parties, and in this in the face of party pledges which still remain unredempted.

For the Republican party it means extension of the Protective System to include agriculture.

For the Democratic party it means the application of the principles of Jefferson. "Equal opportunity for all and special privilege for none." I wish briefly to refer to the con-

dition of agriculture. Economists tell us that the farm debt has trebled since 1910, increasing from four to more than 12 billion dollars, and that the total value of farm property in 1925 had depreciated 20 billion dollars since 1920 or about 25 per cent. The cause of this condition is due principally to the continuing disparity between the price of industrial products which go to make up the farmer's cost of production and the price which he receives for what he has to sell.

Since agriculture is a nation all occupation, covering almost six and a half million separate farm units, and the production of our surplus crops occurs largely in the South and West, it is not difficult to understand the economic kinship of the South and West.

Common Interests Magnified

A century ago the farmers of the then North, West and South realized their common economic interest in political action of the most decisive character. The economic and political arena has been magnified since then; there are more participants in the national drama; new forces have appeared, and the old ones have been moved about. But the economic community of interest is there today just as it was a century ago, and it is asserting itself slowly but certainly.

Then this nation's total population amounted to but little more than millions; today it is nearly ten times as great. From a nation in which three out of four were engaged in agriculture, we have reached the point where almost three out of four are non-farmers, but they are dependent upon farming just as certainly as we are directly.

The increasing complexity of our national life has brought increasingly complex problems to agriculture, and the necessity that those whose business has increased rather than diminished its farming, or closely related to farming, must maintain a united front on all matters of national policy affecting agriculture.

With the nation's westward march from the seaboard and with the development of rail transportation, traffic which once was slow and turned into lanes east and west. A realignment of economic co-operation gradually became more marked until the war of '61-'65 made a political chasm which we are now rapidly bridging.

Better Understanding Coming

Recent developments are serving to bring about a better understanding between the West and South of their many common economic interests. The time is coming when the lower Mississippi, which shocked the nation to a sense of its responsibility served to call our attention to the fact that we of the North Central and Great Plains states, and those of the South and Lower Mississippi, dwell on the same crescent along a joint interest and responsibility of our common good, to utilize them for transportation and, above all, to leave them an unincumbered force for occasional great destruction.

We are coming to realize that the states in which agriculture is the greatest interest lie on both sides of the old Mason and Dixon line, and that there are problems common to all the great farm states that can only be solved, fairly to the farmers, through intelligent economic and political co-operation. Of all the evidences of accomplishment in that direction, none is more significant than the vote on the McNary-Haugen bill in both Houses of the 69th Congress.

In that vote the cotton, tobacco and rice states joined with the corn, wheat and hog states in a solid front. A study of the vote shows conclusively the growing recognition of the economic interest of the South and West.

This recognition is merely beginning. I believe we are on the eve of a broad realization of the essential community of interest among the producers of the staple crops of the great agricultural regions. The cotton growers of Georgia is keenly interested to know whether the South-west is going to turn its acres from corn and hogs or cattle ranges to cotton growing. The dairy men of New England and New York may well be concerned if a continuing disparity turns the corn and hog producers of Illinois, Iowa and Minnesota, or the wheat growers of North Dakota, to milk butter-fat production. If distress due to a bountiful crop of cotton forces the South to turn to meat and grain, the Corn Belt of the North will not long be unconscious of the fact.

Nothing alarming or revolutionary threatens if the farmers, particularly of the great surplus-producing states realizing their common interest, co-operate successfully in political action aimed to secure the adoption of an intelligent, fair, and effective policy for agricultural protection and stabilization.

Can't Be Indifferent

The farmers have possibly the biggest stake of all in our national affairs—they cannot be indifferent to the tariff, to immigration policies, to

:: Neighborhood Notes ::

NOTICE
J. F. Booth of the United States department of agriculture at Washington, D. C., will be in Grinnell Saturday, Feb. 4 at 2 o'clock p. m. in the Township hall. E. R. Downie of Wichita will also be with him. There will be music and a good time for all. Everybody is invited. Admission is free. Everybody come and hear Mr. Booth.

Elba Brandenburg.

THE WOODBINE LOCAL
The Woodbine Local had its annual meeting Tuesday evening, Jan. 10th. The election of officers gave the following result: President, B. H. Oesterreich; secretary-treasurer, Herman Brecht; secretary-treasurer, Harvey Shipley; conductor, Ed Volkman; doorkeeper, August Rindt; executive committee, C. M. Duek, Jr., Fred Kandt, Will Hettgenbach. It was decided to move the Union Co-operative Creamery to the future site of the new building. Eight letters were sent to Senators Capper and Curtis on certain questions.

Yours,
B. H. Oesterreich.

MADISON STOCKHOLDERS MEETING

The annual stockholders' meeting of the Farmers Union Co-operative Association of Beattie was held at the Beattie opera house, Tuesday, January 17th.

The meeting was opened at 11 a. m. by Pres. Geo. Scholz and several committees were appointed. At the noon hour a basket dinner was served in the cafeteria.

At one o'clock sharp the meeting was again called to order by Pres. Scholz. The reading of the minutes of the last meeting was first in order, followed by the secretary's and treasurer's reports. After these three directors were elected: P. L. Anderson, Chas. Wuester and Thomas Wendel.

The directors elected were: P. L. Gurtler, P. L. Anderson and Wm. Casady.

There were fifty-eight stockholders present and it was certainly an enthusiastic meeting, with lots of pep and questions for discussion. H. A. Hansen of Frankfort, R. S. Pauley and Richard Hawkins of Marysville and J. D. Anderson of Atxell, all of whom are stockholders of the Beattie Association, were present at the meeting.

Mr. Pauley and Mr. Waters Winkler also gave a few eye-openers. Henry Lucas gave an interesting talk on the progress of the cream, egg and poultry business which was very pleasing to those present. At the close of the meeting a slogan was adopted: "Boost, but don't knock," after which the meeting adjourned.

THE FARMERS UNION MANAGERS' ASSN OF KANSAS

Hon. Jonas Slicker, M. C. House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

I noticed by the papers that you were one of the party of noted people who accompanied President Coolidge to Cuba this week. You are certainly running true, for as a manager you have proved to be an expert in keeping yourself in the limelight and grabbing a little more than your share of the good things that came along.

Do you remember the time when we were back in the sandhills, when Katie Murphy had a birthday party? We were all playing out in the yard, and awhile before the cake and candy was to be passed around, you sneaked away into the house and told Mrs. Murphy that you believed you had better go home, and could you have some of the cake before you went; of course Mrs. Murphy filled you up, and then, when the rest of us went in, you were Johnny on the spot, too, and got another big helping of the refreshments.

You no doubt will take advantage of your opportunity to get your share of the refreshments offered to your party during your stay in Havana; they will undoubtedly be of better quality than those furnished by the official congressional bootlegger in Washington. I would think too, that you would be able to bring several packages of these refreshments home with you without any danger of having your baggage searched by nosy federal officers, for the people in the president's party should be above suspicion, at least to every one who is not well acquainted with them.

I do hope you will come back refreshed and full of pep, and get to work on the bill which I mentioned to you several weeks ago, in regard to getting government aid for the "Master Farmer" program which is being worked so hard by some of our Chambers of Commerce. The administration must be for this plan, for Mr. Jardine in an interview a short time ago said he believed that the "Master Farmer" plan would solve the farmers' problems.

You will have to get busy soon if you head the farmers off in their attempt to put over an honest to goodness farm relief bill in this congress; why even that staid oldmildmannered Kansas State Board of Agriculture passed a resolution the other day endorsing the McNary-Haugen bill.

I am with you in spirit (s) while you are basking in sunshine and warmth, and getting your refreshments off the ice, while we are wondering where the money is coming from to buy our next ton of coal.

Your old schoolmate,
A. M. Kinney.

Low interest rates provide opportunity to increase owned capital by applying the saving in interest to reduction of the principal of farm loans.

Mr. and Mrs. O. H. Watzig, Myrtle Creek, Oregon, were in Kansas City this week making the acquaintance of the Farmers Union and the Creamery. Mr. and Mrs. Watzig are the owners of the Sunray Orchards of Myrtle Creek and, among other fruits grown by them, are prunes. They came with a car of prunes to Omaha and, from there, they came down into Kansas to become acquainted with our co-operative marketing plan with the view of establishing an outlet for their products.

The fruit growers in their section are forming a co-operative marketing association and they are endeavoring to formulate plans with co-operators of Nebraska and Kansas for marketing their fruits.

Mr. and Mrs. Jacob Anderson of Maple Hill and Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Willgas of Topeka were visitors of the Creamery last week.

A cream can salesman dropped in to the office the other day. He said he was riding a train through the East a few days previous and passed one of our painted refrigerator cars. He had never heard of the Farmers Union Co-operative Creamery but was quick to see in it a prospective buyer of cream cans.

We believe these cars are good advertisers, as they impress the mind of those who see them that the Farmers Union Co-operative Creamery is of some size and note. No doubt the can salesman felt that he had not been keeping up with progress.

The thirteenth annual meeting of the Farmers Union Co-operative Association of Beattie was held at the Beattie opera house, Tuesday, January 17th.

The meeting was opened at 11 a. m. by Pres. Geo. Scholz and several committees were appointed. At the noon hour a basket dinner was served in the cafeteria.

At one o'clock sharp the meeting was again called to order by Pres. Scholz. The reading of the minutes of the last meeting was first in order, followed by the secretary's and treasurer's reports. After these three directors were elected: P. L. Anderson, Chas. Wuester and Thomas Wendel.

The directors elected were: P. L. Gurtler, P. L. Anderson and Wm. Casady.

There were fifty-eight stockholders present and it was certainly an enthusiastic meeting, with lots of pep and questions for discussion. H. A. Hansen of Frankfort, R. S. Pauley and Richard Hawkins of Marysville and J. D. Anderson of Atxell, all of whom are stockholders of the Beattie Association, were present at the meeting.

Mr. Pauley and Mr. Waters Winkler also gave a few eye-openers. Henry Lucas gave an interesting talk on the progress of the cream, egg and poultry business which was very pleasing to those present. At the close of the meeting a slogan was adopted: "Boost, but don't knock," after which the meeting adjourned.

WE APPEAL TO THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE KANSAS FARMERS UNION—KANSAS CONGRESSMEN TAKE WRONG POSITION

Press reports indicate that a conference of Kansas Congressmen was held in the office of James G. Strong and an agreement reached to abandon the equalization fee in the McNary-Haugen bill. Congressman Strong is reported to have said that although he had twice supported the equalization fee proposal, he was now ready to accept a compromise, in the hope of getting something passed which would be acceptable to the administration.

We realize that these men have waged a long, hard fight, and that they may honestly feel that it is better by far to accept what Congressman Strong calls "half a loaf" than to have the whole thing defeated again—to have not bread.

But to use this compromise looks like politics horse play. Both parties pledged themselves to a program of farm relief in the last presidential campaign. When a farm relief measure was finally passed, as sponsored by the great majority of organized farmers, it was promptly vetoed by the President. If now some harmless and empty proposal can be passed by compromise it will not be disapproved by the powerful and influential eastern interests, and the party in power can declare that it has kept faith with the people.

Of course the farmer will not be greatly helped, nor for long, but that is of great consequence. For the farmer neither wants nor will long be permitted to receive an open subsidy. If we cannot secure the passage of an adequate farm relief measure let us scorn the substitute. We asked for bread and are offered bunk.

Wire your Congressman at once, that he may know unmistakably where we stand on this vital issue!

C. E. HUFF, President.

C. E. BRASTED, Secretary.

operation of government financial and banking systems, to transportation laws, rates and adjustments—and this summer the Mississippi as he goes up and down his row of cotton; in North Dakota or Texas as he harvests his wheat; and in Iowa and Indiana as he tends his corn—is thinking of these things. He is less concerned about methods and details than he is over results.

These factors in the way of the growers of our cotton, wheat and pork; but they are magnified by the present effort of our government particularly of the Department of Commerce, to apply high-pressure methods to the expansion and extension of our industrial exports in all the markets of the world. The more we force our industrial exports abroad, the more difficult we make the position of the farmers who grow our export crops, the production of which cannot be contracted or expanded at will.

Industrialization Hurts Farmer
This policy is a conscious one there is no longer any doubt. The whole effect of the policies of the last two administrations has been to hasten the industrialization of America at the expense of agriculture. No one can hear or read the utterances of the leading administration spokesmen without coming to the conclusion that they are determined to have cheap foodstuffs and raw materials for industry regardless of what happens to the farmers.

During the political campaign of 1924, the chairman of the Republican National Committee made a blunt and significant statement in the West. He said in substance: "The best government is the one which gives the greatest benefits to the largest proportion of the people; one-third of our population are producers of farm commodities and two-thirds are consumers; it must follow, therefore, that government administered in the interest of the consumers of farm commodities is the best government regardless of what happens to the farm producers. It is therefore, it is desirable to maintain the present advantage of the consumers at the expense of the farm producers."

Want Advantages Maintained
Secretary Mellon in an official letter of June 14, 1926, vigorously assailed the move to make agricultural tariffs effective, because, he said, "foreign industrial tariffs are lowered and the foreign competition assisted in underselling American products abroad and in our home market."

Continued on page 4)

STAFFORD COUNTY MEETING
The Stafford County Farmers Union held their regular meeting, Jan. 3, 1928, at the O. O. F. Hall, Stafford, Kansas. President Ward J. Spencer in charge. The contest which has been running for the past year closed, and final points totaled: North Star Local winning first prize of 20.00; Union Local, second prize of 10.00.

It was voted to continue the contest another year with three prizes instead of two.

Plans were made for the coming year's work. The 4-H club work was discussed, and a committee of President Ward J. Spencer, Louis Webering, Secretary Rex Lear, Clarence Reed, Ray Henry and John Batchman were voted and appointed to investigate the sponsoring of this work in the county. Very interesting talks were made by Ray Henry, Mr. H. Harrison, Mr. O. Weidner, Mr. T. Buckel, Mr. O. F. Hainet, Mr. W. Blane O'Connor, Mr. John Batchman, and Mr. Roy Waters. Literature and information about the 4-H Club work was given by Rex Lear. So much time was taken in discussions and plans for the coming year, the installing of the officers was postponed until next meeting, at which time President Spencer and Secretary Lear will treat the crowd to something good to eat.

I am enclosing a clipping taken from the Stafford County News of this week, Jan. 19. Which follows:

At the January meeting of the Stafford County Farmers' Union it was decided to try to organize some 4-H clubs in Stafford county.

The 4-H clubs are composed of boys and girls between the ages of 10 and 20 years and are of national scope. There are over 40,000 boys and girls in the United States engaged in some recognized 4-H club project.

A SATISFIED ADVERTISER
Dear Sir:—I wish you would put a STOP SIGN in big letters, I am out of Turkey. Or else send me a secretary and some stamped envelopes to answer the inquiries for Turkey. I did not know we had so many members. I run across members here at home that would ask me about Turkey that never look at the paper, and did not know I had that add in the paper. Look out for next year if I have any turkeys. I will be back if the members of our Union would put their add in the Union and sell the article with a small profit, our paper would grow to a daily which I hope it will before many moons. We are making tracks for that "Simmons fair." I think we ought to keep right on making them. They will get so he won't lik'em after while.

J. P. White,
Wells, Kansas.

The Kansas Union Farmer

Published Every Thursday at Salina, Kansas, by THE KANSAS BRANCH OF THE FARMERS EDUCATIONAL & CO-OPERATIVE UNION 119 South Seventh Street

Entered as Second-Class Matter August 24, 1912 at Salina, Kansas. Under Act of March 3, 1872. Acceptance for Mailing at Special Rate of Postage Provided for in Section 1103. Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized July 30, 1918.

C. E. HUFF, Editor and Manager

Subscription Price, per Year.....\$1.00

Notice to Secretaries and Members of Farmers Union of Kansas. We want all the news about the Locals and what you are doing. Send in the news and thereby help to make your official organ a success.

Change of Address—When change of address is ordered, give old as well as new address, and R. F. D.

All copy, with the exception of notices and including advertising, should be in seven days before the date of publication. Notices of meetings can be handled up until noon Saturday on the week preceding publication date.

Communications and Questions—Communications are solicited from practical farmers, members of the F. E. & C. U. of A., are at liberty to ask questions on any phase of farm work. Answers will be either published or mailed.



THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1928

IS PEASANTRY IN PROSPECT?

The following article, credited to Marcus W. Robbins, a San Diego attorney, has appeared here and there in the farm press. This paper does not have any means of proving the genuineness of the article, and we have been disinclined to give it much credence. However, some recent developments indicate a growing conviction on the part of groups that farm peasantry is even desirable and may as well be openly advocated. The clipping was sent in by Mrs. Mary Campbell, of K. id. If it is as accurate in other details as in reference to the forced return of the negroes in the flood district to the plantations upon which they had been, it is dependably true. Had these negroes been chattel slaves they would not have had closer watching. It is said that armed guards herded them about, and returned them to their "bars" when floods subsided. The article follows:

"An Epistle to American Newspaper Men"

"Realizing the power that rests in the hands of the American newspaper man in shaping American public opinion, I submit the following facts in the hope that they will help to clear up a disagreeable situation.

"We are told that there is an agricultural problem. However, survey the past ten thousand years, and we find a general, universal law governing the growth of human culture. First, there must be a vast river valley with fertile soil, sunshine and water, as witness Egypt, Babylon and China. Second, there must be a peasant class to raise the food, furnish the soldiers and be the foundation for the growing culture. These two factors are the basis and only basis of any and all civilizations, present, past or future. Original, creative power is centered in a small group resting on a peasant class. This peasant class must have no interest in life other than crops, sex, war and the worship of God-like rulers. When they get away from this, there is trouble, and that particular civilization collapses, and a new one is initiated that preserves some of the old culture.

"A new civilization is arising on the North American continent, and this law still holds good, although it will require several centuries to work out, and we can retard or accelerate it by the wisdom of our present action. It does no good to blink the facts. The laws of the universe are inexorable, even though cruel, as judged by human ethics.

"The river basin of this new civilization lays between the Rocky mountains and Alleghany mountains, and the American farmer, or peasant, makes the circle complete. Yet, there is a danger here to our culture. He has tasted a portion of leisure and luxury, and is beginning to ferment with discontent. It is absolutely necessary that this be checked, if he is to continue furnishing a sufficient supply of cheap food, clothing and labor—all absolute necessities on which our present culture of art and science can be based and grow.

"Our American civilization will be wrecked if he is encouraged in his present discontent. He must be distracted and convinced that he has no problems. To that end, he must be encouraged to support emotional religions of the Billy Sunday and Aimee McPherson type. This makes an outlet for one of the oldest of human emotions, and with that implanted in his mind, he will soon forget any present misery. He must be led to marry young and encouraged in having large families. He must be discouraged from spending too much on education, especially of a scientific nature, as it tends to make discontent amongst his youth. He should be told that science is taking his God away from him.

"We are approaching a presidential election. It will be easy to lead him to believe that he can play an important function in it. A proper candidate should be selected who should be one that has handled inferior races of men and knows the psychology of handling the mob and around whom a farmer myth can be built. Myths are a great help in ruling men. Who better than Hoover for this purpose? Hoover, as a young man, when his mind was plastic, took charge of Chinese coolies, Hindus, Belgians, all inferior races with the peasant psychology, and he made a success of it. His mind is now undoubtedly fixed in this attitude, and he is better equipped than any other American to put the farmer in his place in a painless manner without any yelling. Witness the plaudits given him by the Southern aristocracy, for the Negro peasant was not allowed to move away from the Mississippi flood. Each plantation worker will go back to his original

plantation. There shows the hand that has run Chinese coolies.

"In the race for industrial supremacy, those nations are forging ahead that are run by super-men. America must not lag behind. The dictatorship can be sugar-coated and made palatable if the American newspaper men will but do their duty.

Sincerely,
MARCUS W. ROBBINS.

FARM RELIEF AND POLITICAL STRATEGY

It has been apparent for some time that the Committee was unwilling to report out the farm relief bill with the equalization principle included in it. The bill was reported out of Committee in the last Congress by a bare majority, and at present the majority runs heavily the other way, as reported in the press.

Farm organization leaders have done their utmost to secure the favorable action of the Committee on a bill that will at least work if fairly administered. A few days ago the report appeared in the newspapers that the Kansas delegation had agreed to abandon the fee principle, in the interest of securing some relief—the most possible—for the farmer at once. The Farm Bureau and the Farmers Union at once protested this surrender, as did many individuals. In a statement to the Associated Press, Congressman Strong declared that we were wrong, and that to hold out for something we could not get (since the president declares he has not changed his mind in the matter) would be to "betray agriculture." It is my humble judgment that to accept an empty and meaningless "farm relief" measure, and so remove the whole proposal from the present political field and perhaps set back for many years the hope of agricultural equality, is to betray agriculture.

It was my first conviction that the proposal was inspired by party considerations, and developments but strength. That conviction a presidential campaign approaches, the party pledge to enact relief legislation has not been fulfilled, farmers are rather more aware and concerned than for many years, probably. Party ties do not bind very securely. Something must be done, and at once, to put the party in favorable position to enter a new campaign.

Surely no one is in position to know agriculture's need in Kansas better than we in this office. The need is imperative for help. For us to oppose helpful legislation would be unforgivable. But we are as much concerned just now to prevent the wrong as we are to promote the right kind of legislation. It is proverbial that a drowning man will catch at a straw. But since it will not save him who muck him with it? If pressure is being brought to bear on our representatives to give primary consideration to party needs, it puts them in a difficult position. If that is not being done I wish someone would kindly interpret this declaration by Ewing Herbert, of Hiawatha, himself an aspirant to a seat in Congress. He defends the Kansas delegation by setting up their obligation to "be good party sports." We feel that the bill is to be entitled "A Bill for Farm Relief," but that the interest of every provision would justify the title—"A Bill for Political Purposes." Says Herbert, inspired by W. P. Lambertson's letter to Congressman James G. Strong:

"There isn't anything on the political map to get specially wild about. Our representatives in congress probably know better what can and what can't be accomplished in legislation than does Mr. Lambertson, who is far removed from congress. What we all need just now is sanity in our consideration. We shall have to accept the best that can be done. We can hardly expect to over ride the constitution as those in authority view it by threats of revolt, or by misrepresentation of any kind. We are going to get all farm relief legislation possible. The Republican party will nominate the best man it can for president, the Republican voters will elect him. We must all be good party sports, play the game fairly, take what comes, even if we don't get all we want. It is time, now to build up fine party spirit, put aside all mean feeling so that we can continue the Republican party in power in the nation, in the states, district, counties. Let every Republican scatter seeds of harmony for progress. Forward" is the word. Come on, let's go."

LAMBERTSON TAKES CONGRESSMAN STRONG TO TASK. REGRETS THAT KANSAS EQUALIZATION FEE PRINCIPLE DEFEAT IS READY TO ABANDON

TOPEKA, Jan. 23 (AP)—Representative Strong of the fifth congressional district of Kansas was criticized today by W. P. Lambertson, chairman of the Brown County Republican committee and former candidate for governor, for leading the Kansas delegation in congress from the equalization fee in farm legislation.

In an open letter addressed to Representative Strong, who on Saturday announced that five members of the house from Kansas had agreed not to insist on an equalization fee, Mr. Lambertson said:

"I was shocked to see that you led the Kansas delegation from the equalization fee. I think you made a mistake. There might be a time later on

to compromise, when you had something to offer in its place. It isn't apparent now.

"It looks like a long leap from the Ottawa Farmers' Union convention to what you have agreed to in Washington. Recently the Kansas Farm Bureau at Dodge City endorsed the McNary-Haugen bill which means the equalization fee. When you have taken that out you have removed the teeth. The state board of agriculture endorsed the bill by not at its meeting last week.

"If you really believe in it, it seems to me you ought to be a better fighter. You ought to care more for an effective farm relief measure than for the vindication of passing president. I have wondered if it wasn't the Jardine influence on you in the fifth district and back of his vindication is the Hoover candidacy.

"A McNary-Haugen bill without the equalization fee would be like the packer stockyard act which never amounted to a darn, because the bill was finally written by the packers themselves. If you leave the equalization fee out of the McNary-Haugen bill, you have permitted the Hoover flood crowd to write the bill—the arch enemies of agricultural quality. I feel that our two senators will not join with you."

"The farmers of Kansas are a lot more interested in economic justice than they are in political relief and by the gods and little fishes they are going to articulate before the end of 1928.

WHEAT POOL AND FARMERS UNION OFFICIALS CONFER

Officers and Executive Boards Hold All Day Session in Salina

There has always been an intimate relationship between the Wheat Pool organization and the Farmers Union, and a rather close co-operation in some ways. A very large part of the Pool membership is made up of Farmers Union members. The majority of the Directorate of the Pool are members of the Farmers Union. The Union was one of the influential factors in the development of the Kansas Co-operative Wheat Marketing Association and quite naturally a sense of mutual concern exists between them.

Recently the Wheat Pool, after considerable discussion and effort, formulated a new contract for the sign-up which it hopes to make in the field between this time and the expiration of the present contracts, which terminate with the 1928 delivery. One of the provisions of the new contract is for what is termed a "Daily Pool," as distinguished from the seasonal pool.

The Conference, which was called at the request of the Wheat Pool officials, was quite fully attended. In stating their reasons for asking for the Conference the Officers of the Pool said very frankly that it was for the purpose of having the Farmers Union endorse and approve the proposed new contract. It was also quite as frankly stated that the contract was already agreed upon and would not in any way be changed or modified, nor alter what the Farmers Union might think of its provisions. The Union officials seemed to feel that such a situation hardly afforded proper ground for a conference. Discussions were long and very earnest, though in good spirit. The complete "minutes" looks like a dictionary. The words are all there, too.

Two specific things resulted. One was a resolution, adopted by the Executive Board of the Farmers Union unanimously, except that John Vecesky, who because of his official position with the Pool voluntarily absented himself from the Board meeting, voted against it. The resolution was as follows:

"That we re-affirm our confidence in the principle of seasonal pooling of products and their orderly marketing.

"That we stand ready to approve a contract drawn and based on this principle, if such a contract shall be offered by the Kansas Co-operative Wheat Marketing Association.

"That we disapprove the entry of the Kansas Co-operative Wheat Marketing Association into the grain consignment business, as is provided in their new contract, which, in operation will largely destroy the stabilizing influence of the annual or actual pool. We hold this to be a violation of the pooling principle, and hence cannot endorse the new contract.

The other really significant thing, if anything may be expected to come of it, was the adjournment of the meeting subject to future call by the officers of the two organizations. The Union officials seemed to be fully convinced that the time to confer about matters of mutual interest is while they are in the planning—where differences of opinion may find some expression in the final conclusion. On the other hand the officials of the Wheat Pool, having given the matter much thought, seem to feel that the Union need only endorse what they have done. And there, for the present, the matter stands.

A new high record was established in 1927 by the Equity Union Creameries, Aberdeen, S. D., with the sales amounting to \$1,068,877 and net earnings of \$50,132. Each year since 1916 the association has refunded its net earnings to the members and the amount so refunded has reached a total of \$355,764.

A GRAIN OF TRUTH MAKES A LIE DANGEROUS

There is developing a harder fight upon the entire Co-operative movement than ever before in its history in America. The opposition talks about a million dollar fund to fight the further development of Co-operative marketing, and about going as missionaries and crusaders among the handlers of farm products, to awaken them to the seriousness of the threat against their business. Whether this is to be a reality or is only talk we do not know.

Probably a little of each. But at any rate a real campaign is becoming apparent. A recent issue of the Co-operative manager and farmer carries a long story concerning the organization work now going forward in Illinois. We reproduce it as being probably a fair sample of the method of the attack which is being made.

If we may believe that these people will oppose that which they fear most, it may be an honor to the group in Illinois to be thus singled out. The Illinois Co-operative movement is a group in the southern part of the state holding a charter from the National Farmers Union as the Illinois Farmers Union. The newer group is patronizing Farmers Union agencies with its business, and hopes eventually to become officially a part of the Union. The writer knows of no admission in return for support for anyone for president, but does know of a group which wants to make much of our small differences.

It may be said that if the farmer does not want to patronize Co-operative agencies he need only refuse to sign the contract. If the other chap is treating him fairly he will so refuse. But if he is being held up and robbed at present, and enters into agreement with his neighbors to sell jointly with them, he can avoid the heavy penalties about which this "Co-operative" paper sheds such salty tears by the very simple expedient of keeping his word. And it is no fairy tale that the results obtained will repay the member a hundredfold for his effort and loyalty.

Read it and weep:

THE ILLINOIS FARMERS UNION WAS AN OUTLAW

Its Methods and Contracts Dangerous to Farmers and a Menace to Agriculture

For several weeks the Co-operative Manager and Farmer has been gathering information regarding the activities of the Farmers' Union in Illinois. The agents of the Union have been working around the Kanawha, Grand Park, Watseka, Dwight, Pontiac and other smaller places. Our investigators have been in close touch with the promoters, have attended their meetings, heard their orators and know something of their high-pressure salesmanship. It would be amusing if it were not for the fact that the pleasant voices of these oily-tongued field men and public speakers have evidently captivated and misled a few really well-intentioned farmers. Their sales talk is so fascinating and convincing that they do not know the facts and the records of these high salaried gentlemen of winsome ways and charming personalities.

The campaign is huge and spectacular. The best men in the Farmers' Union game have been brought into Illinois. Everything is planned by the mind of a master. Three vertical public meetings are held. It is addressed by one of their best orators, who is paid big money to stir up enthusiasm and get the community ready for the descent of the high-powered go-getter salesmen. And they come, sometimes three or four, and usually in pairs. They select a farmer victim—the man they want to sign up. Livestock marketing is talked. The manner of sending grain and other produce to market is thoroughly discussed. All the unpleasant incidents in the lives of farmers are emphasized. The cost of production is hammered home, and according to their statistics our farmers have lost about twice the total wealth of all America during the last twenty five years. The promoters picture the aggravated condition of agriculture in such a sympathetic and pitiful way that the farmer finally grasps the golden pen of the go-getter salesman and signs his name to the ten-year contract without even reading what it contains. He pays his six dollars, signs the \$10.00 note, also the little side contract requiring a payment of two per cent on the total amount of all sales.

Here we pause to look over the contract which he signs. It is called a "Marketing Agreement." It could not be better named. We quote: Section 2—"The Producer hereby APPOINTS the Union his sole agent and the Union agrees to act as such for purpose of handling and marketing ALL of the Producer's merchantable grain, livestock, poultry and dairy products, except as hereinafter exempted, for a period of ten years from date of this agreement."

Section 5—"The Farm products delivered by the Producer hereunder shall become the ABSOLUTE PROPERTY of the Union."

Section 13—"The Producer hereby authorizes the Union to conduct grading, standardization and classification of the farm products delivered under this and similar Agreements. And the producers agrees to abide by and be bound by all such rules and regulations. The Producer hereby authorizes the Union to fix handling charges for operating expenses and agrees to be bound by them."

Section 17—"The Producer hereby agrees to pay the Union for all grain and livestock sold, consigned or marketed by or for him other than in accordance with the terms of this Agreement, 12 1/2 per cent of the selling price of such grain or livestock, and 20 per cent of the selling price of all dairy and poultry products as

liquidated damages for the breach thereof and all other expenses of litigation."

Read close SECTION 17. It resembles a judgment note.

Would any farmer like to pay the Union 12 1/2 per cent of the selling price on all his grain which he does not turn over to the Union? At present prices this would amount to 14 cents per bushel on wheat, 8 cents on corn, 5 cents on oats and 8 cents on barley.

Would any farmer like to pay to the Union 12 1/2 per cent of the selling price on all his dairy and poultry products which he does not turn over to the Union?

And these fines and liquidated damages apply to all sales by a member, with the exception of grain sold for seed, or to feeders of livestock, or to the sale of pure bred livestock, or livestock sold to butchers for local consumption, or to poultry and eggs sold direct to local consumers. It says so in the contract. And the contract is binding for ten years. This is why it is dangerous. Would any farmer care to sign its contents and requirements? In fact, the entire contract is especially damnable as the producer in signing it automatically closes the door upon his own best interests and has no say whatever about how or where he may dispose of his grain, his livestock and other products.

Does any red blooded farmer in Illinois wish to make any agreement of this kind with anybody, and especially with an organization that he knows nothing about? Does any sensible, right-minded producer wish to tie up his marketing rights for ten years and at the same time pay six dollars a year, give a note for ten dollars and pay two per cent on the total amount of everything he sells?

Do the farmers of Illinois need a conservator? We think not. But many of them are easily fooled. No other so-called Marketing Agency requires the grain farmer to sign away his rights to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The farmers in other grain states where a little work has been done now and then in the past by some sort of a Farmers' Union were never required or solicited to sign a contract of such a nature. We are told that in the tobacco and cotton regions the organizations of the farmers have been practically gone out of business and are fading from the picture.

Some sort of a Farmers' Union tried to break into the Illinois Farmers Elevator Organizations over twenty years ago. It succeeded in forming five or six Farmers Union Elevator Companies, all of which have failed and left a trail of financial losses and disgruntled farmers. But now comes the "High Priest" of this new Farmers' Union and says that they have nothing against the Farmers Elevators—that they want to work with them and help them. The record belies these statements. A sample is the present situation and community conditions at Manteno.

Ninety days ago the Manteno Farmers Elevator Company was a fine prosperous organization, owning three elevators, a large lumber yard and other equipment. It had been doing a successful business for many years. Then came the Farmers' Union, scattering poison among its stockholders, stirring up trouble and creating dissensions. The promoters pictured the wonders of the Farmers' Union, how much it could pay for grain than any other organization and how much larger dividends it could earn. They had no proof of a single statement but their recital was a moving picture of profit and prosperity. It had its effect upon a few people and a number of farmers signed up with the Union. The community was divided. Families became at odds. Antagonisms and hatred were everywhere in the neighborhood. The Manteno Farmers Elevator Company was practically compelled to sell one of its elevators to the Union, adding another burden to the back of the community for its costs money to operate a business and the farmers, like everybody else, must pay for their foolishness.

But happily the reaction is already on the way. Many farmers are ready and willing to tear up their contracts with the Union. Others who have signed declare openly that they will never sell a bushel of grain to the Farmers' Union, some of the signers are already hauling their grain to the Manteno Farmers Elevator and flaunt their opposition in the face of the Union officials, daring them to commence suit to enforce the contract. But the harm has been done and it will take the Manteno community a quarter of a century to outgrow the evil effects of this false and vicious propaganda.

The Illinois Farmers' Union carried all the earmarks of failure at the start. The success of every movement among the people for greater economic progress depends upon the business ability, high standing and character of its leadership. Without these it must fail even if it have merit. But without merit and with none of the qualifications of successful and dependable leadership, it must end in disappointment to its followers. This is one of the reasons why the Illinois Union is dangerous to farmers and a menace to agriculture. And further:

The Editor of this Paper has been told within the last sixty days that the Manager of one of the largest State Unions in America that the Illinois Farmers' Union was an out-law and not recognized by the older organizations that originated the name and have been in certain lines

of business for years. However, it is said to have been admitted a few weeks ago by promising to help elect a certain man President of the National Organization.

This is a good time for the farmers of Illinois to stop and think. They now have two of the finest farmer organizations in the civilized world—the Illinois Farmers' Grain Dealers' Association and the Illinois Agricultural Association. They have accomplished something for agriculture. They are working along lines that mean success. They have never tried to fool the farmer. They have tried not to promise more than can be accomplished and they have done more for agriculture in the middle west than all the other farm organizations combined. And they are the Organization that should be supported by the grain growers and producers of the Mississippi Valley. All of us might as well forget all this stuff about getting something for nothing. The Promised Land is not likely to come in our day and generation. Fairy tales belong to the time of childish fancies. Bedtime Stories do not properly dove-tail with the needs and deportment of the nature and older grown. Work—well directed labor—under equal opportunities, is largely the answer and always has been the solution to our commercial, industrial and ethical problems in all the professions and in every occupation. The Co-operative Manager and Farmer for January.

THE DAILY DROVERS TELEGRAM CONTINUES FIGHT

DIRECT BUYING AS SEEN BY FARMERS

The Farmer to Blame
Editor Telegram: The packer is not responsible for this situation. The farmer, himself, is the nigger in the woodpile, the packer needs no champion. His brains champion his own cause; he is wise, astute enough to combine with his fellow packer for business and social purposes and for other obvious reasons. And he is not asleep at the switch when his business languishes and is threatened. Unscrupulous? I do not know or care about that, now. That is not the vital question before the house.

I am a friend of the farmer (I am one, have been for 20 years). I want above all to see him prosper and I can't understand how he ever is to do it under present methods. He isn't even alive to what is going on until he's lost his marbles.

He'll sell his hogs or his corn or hay, anything, today—on a suspicion of getting a dime more and disclaim responsibility for ruinous prices on subsequent deliveries when he will be literally driven to slaughter and no recourse but to holler his head off—too late.

Do not want to malign any one. Though I am disgusted, mortified and ashamed and ruined with the rest, by this suicidal method of business and I can see no little promise in the future so long as the farmers the country over, persist in their present attitude toward one another. Their greed and selfishness is their undoing.

There is no relief from oppression for any, unless it is recognized by the oppressed himself, and embraced. God in heaven makes no promise to help neighbor when opportunity offers. Right here I want to take occasion to declare my solemn conviction and belief that when we all and sundry become so innocent that selfishness and greed retain no motivating elements in our thoughts and actions, at that time our trials and grief will end.

It is not magic either, but I believe that loving kindness, even toward our enemies will do more to conquer than all the bullets and abusive epithets that can ever be manufactured or repeated, why abuse, and why mis-use another for the ruin born, of our own preoccupation, our own delirium? Is it right? Is it honest? Is it manly? Defend the packer. No (not necessary). Be honest, be true. Be men. Bring the real curb to bear. Let him speak. But let him speak true.

Olivet, Kans. H. F. GARARD.

Penny Wise, Pound Foolish
Editor Telegram: I have been reading the Drovers with interest in regard to direct hog buying by the packers in the country and can say "amen" to about everything he has written and also add a little as I am both a feeder of hogs and also buy hogs to ship; a few years ago I was buying hogs 75c under their class and shipping them all to the open market and making a little money, then along came my competitors bidding 60c to 65c under their class and getting the farmers' hogs who had always sold to me. There was not two things left for me. There was just two things left for sell to packers. I know very well when I began to sell to the packers I was beginning to lose money on hogs which I fed, as the packers could govern their own market. I can see but one solution and that is force everybody who wants hogs to buy them in open competition on the open market. As for farmers and feeders to organize, I don't think that will ever work, as I find the general run of feeders and farmers do not look far enough in advance but will sell to the one who will pay the most for their hogs when finished, not realizing in doing so they are letting the packers stay off the market causing it to be slow and draggy and making their own hogs bring less money.

HOTCHKISS MORTGREDGE.

Longton, Kans.

Legislation, through the Federal Farm Loan Act, has resulted in reducing the rates of interest on farm loans below the rates paid by other lines of business. Individuals themselves must reduce the principal of loans.

Perpetual motion is a delusion. Like the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, it is pursued only by the dreamer who doesn't know.

The population engaged in agriculture and the business of agriculture in this country purchase annually about one-tenth of the products of the manufacturing industries of the United States.—New England Homestead.

GLIMPSES OF CO-OPERATION

THE EQUALIZATION FEE

The McNary-Haugen bill carries a provision for a revolving fund. The money is to be advanced by the U. S. Treasury at the beginning of operations, and the costs of conducting the enterprise, together with any losses sustained in the sale of surpluses abroad, are to be assessed against all marketed units of production in any given commodity. The money so secured goes back into the revolving fund. That's what makes it revolve.

The Administration proposed a bill in which no arrangement is made for reimbursing the original fund for costs or losses. Farm organizations opposed it, on the ground that if prices on farm products were to be higher in America than the world price the losses on the sales of surpluses would impair the fund and make the relief only temporary. And it would tax the whole people for the benefit of one group. The farmer wants no subsidy.

Or if the fund was to be kept intact the plan could only operate when farm prices had reached so low a level that purchases would show a profit, or at least not show a loss. To have a government agency to buy his product at disastrously low levels will not help the farmer. What he needs is a better price, not another customer at a low price.

If we accept the McNary-Haugen bill without the free provision, do we not have in fact merely the Jardine bill under another name? And in what way can it possibly function to give agriculture a permanent principle of equality with American industry?

We sincerely want farm relief, but neither nor subsidy interests us greatly. And so far as we can see the farm relief bill without the fee principle becomes either the one or the other.

EQUALITY FOR AGRICULTURE THE NATION'S CONCERN

(Continued from page 1)

Congressman Fort of New Jersey (a recognized spokesman on farm matters for the administration in the lower House) on May 4, 1922, declared his opposition to farm legislation which would extend the benefits of the tariff to producers of exportable farm products on the ground that an increase in prices of farm products would mean an increase in wage scales, and "therefore the cost of production to the American manufacturer must go up while the foreign cost goes down and his world market is lost."

Senator Fess of Ohio, often referred to as the administration's senatorial spokesman, based his opposition on the ground that the proposed legislation would "feed at a lower cost the producer of competitive articles that come in competition with American products."

When a member of the House Committee on Agriculture asked Secretary Jardine if any plan he advocated would make the tariff on farm products effective, he replied: "No, I would forget about that."

What This Policy Means

If this policy of expanding industrial exports no matter at what cost to other groups, as laid down by administration spokesmen, means anything at all, it means the definite submergence of agriculture. This policy says in substance that American farmers must provide the food and raw materials for American industry and labor at prices no higher than foreign manufacturers and laborers pay. Why? In order that American industry may export manufactured goods in competition with Europe.

The administration doctrine is dangerous. Its vicious effect on agriculture needs no further explanation. But it is equally unwise and short-sighted as a policy for our industry and commerce.

The buying power of the farm population of America is incalculably more important to our manufacturers as a whole, even including those who manufacture for sale abroad, than an export market. The nation's economic position in the world does not require or even sanction stimulated industrial exports.

This is true of the nation as a whole. For the mid-West, West and South, the farm population is overwhelming. Their direct interest in industrial export trade is infinitesimal; their interest in agriculture's buying power is everything. There are some manufacturers in these districts who export some of their goods; but give up the idea of competing with the export market and a sustained home market built an agricultural prosperity, and they could not hesitate for a moment. I doubt if more than one per cent of the commerce of the Middle West and South, exclusive of agricultural products, goes into export, while less than five per cent of the total of the nation's manufactured commodities goes into export.

Program Helps Industry

From the standard of a few eastern industries the program has been perfect; it has retarded the inevitable deflation of wartime facilities to peacetime demand, and has afforded an opportunity for them to seek outlets in foreign fields for the product of their expanded facilities. From the standpoint of the nation, the program has resulted in ruin to untold millions of our finest people; in wholesale bankruptcy not only of farmers but of thousands of banks, merchants and manufacturers who rely primarily upon the farm market.

There are other consequences of this policy which should not be overlooked. The exporting manufacturers and the bankers who finance them inevitably will be driven to seek imports with which they may be paid for their exports. What course is open to them? The recurrence of such natural to press for increased imports of raw materials from the farms and food products to compete with the products of our own farms? The men and women who people the great surplus-producing agricultural states of the South, North and West have a common interest in farm protection and stability. This interest constitutes a force powerful enough in its political expression to compel the adoption of an intelligent national program aimed to repair and prevent the recurrence of such losses as have been visited on agriculture since the war.

What Can Be Done?

Some people have argued that these problems with which govern our sense of history and our consciousness of what goes on about us refutes such a contention.

John Stuart Mill was very definite in his conclusion:

"The distribution of wealth depends upon the laws and customs of society. The rules by which it is determined are what the opinions and feelings of the ruling portion of the community makes them, and are very different in different ages and countries; and might be still more different if mankind so chose."

(Book 2, Chapter 1, of his Political Economy.)

What can be done to restore agriculture and maintain it, is the outstanding problem—a challenge not only to the farm and business leadership, but to the statesmanship of the United States. It is a problem that cannot fail to unite far-sighted men in a common effort, no matter whether they come from north or south of the Mason and Dixon line.

Congress will be confronted this fall with the necessity of choosing from several alternative proposals which are reasonably assured of strong backing.

First, there is the proposal for effective surplus control financed by funds drawn from each marketed unit of the commodity—this is commonly known as the equalization fee and this principle was embodied in the McNary-Haugen bill, which passed both Houses of the last Congress.

What is McNary-Haugen Bill?

Briefly, this bill provided for a farmer nominated board, authorized,

upon petition of the growers of a majority of a particular commodity, to assist in removing, storing and disposing of the surplus portion of the commodity. This was to be accomplished by entering into agreements with co-operative associations or other agencies. The losses costs and charges were to be paid from the fund secured from the collection of the equalization fee. The principle is as old as government itself. It is that all beneficiaries of an undertaking in behalf of the public welfare shall contribute ratably toward paying the cost. It is new in name only. It is permissive legislation supplemented by sufficient government authority to enable the growers of a commodity to stabilize the price of that commodity by regulating its flow to market. The costs to be distributed as widely as the benefits, that is, over all the growers of the commodity.

Second, legislation may be urged to create a farm board similar in form to that established by the first proposal, but operating with funds appropriated by the government for loan purposes only. The theory of such a bill is that by loaning money to co-operative associations, they will be enabled to handle surpluses for the producers. The terms of the bill will permit only such operations as will result in profits, not losses, to the co-operative, hence to the loan fund. This was the central idea of the so-called Fess or Tinchin bill recently before Congress. The ineffectiveness of such a plan is shown by existing inequalities generally recognized among agricultural co-operatives and farm organizations.

The Subsidy Proposal

Third, there will be a proposal also similar in form to the first, but instead of financing the costs, losses and charges involved in handling surpluses to the advantage of agriculture, from the benefited agricultural industry, it will propose to draw the funds directly or indirectly from the Treasury of the United States. For such a proposal it will be urged: "There should not be any large loss to the Treasury, let the Treasury stand them." This appears to be the theory of the bill recently emanating from the Black Hills. Wheat co-operatives will recognize it as the bill decisively rejected by them recently when presented by Secretary Jardine in Kansas City and later in St. Paul.

In appraising this plan, it must be understood that marketing is a practical operation in the market places, and cannot be accomplished by the theorizing or talking about it. Proper control of market surpluses will require the assumption of larger risks than would be justified in the case of a private, profit-seeking enterprise. If this plan is operated to do what is claimed for it, it is a subsidy to agriculture, either open or disguised. This the farmers do not want. The very suggestion is distasteful to the American mind. It offers the spectacle of thirty millions of the people, when in need, reaching their hands into the Treasury, and suggests the time when other groups, in similar straits, may demand a dollar—and they will get it. If the precedent is once established, this plan compels an involuntary contribution or "equalization fee" paid by the whole people, since it draws from the public Treasury, as contrasted with the McNary-Haugen bill, which would secure contribution or "equalization fee" from the particular growers benefited.

Neither Would Be Effective

Neither the second nor third proposal offers any suggestion of making the tariff effective on surplus crops. No matter what may be claimed for them, neither would effectively operate to prevent violent price fluctuations. Neither would fix the responsibility of caring for surpluses upon those responsible for their creation. In them either the government or the progressive few who have joined co-operatives would be held for risks and losses incident to control of the surplus of all the growers—a responsibility in which all producers of a commodity should share equally with the responsible co-operatives frankly say they cannot undertake.

Either of the two last proposals would impose a penalty upon membership in co-operative associations, while the operation of the plan that compels all growers to share alike in the cost of surplus control could not fail to encourage the growth and effectiveness of co-operative associations.

Finally we have the proposal advanced at this meeting for a Federal Farm Board to be composed of the Secretaries of Commerce and Agriculture, the chairman of the Federal Farm Loan Board and four members appointed by the President, to study the farm question and to make recommendations to Congress. Farmers will repudiate such a proposal, since for some years they have waited for this leadership to bring forth some constructive suggestions and further because such a board would be wholly political in character subject always to the appointive power of a President. Farmers have sought to treat with the subject upon an economic basis and reluctantly have been compelled to consider political force.

It required five years to disclose the real issue which underlies the agricultural question.

Early in 1922 the cause of the farm depression was laid before the Harding administration.

Try to Prejudice People

During the long period intervening between 1922 and 1923 the opposition to effective relief for agriculture hurled epithets after epithets at the legislation advocated by farmers addressing the cause of inequality; the aim was to confuse the public mind and to prejudice the American people against any legislative proposal designed to give common justice to that great group of farm people while the process of industrialization went steadily on.

The progress that has been made toward political co-operation of the West and South toward a fair and constructive policy is the result of little more than two years effort.

requires no prophetic vision to forecast the scope and permanence which it will achieve in the future; and as this common effort moves forward in an intelligent program for a sounder agriculture, it is contributing to a stronger, more wholesome, national life.

The welfare of agriculture is of far more importance to the nation than is the welfare of any political party or of any individual; that the issue has become political because the administrations since the armistice have refused to recognize the economic injustice being done the farmer, and because the President vetoed a non-political remedy passed by a bi-partisan vote in Congress. If it results in sectional strife, the responsibility likewise rests with the administration and its agricultural advisors. There will be an equalization fee in the next Congress or an equalization fight in the next campaign. American farmers may be temporarily repulsed, but they will not permanently be subordinated to other groups in our organized society.

1922 REPORT OF THE FARMERS UNION LIVE STOCK COMMISSION

South St. Joseph, Mo.

Condensed Statement of the Business for the Year 1922

Total number of cars handled, including truck stuff and cars purchased	8,712
Number of head of livestock handled	540,756
Value of stock	\$14,280,638.48
Amount of commissions collected	159,470.31
Interest earned	2,614.01
Total earnings	\$162,084.44
Amount of operating expenses, including premiums on surety bonds, general insurance, and protection against stolen and mortgaged stock	80,440.93
Total amount of savings	\$81,643.51

Which is equivalent to fifty per cent of all commissions collected, and is to be returned to patrons, based on the amount of their individual business.

Average commissions collected on:

hogs and sheep per car	\$18.30
Average handling cost per car	9.23
Average savings per car	9.07

Savings to patrons since the organization of the live stock commission amounts to more than \$713,000.00.

This house has rounded out ten years of active service. It feels proud of the fact that the loyalty of the membership has made the above achievement possible, but its disappointment is keen in that much more has not been accomplished.

There are ten different state-wide farm organizations who are the owners of this house, and who are in absolute control. It has been made possible for the individual members of any and all of these organizations to profit by the savings of the commission, but only a small percentage of the entire membership has been loyal to itself. The state organizations are possibly in some measure responsible for this deplorable condition, in not being awake to the fact that the Farmers Union Live Stock Commission belongs to them, and is their own individual business, and in a measure, they have not put forth their best efforts for the benefit of the members of the business. To the individual member of the state-wide organizations, it might be said that their moral contract should bring every hoof of livestock which they produce to a co-operative marketing agency. A moral contract, as it represents the moral integrity and real worth of the individual. When a farmer goes into a co-operative organization, by that very act he makes a moral contract with his neighbors to stand with them, and this moral contract should be stronger than any written contract that can be drawn. When one so far goes back on his word, his solemn agreement with his neighbors, his promise to "stick" through thick and thin with the organization which was established solely to better his personal condition and that of his posterity, to that man is the legal contract applicable. If all farmers who join co-operative associations would take this moral contract seriously, then might it be truly said that there is no such word as "fail" in co-operation.

The menace to the co-operative movement comes not from without, but from within. More than one association has been driven on the rocks because of a traitor and a disturber in the midst.

What manner of man is it that can so far forget himself as to repudiate his only action that looks toward relief, and drops back into the old rut that can only lead to defeat?

To the loyal members who have made this business what it is, be all the praise, and to the disloyal members, be all the blame for the limit of its success.

C. F. EMMERT, Manager.

HERE'S HOW IT WORKED OUT TODAY

Kansas Hogman Declined Packer Bid and Bought His Hogs to Market

J. W. Canfield, of Oswego, Labette county, Kan., took his own chances in shipping his hogs to market after he had been bid \$8 a hundred by the packer buyer \$8 a hundred yesterday, and won. He sold the hogs at the top of the Kansas City market today, \$8.80, thus proving to his own satisfaction that it pays to ship to the open market, particularly on a rising market. He figures that his expenses of shipping and marketing will be fully covered by 50 cents a head.

Mr. Canfield says there are no longer any local buyers of hogs in southeastern Kansas, all the buyers now having arrangements to ship their hogs they buy direct to the packers. Farmers in that section are attributing the slump in the hog market to the influence of direct buying and many of them are ready to agree not to sell to buyers who ship direct. Leadership has not yet developed to proceed with organization work, but Mr. Canfield thinks that leadership is all that is lacking.

—K. C. Drivers Telegram, Jan. 3, 1923.

It never been discovered where the people who live beyond their incomes get the money.—The Ayshire Digest

STOCK MARKET

FARMERS UNION LIVE STOCK COMMISSION

Kansas City, Mo., January 26, 1923.

THE FRONT PAGE

Flaming youth now receives more newspaper notice than ever before. Most of this is criticism, and some of it deserved. But, the illustrious name of Charles Lindbergh also daily appears, and no doubt, this young man's deportment and behavior, together with his accomplishments, proves an excellent example which, we hope, may be emulated by many.

STEEPS. Market for the week 25 lower on medium weights and 50 lower on heavies. Bulk of medium weights, short feds, sold at 12:50 to 13:50, some lightweight short fed grades at 11:00 to 12:25 to feeder buyers. Best heavy steers sold at 15 to 15 cents, nothing strictly fancy here. Cattle weighing 1200 to 1300 lbs. brought 13:75 to 14:50. Few yearlings coming.

STOCKERS & FEEDERS.—This class 25 lower for the week. Not much stock coming, most of the receipts being feeders and cattle that had some grain.

COWS, HEIFERS, MIXED YEARLINGS & BULLS.—General butcher market has been a little uneven all week, but is closing about steady on everything except the better grades of cows which are about 50 lower. Cows that were selling at 9 to 10 cents are now bringing 8:50 to 9:50. Fair to good killing cows 7 to 8 cents, cutters 5:50 to 6:50, canners 5:00. Fat yearling heifers sell at 11 to 12 cents, while real lightweights will bring more. WE SOLD a load of 780 lb. heifers this week at 12:75. Choice heavy heifers sell nearly as high as yearlings. Stock cows and heifers very scarce and high. Good to choice whiteface stock cows 7 to 8 cents, reds 6:50 to 7:50; heifers fully 50 cents to \$1.00 higher than cows. Bulls about steady, good heavy bolognas up to 8 cents.

CALVES.—Veals \$2.00 higher for the week, top 13 cents, bulk 10 to 12 cents, commoner kinds down to 7 cents. Medium weight and heavy killing 10 to 11 cents. Good calves scarce and strong, weighing 11 to 12 cents for good grades, reds 9:50 to 10:50.

HOGS.—Lower markets, steady to 10 lower today than Wednesday's average. Packer and shipper top 8.10 on 190s to 230s. Bulk desirable 160s to 225s, 7:00 to 8:10. Packing sows 6:75 to 7:35. Culls 5:25 to 7:25. Stock pigs 7:00 to 7:50.

SHEEP & LAMBS.—Good fat lamb market all week until today when they sold 10 to 15 lower. Top today 13:85, which is 50 to 75 higher than week ago. Good native lambs up to 13:50, culls 10:50 to 10:50. Fat shorn lambs 11:50 to 11:75. Fat ewes 7:00 to 7:50. Culls, canners and bucks 3 to 5 cents.

FARMERS UNION LIVE STOCK COMMISSION

CATTLE

Cattle receipts continue light but the buyers are all trying to reduce prices on the better cattle. There are very few good cattle coming but most of the receipts are of the poorest quality. The market is very uneven and does not show as good a prospect as they usually do at this time of the year. The top on heavy cattle for the week was \$18:25; top on yearlings \$15:75. The bulk of the cattle coming are selling from 14:50 down. There is a good demand for all cattle selling around \$13:50 down as the feeder buyers and killers are out looking for this class of cattle. The butcher market has been a little slow on the better grades, but the local market is very active being about steady with a week ago. The bull market is about steady with a week ago. Calves up until today were higher but it looks as though calves are out of line with the price of the week.

Our cattle business continues to show an increase compared with the receipts of the yards. We would like to have an opportunity to demonstrate to you our ability to sell cattle. SHIP TO THE UNION.

HOGS

Considering the heavy receipts of hogs this week, prices have held up remarkably well, with the bulk of the hogs showing a loss of 25 to 35 per cent for the week. Today, with 65,000 hogs showing a loss of 25 to 35 per cent, the bulk of the good hogs sold from \$8:05 to \$8:20. The packers could have taken off 35c per cwt, had they been so inclined but they seem to be making money on hogs at present prices and they bought today's supply at a 5 to 10c decline.

Prospects for the near future do not look very encouraging. Unless the receipts are curtailed very materially, prices are not going to show any advance. It is up to you boys in the county to market your hogs in a more orderly manner, and of course this can only be done through organization. Our business is growing continually, and with your support we believe that we will be able to relieve this situation in the hog market.

Sheep

Farmers Union yesterday sold three loads of lambs for S. M. Burch, Calial, Mo., at \$14:50, this being the highest price paid for lambs since last May. Shippers paid up to \$14:95 for a few choice loads lambs but the packers stopped at \$14:00.

Today we have a run of 13,000 and the shippers are stepping out and buying lambs at \$14:35, but the packers are showing no sign of buying, trying to buy lambs lower. The dressed meat trade is in very bad condition but we look to see this cleared up by the end of this week and look for good strong prices from now on. If you are not getting on Friday, Sheep Letter and want it, let us know.

Ship to Farmers Union.

Boost Farmers Union.

FARMERS UNION LIVE STOCK COMMISSION

Union Stock Yards, Chicago, 10, Ill.

Thursday, Jan. 26, 1923.

Long service in this noble profession tends to make a man somewhat skeptical and we often think that the corn borer will not be eradicated until the Federal appropriations are.—Ohio State Journal.

Department of Practical Co-Operation

We are changing the policy of this department, beginning the first of the year. The Meeting Notices that have appeared here to fore were 100% locals for 1922. At this time we are showing only those that are 100% for 1927. All 100% locals for 1927 that wish their meeting notice to be published will receive this service free of charge. Locals that are not paid up in full but want their meeting notice published can have space in this department for One Cent per word per week.

ALLEN COUNTY

FARLEIGH LOCAL NO. 211
Meets the second and fourth Monday of each month. Glen Thompson, Sec.

GOLDEN VALLEY LOCAL NO. 2167
Meets the first and third Wednesday of each month. H. V. Adams, Sec.

LIBERTY LOCAL NO. 2148
Meets the second and fourth Friday of each month. Mrs. M. A. Fender, Sec.

SILVER LEAF LOCAL NO. 2156
Meets the 2nd and 4th Wednesday of each month. Mrs. C. C. Parish, Sec.

DIAMOND LOCAL NO. 2081
Meets the second and fourth Friday of each month. Mrs. J. W. Page, Sec.

ALLEN CENTER LOCAL NO. 2155
Meets the first and third Tuesday of each month. Mrs. J. W. Page, Sec.

FAIRVIEW LOCAL NO. 2154
Meets the first and third Wednesday nights of each month. Mrs. Chas. L. Stewart, Sec.

ANDERSON COUNTY

LIZTOWN LOCAL NO. 2064
Meets every second and fourth Wednesday of each month. Mrs. A. W. Williams, Sec.

CHASE COUNTY

COTTONWOOD VALLEY LOCAL NO. 1833
Meets the 2nd and 4th Wednesday of each month. J. C. Graham, Sec.

CHESTER COUNTY

NEUTRAL LOCAL NO. 2108
Meets the first Tuesday of each month. C. A. Thomson, Sec.

CLAY COUNTY

FOUR MILE LOCAL NO. 1128
Meets on the first Tuesday of each month. G. W. Tomlinson, Sec.

COMBEE COUNTY

SUNNYSIDE LOCAL NO. 2144
Meets on the second Wednesday of each month. Mrs. H. B. Lusk, Sec.

CRAWFORD COUNTY

BEAVER CREEK LOCAL NO. 1558
Meets the first and third Monday nights of each month. Mrs. Don Berrie, Sec.

DOUGLAS COUNTY

CARGY LOCAL NO. 2139
Meets the 1st and 3rd Thursday of each month. R. E. Titcher, Sec.

FRANKLIN LOCAL NO. 1832
Meets the first Friday of each month. Mrs. Frank Topping, Sec.

ELLISWORTH COUNTY

ADVANCE LOCAL NO. 1889
Meets on the first Monday of each month. F. E. Svolyn, Sec.

LIBERTY LOCAL NO. 1855
Meets every first and third Monday of each month. Ed Mog. Sec.

TRIVOLI LOCAL NO. 107
Meets the first Monday evening in each month. W. H. Fleming, Sec.

ELIOT COUNTY

HAYS LOCAL NO. 864
Meets the first Friday in each month, alternating Pleasant Hill at 7:30 in the evening with Hays Court House at 8:00 in the afternoon. Frank B. Pfeiffer, Sec.

EXCELSIOR LOCAL NO. 608
Meets the first and third Monday of each month. Joseph L. Weber, Sec.

PLEASANT VALLEY LOCAL NO. 1804
Meets the first and third Monday of each month. Frank Reimeyer, Sec.

GREENWOOD COUNTY

NEAL LOCAL NO. 1313
Meets the second and fourth Friday of each month. J. C. Graham, Sec.

SOUTH VERDIGRIS LOCAL 1498
Meets on Friday night every two weeks. H. L. Soule, Sec.

GOVE COUNTY

PARK LOCAL NO. 909
Meets the last Saturday of each month. Jas. Hein, Sec.

JEWELL COUNTY

PLEASANT VALLEY LOCAL NO. 1309
Meets the first and third Wednesday of each month. Wm. T. Flinn, Sec.

JOHNSON COUNTY

SHARON LOCAL NO. 2144
Meets the last Friday evening of each month. Mrs. Gussie K. DeVault, Sec.

LYNN COUNTY

BUCKEYE LOCAL NO. 2072
Meets the first Wednesday night of each month. Roy Edmonds, Sec.

WHEAT STRAW TOO VALUABLE TO BURN

"The real value of wheat straw is not what it is worth on the market or for feeding live stock, but what it is worth in the form of fertility and humus, when returned to the soil," says H. M. Bainer, director of the Southwestern Wheat Improvement Association. Continuing, he says, "Much of our farm land is deficient

pound of wheat straw or stubble that in humus and fertility and every is burned makes this condition worse.

"Analysis of cultivated soils in the Southwest indicates that as much as one-third of the original nitrogen and one-half of the original organic matter has already been lost. Experimental data indicate that an average wheat crop removes from each acre of soil, approximately twenty

pounds of nitrogen, eighteen pounds of phosphoric acid and ten pounds of potash. To replace this fertility, in the form of a commercial fertilizer, would cost something like \$4.50 an acre. The fertility represented in returning the straw to the soil is probably worth \$1 an acre, but the greatest value will come from the humus it will add.

"For best results, each crop of wheat should be worked into the soil right away, but if this cannot be done, it should be rotted and returned to the soil in the form of manure, later. The harvester-thresher has solved the straw problem, and it has been fairly well solved by the header. Bundle straw should be stacked in fed lots, where it can be fed and tramping by the stock will assist in converting it into manure. Such straw as cannot be handled through the feed lot or spread over the fields should be piled in out-of-the-way places, with lots of surface exposure, where it can remain until rotted and is ready to be hauled out as manure.

"A soil that is deficient in humus is also deficient in fertility. Humus adds life to a soil, it prevents puddling, cracking, baking and blowing. Humus improves the physical condition of the soil making it mellow, friable and easier to cultivate. It also assists in holding moisture, thus helping to carry crops through periods of drought."

TWO LOCALS IN JOINT SESSION RESOLVE

Joint meeting of Farmers Union Moon Local No. 2114 and the Hustler's Union club Thursday, Jan. 23.

The members of Moore Local No. 2114 held their regular monthly business meeting followed by a social held jointly with the Hustler's Union.

After a fine program prepared by the latter everyone partook of a tasty luncheon, consisting of a bowl of chili, crackers and pickles topped off with cake and coffee.

There was much talk and dissatisfaction expressed on slowness in sentencing, the paroling and the wholesale pardoning of criminals. This led to the following resolutions:

We, the members of Moore Local No. 2114 and Hustler's Union met in joint session resolve that we are opposed to the

Too free use of the power of pardon and parole as exercised by the judges and governor

To the communiting of sentences of criminals

To the slowness of sentencing criminals after trial.

Signed

C. W. Horak,
C. W. Moore,
M. L. Pressnall,
Committee.

The Chinese seems to be solving the communist problem with the aid of firing squad. If the ammunition holds out, the experiment ought to prove a success.—Des Moines Register.

HONOR ROLL

CLAY COUNTY

Swanson Local No. 1191

ELLISWORTH COUNTY

Prairie Star 644

Ash Creek 1388

Avon 1382

GREENWOOD COUNTY

Neal Local No. 1313

June 1804

JEFFERSON COUNTY

Greenville 2023

JEWELL COUNTY

Pleasant Valley

Local No. 1313

Amy Local No. 1564

LINCOLN COUNTY

Dew 43

LYON COUNTY

Admire 1255

MAHARASHTRA COUNTY

Dow Local No. 858

NEMAH COUNTY

Korher 91

OSBORNE COUNTY

Victor Local No. 775

REPUBLIC COUNTY

Three Corners 769

RUSSELL COUNTY

Sumner Local No. 1745

PILEY COUNTY

Rock Island Local No. 1199

Lee 154

WABANUSSE COUNTY

Kaw Valley Local No. 1033

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Cedar Creek 1168

the history of the past that would indicate that one class of people would do that, say nothing about the consumers of the United States doing such a thing, I will certainly appreciate it if you will advise me once the chapter and verse where such an act is of record, for I have certainly missed it, in reading my history.

The Farmers Union plan of cost of production plus a profit has very much greater possibilities to my mind, than any such plan as the present program as Mr. Schmitt suggests. He has "rotten impatient because the advancement which we have sought has not been brought about in a day, which was hardly to be expected when we consider that the farming class of people up until recent times were compelled to live isolated lives. And it is not after all astonishing that they have not become class conscious as rapidly as some other classes who lived in towns and cities and had the examples of co-operation before them every day, long before the farmer had any means of transportation and communication, which permitted him to get away from home occasionally or keep posted on current events.

Just give us a little time, Roy. We have lost some members in the last few years, we will admit. However, as you say, they are beginning to come back, and while our business associations are many of them not properly financed and have their difficulties, yet most of them now have a real system of recovery, their financial status has improved somewhat in the last five years, and the members that we have left are the loyal ones that were in, and the ones that are coming in now are coming in realizing what the benefits to be derived are, besides we have a leadership both loyal and capable. So be patient, Roy, and let us work harder on the same and sound program which we now have under way. If the farmers are so much brighter than the farmer it may be that they will learn without our help.—Clifford Miller.

Beattie, Kans., Jan. 20, 1923

Editor of Farmers Union,
Dear Sir:—

Just a few lines, not only the farmers and business men know there is something wrong with our hog prices. It seems like every one is laying the blame on direct buyers. I just received Capper's Weekly and see where he sees the farmers ilk and has a new bill which I would like to see published in our Union papers. Also I see in our paper where Chief Market Specialist W. C. Davis says co-operation means more to the farmers than ever before, also Secretary Daniels' diagnosis agricultural ills and raises co-operative efforts. All that gentleman is looking for an argument for I can hardly believe that he is really serious.

I take it from his article that he thinks that if the Farmers organizations were to do an about face and cease making any effort to find out the underlying difficulties of the farming business and to advise their members of the same and to point out remedies for them, but would put in their time and spend their money advising the consuming public of our plight, that said public would appreciate our efforts along that line to the extent that they would at once voluntarily pay us more for our bread as a mark of that appreciation. Now Roy, if there is anything in