

Mr. Harding has released to the public the address he had planned to deliver at San Francisco, a reiteration of the views he expressed at St. Louis and, in some measure, a reply to those who have opposed his plans then outlined. It is, as have been all his addresses, a calm, dispassionate discussion of the question of peaceful relations with all the world in its broadest sense. He specifically disclaims the imputed desire to popularize himself by advocating peace through a world court, but plainly states that he conceives it to be his duty as president of the United States to advance the welfare of his country, and believing that service can well be done through ensuring a future of tranquil and harmonious intercourse with all nations, he presses for his world court idea.

As a paramount reason for desiring to adopt some method for settling international disputes by other means than war, Mr. Harding says:
"Nations ought no more need resort to force in the settlement of their disputes or differences than do men in this enlightened day. Out of this conviction, out of my belief in a penitent world craving for the agencies of peace, out of the inevitable presidential contact with the world war havoc and devastation and the measureless sorrow which attended and has followed, I would be insensible to duty and violate all the sentiments of my heart and all my convictions if I failed to urge American support of the permanent court of international justice."
"I do not know that such a court will be unfeeling in the avoidance of war, but I know it is a step in the right direction, and will prove an advance toward international peace for which the reflective conscience of mankind is calling."

The president recapitulates what has been done by America to further the interest of peace in the world; the work of Woodrow Wilson at Paris, the settlement of the British and Finland debate, the conference through which the Tacna-Arica dispute was settled between Chile, Peru and Bolivia, and the crowning triumph of all modern diplomatic undertakings, the limitation of armaments conference. American influence at Lausanne also is referred to as helpful in bringing peace.

All of these steps, the president says, are further indications of the growing sentiment in favor of the sacredness of international obligations. Senators who oppose his plans contend for the preservation of the independence of the United States, its continued freedom from any form of alliance with other nations. Mr. Harding himself, when a senator, advocated earnestly the reservations to the Treaty of Versailles, as affecting the League of Nations, and supported his views with his vote. Nothing in his present or past utterances as president suggests that he has changed his mind on this point, but he does want something done to prevent war if possible.

As to the "chinquero" of the United States, such a thing is not thought of. Our country has never waged an aggressive war; our people have only taken up arms in defense of their liberties and their government. No sentiment for war exists in this country, but reasonable readiness for defense is but the exercise of prudence. And when a man powerful enough to do combat in support of his contentions goes into court, quietly to submit to the decrees of justice, he shows due regard for his own as well as for the rights of others. That is all the president has in mind in his world court plan. The United States is able to defend its rights, but is willing to submit her claims to examination and righteous judgment.

WARMING UP THE ORATORS.

Everybody seems to be making some use of the summer before the next national campaign. All over the country echoes are heard of an expanding or collapsing boom for some favored son or recognized statesman, and the sachems and sagamores of all the tribes are busy concocting the medicine to be brewed come June, 1924. Now we discover by reading the New York Sunday Times that the rattles and the war drums are being tested and tuned so that the dance will not be asked to go on without the inspiration to be provided by them.

A special writer has surveyed the field, and tells us that we are to have a revival of oratory at the next national conventions. He reviews the efforts at Chicago and San Francisco in 1920, and finds them to be sadly lacking in the inspirational qualities that used to mark such proceedings. Ingersoll's effort at Cincinnati on behalf of Blaine is set up as an example of what such speeches should be. Just why he did not give space to Mr. Bryan's famous outburst at Chicago in 1896 is not clear, but that speech never was surpassed in its effect. It swept the convention from its moorings, nominated the man who made it, and wrote a new chapter of history in the United States.

Unless the temper of the American people undergoes a distinct and radical change between now and convention time, the present aspirants for oratorical distinction will do well to study the art of making it snappy. The four-minute talker is the popular one at a political or any other sort of convention these days, and leave to print is of no service when one is making a nominating speech.

KNOWS WHAT IS WANTED.

One of the first duties of a good congressman is to know what the people of his district want. Not that the service is to be limited to that, but he will get along better and feel easier in his job if he has the first hand information that will guide him in looking after the welfare of the section he particularly represents. When Bob Simmons goes down to Washington in December, if not before, he will be prepared. He has just completed a 1,500-mile tour of his district, made in a "tin lizzie," for the purpose of getting a line on what was wanted. Bob made a trip all over the district last fall, but he was in quest of votes then, and did not have too much time to devote to other matters. He did not make many promises, but one he did give out was that he would do his best for the benefit of the Big Sixth. He got the votes, and his tour just over may be taken as proof that he proposes to make good on his campaign promise.

Definite announcement of Oscar Underwood as a candidate may excite some interest in democratic circles, but will not draw public attention from the pennant races now in progress.

WHO CUT THE TAX RATE?

State Tax Commissioner Smith, announcing the levy for 1923, gives vent to the following statement: "Governor Bryan's proposal to reduce state taxes has been fulfilled. The people of the state will be charged with approximately \$1,000,000 less in 1923 than in 1922. To be exact, the reduction amounts to \$935,597."

On the surface it appears as if the governor were making good on his promises, but let us look just a little closer. We have already pointed out that a considerable part of the 3-10ths of 1 mill reduction achieved is due to the fact that no levy is made for the soldiers' relief fund this year. The rest is due entirely to the increase of \$11,473,905 in the total assessed valuation of the property subject to tax in the state. How can any credit for this be given to Governor Bryan, or anyone associated with him in the state administration?

A much more interesting fact is concealed in the figures given out by Commissioner Smith. In reporting an increase of \$11,473,905 in the total valuation of the state, he neglects to explain that in Douglas county alone the assessed valuation was increased by \$11,893,554, or almost \$420,000 more than the total increase reported for the state. Lancaster county also reports an increase of more than a million, which shows that at least \$1,500,000 has been cut off somewhere else in Nebraska. Instead of credit going to the democratic governor and his board, relief from taxation is properly due to the efforts of republican assessors in two republican counties.

Furthermore, Commissioner Smith sets out that the amount of revenue to be collected through taxation this year will be \$935,527 less than for 1922. As the .028 mills for the soldiers' relief fund, now dropped, would produce on the 1923 valuation \$898,890, all but \$36,437 of the boasted saving is accounted for by that fact alone.

If the assessors of Douglas and Lancaster counties had followed the example of those in other parts of the state, instead of a reduction, the levy for state purposes would have been increased.

As it is, the only reduction, apparent or otherwise, is due to the fact that 0.028 of the 3-10ths of a mill cut off was because the levy for the soldiers' relief expired by law. In figures, an increase of nearly \$12,000,000 in Douglas and more than \$1,000,000 in Lancaster counties produced a total increase in the state roll of less than \$11,500,000 and a cut in the general fund levy of 0.272 mills.

Taxpayers will surely see through this thin pretense of the governor at redeeming his promise to cut taxes.

ARMS AND THE TYPEWRITER.

Sleeveless dresses may not have been on view in Omaha when the inquiry recently was made, but they are coming into sight now. That is, the arms are on exhibition, not the sleeves. Whether their present mood will lead the ladies to adopt this new style generally is something only the girls can answer, and they probably will do in their own way.

Then will come the other question: Will any Omaha employers follow the lead of the Chicago Federal Reserve bank, and forbid the bare arm and bobbed hair? Probably not, for very few Omaha employers seek their publicity in that fashion. If the girl can go about her work and attend to the duties entrusted to her with her sleeves rolled up to the elbow or above, she probably can do the same work just as well with the sleeves entirely removed. Nor did the length of their tresses ever materially add to the ability of the girls at whatever work they undertook. Most of the young women employed in offices nowadays take themselves and their work seriously. Whether they must have the employment or not, they are of the opinion that they are helping to do the world's work, and they want to be recognized for their ability rather than for any other reason.

The office "vamp" exists chiefly in the thrillers, and seldom is found in real life. Good looks are no handicap, and the presence of a pretty girl in a working force is a refreshing note; but she is not there solely because she is beautiful. Employers know this, and most of them are human enough to understand also that the routine of a modern counting room is drab enough, without adding to its dreary monotony by rules that require the workers to wear garments that depress the mind while they obscure the body.

Books to the number of 860,000, used in army recreational and base work in France, are about to be disposed of in Brooklyn. Why not box them up and save them for the next war? They will be about ripe by that time.

A failed state bank's assets sold at auction for nearly enough to recompense the guaranty fund, which might lead to the conclusion that the bank was not in such bad shape when it closed its doors.

Luis Angel Firpo says he would prefer to postpone his meeting with Shipbuilder Dempsey for one year. Luis may be forgotten by that time.

If President Harding's transport had to run down a sister ship, the choice might have been made of some of the navy can spare.

Farmers stacking their wheat are showing good judgment, if they are putting on tops that will shed water.

The man who drove his auto into a police car showed bad judgment as well as poor control.

Mr. Ford is not the only citizen who regards his presidential boom as silly.

"Buy and hold" is the short version of a grand slogan.

Homespun Verse
—By Omaha's Own Poet—
Robert Worthington Davis

WONDERMENT.
I wonder where the hunting sleeps
When night is robed in haze;
I wonder where the tortoise creeps
To spend his parting days.
I wonder what the zephyrs say—
The songs their whispers form,
I wonder while the tempests away
Before the wrathful storm.
I wonder what the clouds express
In silence as they roam
Across the skies in gala dress
Beneath the blue of home.
I wonder what the flowers give
In wealth of words, and I
Can merely wonder while I live,
And wonder when I die.
We wonder oft; we wonder long,
And knowledge is so small,
That life is one incessant song
Of wonder to us all.



Political conditions in 1924 resembled so strongly those of today that Edward Rosewater and published on them a pamphlet which was written yesterday, so far as its contents and conjectures are concerned.

"CAN THEY UNITE?"

"The proposition to unite all the industrial and producing elements of the country into one homogeneous cooperative body is by no means novel or startling. Ambitious politicians and theoretical economists have very frequently attempted to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes.

Some years ago the agitators of the political labor reform party endeavored to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes. The idea of uniting all the industrial and producing elements of the country into one homogeneous cooperative body is by no means novel or startling. Ambitious politicians and theoretical economists have very frequently attempted to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes.

"FROM STATE AND NATION"

Editorials from other newspapers.

Agriculture in 1922.
From the Topeka Capital.

Secretary Wallace's yearbook of agriculture for 1922 is not several months earlier than usual this year, an evidence of the greater efficiency and hustling introduced into this department of the government under the present alert secretary. The yearbook is voluminous, more than 1,000 pages and tells the story of agriculture for 1922, with comparisons with other years in great fullness.

Prices of farm products on the whole were considerably higher in 1922 than in 1921, and while it is true as stated in this report that prices of commodities which the farmer produces were also higher and the advance was even greater even in farm prices, so that the farmer was relatively in that respect worse off rather than better, yet in practical effect, yet was the whole farm price level was better off, since he was economizing rigidly and not buying other commodities beyond urgent necessities. Owing to extra large yields and better prices therefore the farmer's income was some 20 percent more than a billion dollars more in money coming in, and he was able to reduce his floating debt. But his expenses were heavy, there was little profit, and the farmer's income was not so large as it appeared to be. He is still not in condition to pay his debts, and he is looking for farm machinery, fertilizers and other proper necessities. He is lagging behind the procession, but he is peering along with a courage and optimism which is worthy of agriculture praises in fit terms.

"THE PEOPLE'S VOICE"

Editorial from readers of The Morning Bee. Readers of The Morning Bee are invited to contribute to the expression of public interest.

How to Help the Farmer.
Holdrege, Neb.—To the Editor of The Omaha Bee: I notice in today's paper (Sunday) you have a front page editorial address to the railroad executives, appealing for a cut of 25 per cent in freight rates for the movement of wheat as an emergency measure to help the farmer. Help for the farmer is certainly a very commendable thing and is deserving of general support from everyone. Your editorial states that in the past the railroads have always helped generously in times of stress and calamity. I have no doubt that in this case the railroads would be very willing to help out, but why ask them to do it?

A statement recently issued by the Department of Agriculture shows the total freight charges paid on freight products in 1922 were only 4 per cent of their value. The American Farm Bureau Federation has estimated that for machinery, clothing, house furnishing and other commodities the farmer spends about \$7,000,000,000. A 2 per cent reduction on the price of these things would mean more than a 25 per cent reduction on all their products, while you are only asking a reduction of 25 per cent on everything the farmer shipped. It would only reduce their total expenditures about 1 1/2 per cent.

I believe the people of this country realize that as a class the farmers are in sore straits, for it seems that most everything they use is high in price while their products are low. We can't allow this to go on indefinitely or we are liable to find a severe shortage in food staring us in the face. We have in the past been faced with transportation shortages, with all its inconveniences but a food shortage would hit us where we live. By asking the railroads to share all the burden of rehabilitating the farmer, by so doing we would have the railroads in the same fix the farmers are now placed. Then we have the same vicious circle started over again, the farmer prosperous with a big crop on hand, but the railroads too poor to provide the proper transportation, and then the farmer with the big crop and no means of getting to market has to borrow and pay high interest till he is in the same fix before the rates were reduced. If the farmer needs help and it is conceded that he does, let's all help him. Everyone who sells anything to a farmer give him a reduction of 5 per cent. This would include the newspapers, telephones, in fact let all who have anything to do with a farmer that costs him money waive a certain reduction for a designated period, and I believe you will find it will enable him to get on his feet quicker than any reduction of rates by the railroads if they were to transfer his products at a third of the going rate, and it would not cost anyone enough to hurt their business.

After it's all said, don't you think it's just a little unreasonable for you to ask the railroads alone to shoulder the burden? While all the rest of us are feeling sorry for his condition, we are willing to pass the "back" to the extent of trying to persuade someone else to do it.

A general permanent reduction of prices in commodities that farmers use would go further toward stabilizing the agriculture industry than any temporary price setting the government could establish. You have started a "buy some wheat" movement which is very commendable and will help out temporarily. I say temporarily because it's got to be put back on the market some time, but a "reduce the cost to farmer" movement would be far more beneficial in the long run.

L. F. JAGGER,
319 Blaine Street.

"CAN THEY UNITE?"

"The proposition to unite all the industrial and producing elements of the country into one homogeneous cooperative body is by no means novel or startling. Ambitious politicians and theoretical economists have very frequently attempted to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes.

Some years ago the agitators of the political labor reform party endeavored to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes. The idea of uniting all the industrial and producing elements of the country into one homogeneous cooperative body is by no means novel or startling. Ambitious politicians and theoretical economists have very frequently attempted to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes.

"FROM STATE AND NATION"

Editorials from other newspapers.

Agriculture in 1922.
From the Topeka Capital.

Secretary Wallace's yearbook of agriculture for 1922 is not several months earlier than usual this year, an evidence of the greater efficiency and hustling introduced into this department of the government under the present alert secretary. The yearbook is voluminous, more than 1,000 pages and tells the story of agriculture for 1922, with comparisons with other years in great fullness.

Prices of farm products on the whole were considerably higher in 1922 than in 1921, and while it is true as stated in this report that prices of commodities which the farmer produces were also higher and the advance was even greater even in farm prices, so that the farmer was relatively in that respect worse off rather than better, yet in practical effect, yet was the whole farm price level was better off, since he was economizing rigidly and not buying other commodities beyond urgent necessities. Owing to extra large yields and better prices therefore the farmer's income was some 20 percent more than a billion dollars more in money coming in, and he was able to reduce his floating debt. But his expenses were heavy, there was little profit, and the farmer's income was not so large as it appeared to be. He is still not in condition to pay his debts, and he is looking for farm machinery, fertilizers and other proper necessities. He is lagging behind the procession, but he is peering along with a courage and optimism which is worthy of agriculture praises in fit terms.

"THE PEOPLE'S VOICE"

Editorial from readers of The Morning Bee. Readers of The Morning Bee are invited to contribute to the expression of public interest.

How to Help the Farmer.
Holdrege, Neb.—To the Editor of The Omaha Bee: I notice in today's paper (Sunday) you have a front page editorial address to the railroad executives, appealing for a cut of 25 per cent in freight rates for the movement of wheat as an emergency measure to help the farmer. Help for the farmer is certainly a very commendable thing and is deserving of general support from everyone. Your editorial states that in the past the railroads have always helped generously in times of stress and calamity. I have no doubt that in this case the railroads would be very willing to help out, but why ask them to do it?

A statement recently issued by the Department of Agriculture shows the total freight charges paid on freight products in 1922 were only 4 per cent of their value. The American Farm Bureau Federation has estimated that for machinery, clothing, house furnishing and other commodities the farmer spends about \$7,000,000,000. A 2 per cent reduction on the price of these things would mean more than a 25 per cent reduction on all their products, while you are only asking a reduction of 25 per cent on everything the farmer shipped. It would only reduce their total expenditures about 1 1/2 per cent.

I believe the people of this country realize that as a class the farmers are in sore straits, for it seems that most everything they use is high in price while their products are low. We can't allow this to go on indefinitely or we are liable to find a severe shortage in food staring us in the face. We have in the past been faced with transportation shortages, with all its inconveniences but a food shortage would hit us where we live. By asking the railroads to share all the burden of rehabilitating the farmer, by so doing we would have the railroads in the same fix the farmers are now placed. Then we have the same vicious circle started over again, the farmer prosperous with a big crop on hand, but the railroads too poor to provide the proper transportation, and then the farmer with the big crop and no means of getting to market has to borrow and pay high interest till he is in the same fix before the rates were reduced. If the farmer needs help and it is conceded that he does, let's all help him. Everyone who sells anything to a farmer give him a reduction of 5 per cent. This would include the newspapers, telephones, in fact let all who have anything to do with a farmer that costs him money waive a certain reduction for a designated period, and I believe you will find it will enable him to get on his feet quicker than any reduction of rates by the railroads if they were to transfer his products at a third of the going rate, and it would not cost anyone enough to hurt their business.

After it's all said, don't you think it's just a little unreasonable for you to ask the railroads alone to shoulder the burden? While all the rest of us are feeling sorry for his condition, we are willing to pass the "back" to the extent of trying to persuade someone else to do it.

A general permanent reduction of prices in commodities that farmers use would go further toward stabilizing the agriculture industry than any temporary price setting the government could establish. You have started a "buy some wheat" movement which is very commendable and will help out temporarily. I say temporarily because it's got to be put back on the market some time, but a "reduce the cost to farmer" movement would be far more beneficial in the long run.

L. F. JAGGER,
319 Blaine Street.

"CAN THEY UNITE?"

"The proposition to unite all the industrial and producing elements of the country into one homogeneous cooperative body is by no means novel or startling. Ambitious politicians and theoretical economists have very frequently attempted to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes.

Some years ago the agitators of the political labor reform party endeavored to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes. The idea of uniting all the industrial and producing elements of the country into one homogeneous cooperative body is by no means novel or startling. Ambitious politicians and theoretical economists have very frequently attempted to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes.

"FROM STATE AND NATION"

Editorials from other newspapers.

Agriculture in 1922.
From the Topeka Capital.

Secretary Wallace's yearbook of agriculture for 1922 is not several months earlier than usual this year, an evidence of the greater efficiency and hustling introduced into this department of the government under the present alert secretary. The yearbook is voluminous, more than 1,000 pages and tells the story of agriculture for 1922, with comparisons with other years in great fullness.

Prices of farm products on the whole were considerably higher in 1922 than in 1921, and while it is true as stated in this report that prices of commodities which the farmer produces were also higher and the advance was even greater even in farm prices, so that the farmer was relatively in that respect worse off rather than better, yet in practical effect, yet was the whole farm price level was better off, since he was economizing rigidly and not buying other commodities beyond urgent necessities. Owing to extra large yields and better prices therefore the farmer's income was some 20 percent more than a billion dollars more in money coming in, and he was able to reduce his floating debt. But his expenses were heavy, there was little profit, and the farmer's income was not so large as it appeared to be. He is still not in condition to pay his debts, and he is looking for farm machinery, fertilizers and other proper necessities. He is lagging behind the procession, but he is peering along with a courage and optimism which is worthy of agriculture praises in fit terms.

"THE PEOPLE'S VOICE"

Editorial from readers of The Morning Bee. Readers of The Morning Bee are invited to contribute to the expression of public interest.

How to Help the Farmer.
Holdrege, Neb.—To the Editor of The Omaha Bee: I notice in today's paper (Sunday) you have a front page editorial address to the railroad executives, appealing for a cut of 25 per cent in freight rates for the movement of wheat as an emergency measure to help the farmer. Help for the farmer is certainly a very commendable thing and is deserving of general support from everyone. Your editorial states that in the past the railroads have always helped generously in times of stress and calamity. I have no doubt that in this case the railroads would be very willing to help out, but why ask them to do it?

A statement recently issued by the Department of Agriculture shows the total freight charges paid on freight products in 1922 were only 4 per cent of their value. The American Farm Bureau Federation has estimated that for machinery, clothing, house furnishing and other commodities the farmer spends about \$7,000,000,000. A 2 per cent reduction on the price of these things would mean more than a 25 per cent reduction on all their products, while you are only asking a reduction of 25 per cent on everything the farmer shipped. It would only reduce their total expenditures about 1 1/2 per cent.

I believe the people of this country realize that as a class the farmers are in sore straits, for it seems that most everything they use is high in price while their products are low. We can't allow this to go on indefinitely or we are liable to find a severe shortage in food staring us in the face. We have in the past been faced with transportation shortages, with all its inconveniences but a food shortage would hit us where we live. By asking the railroads to share all the burden of rehabilitating the farmer, by so doing we would have the railroads in the same fix the farmers are now placed. Then we have the same vicious circle started over again, the farmer prosperous with a big crop on hand, but the railroads too poor to provide the proper transportation, and then the farmer with the big crop and no means of getting to market has to borrow and pay high interest till he is in the same fix before the rates were reduced. If the farmer needs help and it is conceded that he does, let's all help him. Everyone who sells anything to a farmer give him a reduction of 5 per cent. This would include the newspapers, telephones, in fact let all who have anything to do with a farmer that costs him money waive a certain reduction for a designated period, and I believe you will find it will enable him to get on his feet quicker than any reduction of rates by the railroads if they were to transfer his products at a third of the going rate, and it would not cost anyone enough to hurt their business.

After it's all said, don't you think it's just a little unreasonable for you to ask the railroads alone to shoulder the burden? While all the rest of us are feeling sorry for his condition, we are willing to pass the "back" to the extent of trying to persuade someone else to do it.

A general permanent reduction of prices in commodities that farmers use would go further toward stabilizing the agriculture industry than any temporary price setting the government could establish. You have started a "buy some wheat" movement which is very commendable and will help out temporarily. I say temporarily because it's got to be put back on the market some time, but a "reduce the cost to farmer" movement would be far more beneficial in the long run.

L. F. JAGGER,
319 Blaine Street.

"CAN THEY UNITE?"

"The proposition to unite all the industrial and producing elements of the country into one homogeneous cooperative body is by no means novel or startling. Ambitious politicians and theoretical economists have very frequently attempted to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes.

Some years ago the agitators of the political labor reform party endeavored to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes. The idea of uniting all the industrial and producing elements of the country into one homogeneous cooperative body is by no means novel or startling. Ambitious politicians and theoretical economists have very frequently attempted to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes.

NET AVERAGE CIRCULATION

for June, 1923, of
THE OMAHA BEE
Daily 72,799
Sunday 77,783

Does not include papers, circulars, overruns, samples or returned special printing and includes no special sales.

B. BREWER, Gen. Mgr.
V. A. BRIDGE, Cir. Mgr.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of July, 1923.
W. H. QUIGLEY,
Notary Public.

"CAN THEY UNITE?"

"The proposition to unite all the industrial and producing elements of the country into one homogeneous cooperative body is by no means novel or startling. Ambitious politicians and theoretical economists have very frequently attempted to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes.

Some years ago the agitators of the political labor reform party endeavored to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes. The idea of uniting all the industrial and producing elements of the country into one homogeneous cooperative body is by no means novel or startling. Ambitious politicians and theoretical economists have very frequently attempted to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes.

"FROM STATE AND NATION"

Editorials from other newspapers.

Agriculture in 1922.
From the Topeka Capital.

Secretary Wallace's yearbook of agriculture for 1922 is not several months earlier than usual this year, an evidence of the greater efficiency and hustling introduced into this department of the government under the present alert secretary. The yearbook is voluminous, more than 1,000 pages and tells the story of agriculture for 1922, with comparisons with other years in great fullness.

Prices of farm products on the whole were considerably higher in 1922 than in 1921, and while it is true as stated in this report that prices of commodities which the farmer produces were also higher and the advance was even greater even in farm prices, so that the farmer was relatively in that respect worse off rather than better, yet in practical effect, yet was the whole farm price level was better off, since he was economizing rigidly and not buying other commodities beyond urgent necessities. Owing to extra large yields and better prices therefore the farmer's income was some 20 percent more than a billion dollars more in money coming in, and he was able to reduce his floating debt. But his expenses were heavy, there was little profit, and the farmer's income was not so large as it appeared to be. He is still not in condition to pay his debts, and he is looking for farm machinery, fertilizers and other proper necessities. He is lagging behind the procession, but he is peering along with a courage and optimism which is worthy of agriculture praises in fit terms.

"THE PEOPLE'S VOICE"

Editorial from readers of The Morning Bee. Readers of The Morning Bee are invited to contribute to the expression of public interest.

How to Help the Farmer.
Holdrege, Neb.—To the Editor of The Omaha Bee: I notice in today's paper (Sunday) you have a front page editorial address to the railroad executives, appealing for a cut of 25 per cent in freight rates for the movement of wheat as an emergency measure to help the farmer. Help for the farmer is certainly a very commendable thing and is deserving of general support from everyone. Your editorial states that in the past the railroads have always helped generously in times of stress and calamity. I have no doubt that in this case the railroads would be very willing to help out, but why ask them to do it?

A statement recently issued by the Department of Agriculture shows the total freight charges paid on freight products in 1922 were only 4 per cent of their value. The American Farm Bureau Federation has estimated that for machinery, clothing, house furnishing and other commodities the farmer spends about \$7,000,000,000. A 2 per cent reduction on the price of these things would mean more than a 25 per cent reduction on all their products, while you are only asking a reduction of 25 per cent on everything the farmer shipped. It would only reduce their total expenditures about 1 1/2 per cent.

I believe the people of this country realize that as a class the farmers are in sore straits, for it seems that most everything they use is high in price while their products are low. We can't allow this to go on indefinitely or we are liable to find a severe shortage in food staring us in the face. We have in the past been faced with transportation shortages, with all its inconveniences but a food shortage would hit us where we live. By asking the railroads to share all the burden of rehabilitating the farmer, by so doing we would have the railroads in the same fix the farmers are now placed. Then we have the same vicious circle started over again, the farmer prosperous with a big crop on hand, but the railroads too poor to provide the proper transportation, and then the farmer with the big crop and no means of getting to market has to borrow and pay high interest till he is in the same fix before the rates were reduced. If the farmer needs help and it is conceded that he does, let's all help him. Everyone who sells anything to a farmer give him a reduction of 5 per cent. This would include the newspapers, telephones, in fact let all who have anything to do with a farmer that costs him money waive a certain reduction for a designated period, and I believe you will find it will enable him to get on his feet quicker than any reduction of rates by the railroads if they were to transfer his products at a third of the going rate, and it would not cost anyone enough to hurt their business.

After it's all said, don't you think it's just a little unreasonable for you to ask the railroads alone to shoulder the burden? While all the rest of us are feeling sorry for his condition, we are willing to pass the "back" to the extent of trying to persuade someone else to do it.

A general permanent reduction of prices in commodities that farmers use would go further toward stabilizing the agriculture industry than any temporary price setting the government could establish. You have started a "buy some wheat" movement which is very commendable and will help out temporarily. I say temporarily because it's got to be put back on the market some time, but a "reduce the cost to farmer" movement would be far more beneficial in the long run.

L. F. JAGGER,
319 Blaine Street.

"CAN THEY UNITE?"

"The proposition to unite all the industrial and producing elements of the country into one homogeneous cooperative body is by no means novel or startling. Ambitious politicians and theoretical economists have very frequently attempted to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes.

Some years ago the agitators of the political labor reform party endeavored to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes. The idea of uniting all the industrial and producing elements of the country into one homogeneous cooperative body is by no means novel or startling. Ambitious politicians and theoretical economists have very frequently attempted to enlist the agrarian working classes under one banner, for political and co-operative purposes.

"FROM STATE AND NATION"

Editorials from other newspapers.

Agriculture in 1922.
From the Topeka Capital.

Secretary Wallace's yearbook of agriculture for 1922 is not several months earlier than usual this year, an evidence of the greater efficiency and hustling introduced into this department of the government under the present alert secretary. The yearbook is voluminous, more than 1,000 pages and tells the story of agriculture for 1922, with comparisons with other years in great fullness.

Prices of farm products on the whole were considerably higher in 1922 than in 1921, and while it is true as stated in this report that prices of commodities which the farmer produces were also higher and the advance was even greater even in farm prices, so that the farmer was relatively in that respect worse off rather than better, yet in practical effect, yet was the whole farm price level was better off, since he was economizing rigidly and not buying other commodities beyond urgent necessities. Owing to extra large yields and better prices therefore the farmer's income was some 20 percent more than a billion dollars more in money coming in, and he was able to reduce his floating debt. But his expenses were heavy, there was little profit, and the farmer's income was not so large as it appeared to be. He is still not in condition to pay his debts, and he is looking for farm machinery, fertilizers and other proper necessities. He is lagging behind the procession, but he is peering along with a courage and optimism which is worthy of agriculture praises in fit terms.

"THE PEOPLE'S VOICE"

Editorial from readers of The Morning Bee. Readers of The Morning Bee are invited to contribute to the expression of public interest.

How to Help the Farmer.
Holdrege, Neb.—To the Editor of The Omaha Bee: I notice in today's paper (Sunday) you have a front page editorial address to the railroad executives, appealing for a cut of 25 per cent in freight rates for the movement of wheat as an emergency measure to help the farmer. Help for the farmer is certainly a very commendable thing and is deserving of general support from everyone. Your editorial states that in the past the railroads have always helped generously in times of stress and calamity. I have no doubt that in this case the railroads would be very willing to help out, but why ask them to do it?

A statement recently issued by the Department of Agriculture shows the total freight charges paid on freight products in 1922 were only 4 per cent of their value. The American Farm Bureau Federation has estimated that for machinery, clothing, house furnishing and other commodities the farmer spends about \$7,000,000,000. A 2 per cent reduction on the price of these things would mean more than a 25 per cent reduction on all their products, while you are only asking a reduction of 25 per cent on everything the farmer shipped. It would only reduce their total expenditures about 1 1/2 per cent.

I believe the people of this country realize that as a class the farmers are in sore straits, for it seems that most everything they use is high in price while their products are low. We can't allow this to go on indefinitely or we are liable to find a severe shortage in food staring us in the face. We have in the past been faced with transportation shortages, with all its inconveniences but a food shortage would hit us where we live. By asking the railroads to share all the burden of rehabilitating the farmer, by so doing we would have the railroads in the same fix the farmers are now placed. Then we have the same vicious circle started over again, the farmer prosperous with a big crop on hand, but the railroads too poor to provide the proper transportation, and then the farmer with the big crop and no means of getting to market has to borrow and pay high interest till he is in the same fix before the rates were reduced. If the farmer needs help and it is conceded that he does, let's all help him. Everyone who sells anything to a farmer give him a reduction of 5 per cent. This would include the newspapers, telephones, in fact let all who have anything to do with a farmer that costs him money waive a certain reduction for a designated period, and I believe you will find it will enable him to get on his feet quicker than any reduction of rates by the railroads if they were to transfer his products at a third of the going rate, and it would not cost anyone enough to hurt their business.

After it's all said, don't you think it's just a little unreasonable for you to ask the railroads alone to shoulder the burden? While all the rest of us are feeling sorry for his condition, we are willing to pass the "back" to the extent of trying to persuade someone else to do it.

A general permanent reduction of prices in commodities that farmers use would go further toward stabilizing the agriculture industry than any temporary price setting the government could establish. You have started a "buy some wheat" movement which is very commendable and will help out temporarily. I say temporarily because it's got to be put back on the market some time, but a "reduce the cost to farmer" movement would be far more beneficial in the long run.

L. F. JAGGER,
319 Blaine Street.

"CAN THEY UNITE?"