

officers here are all kind to us. Of late we have milk at night, and since we got it my health has greatly improved. The brethren are all well, but it is six weeks since I spoke to any of them. Bishop Udall looks well, and bears his double distress as but few men could, yet knowing his noble character as well as I do, it is no wonder. He and Brother Tenney have, from choice, joined in our cell.

With gratitude and thanks to all our kind friends, I remain as ever, your brother in the Gospel of Christ.

CHRIS. I. KEMPE.

REPLY TO U. N. V.

NOT OPPOSED TO SAVING GRAIN, BUT STILL CONVINCED THAT THE MERCHANTS ARE THE SUBJECTS OF UNJUST STRICTURES—THE CREDIT SYSTEM.

PROVO CITY,
November 5th, 1885.

Editor Deseret News:

I had designed to have nothing more to say about the grain question or my friend U. N. V., but after being so vigorously attacked by both yourself and the author of "An Appeal to Farmers," I feel myself justified in casually referring to the matter again. I do not remember of having said anything in my reply to U. N. V. against the propriety of storing grain, the introduction of creameries, fruit and meat canneries, or any other local industry that we are noted for not having, but my main points as against the gentleman were, the manner in which he referred to the merchants as being "importunate and ungentlemanly creditors," and branding the farmers as weak and foolish and the dupe of the

WILY AND SCHEMING MERCHANT.

I also took issue with him about the effect the Utah crops would have upon the markets of America, and her influence as governing the prices of the same. Now, let me repeat his own words in his "appeal to the farmers." He says: "Now is a good opportunity for you to make a stand; never mind the importunate demands of impetuous and ungentlemanly creditors," and again, "importunate creditors don't care whether any others but themselves get their pay, so they will use every exertion, argument and force to get you to sell enough wheat at the present ruinous prices to pay them, and while you in your weakness allow yourselves to be coerced into doing so, you render yourselves unable to pay all you owe and sustain your family in comfort."

Now, Mr. Editor, who are these importunate and ungentlemanly creditors but our co-operative institutions throughout the country; and who is it that is guilty of this

COERCING BUSINESS,

(if there has been any) but the superintendents and business managers, acting under the immediate direction of the boards of directors? I say none others, and hence it appears to me to be an injustice. If it was this infernal system of credit that he wanted to bring before the eyes of the farmers, which, as he says, was the object of his appeal, why then did he not deal fairly and squarely with that subject, without reflecting dishonestly upon the merchant, and the grossest of folly upon the farmer?

In talking with a superintendent of one of the largest co-operative stores in Sanpete County not long since (and who by the way is a Bishop and a gentleman) the subject matter of U. N. V.'s letter came up and he remarked with considerable emphasis, "I consider it not only unwise and impolitic, but

ROBBERY,

for," said he, "our outstanding accounts are principally among the farmers, and when I go to them, and ask them to pay their dues, they say we have no money and at present prices for grain we cannot afford to sell; in fact, Mr. Superintendent, we have been advised to make a stand and not pay you until grain advances from 50 to 100 per cent. As to the honesty of such a stand, under existing circumstances, I will leave you to judge."

I am inclined to believe, Mr. Editor, that U. N. V. is laboring under a mistake, when he bases his conclusions upon this matter from a Salt Lake business standpoint, for while the principal business houses of Salt Lake, (Z. C. M. I. excepted, are private concerns, it is not so in the country; there they belong to the people, and they have a voice directly or indirectly in the management of the same, and if the superintendents are guilty of blundering and making ungentlemanly business transactions, the board of directors and stockholders are alike guilty and responsible. Again, I think U. N. V. is not justified in charging the merchants or the superintendents with being able to make improvements to the amount of from \$20,000 to \$50,000, while the farmer can only make from \$2,000 to \$3,000 worth of improvements, and filling their fine dwellings with elegant furniture, fine pictures, and giving their children the advantage of a superior education—all at the expense of the farmer. Perhaps U. N. V. has been a merchant himself, and can vouch for the correctness of his theory. Cases of this kind may be the exception, but not by any means the rule.

THIS SYSTEM OF CREDIT

and the necessary means for a remedy constitute a subject that we all should feel deeply interested in, and if it is possible to devise some means by which it can be stamped out of existence, it ought to be done, for it is not only bondage but ruin. How many stores are there in Utah to-day, which are almost bankrupt, and doing business on ruinous principles because of this system of credit? Some have closed their doors, and assignments have been made, and others will soon follow. I took the pains not long ago of ascertaining the amount of credit extended in one of our southern towns, and it amounted to the enormous amount of \$86,000, which, with a population of 5,000, brings the indebtedness to \$17.20 for every man, woman and child, and this case is not so bad as those of some other towns in Utah. But the farmers alone are not the only ones to be blamed in this matter, for it extends to all classes of citizens.

In conclusion, Mr. Editor, I will say that I have been prompted by no other motive in writing these communications but to do good, and it has not been my intention for one moment to be unjust or to use acrimonious expressions. If, however, my remarks have been so construed by my friend U. N. V., I beg to offer an humble apology, for I can afford in this matter, as in all others, to be as magnanimous and just as any one; and if I make a mistake, which I am liable to do, I always want to be sufficient of a gentleman to make it right.

Respectfully yours,

W. C. A. SMOOT, JR.
P. S.—So far as I am concerned, this ends the matter. W. C. A. S., JR.

CORRESPONDENCE.

RAISING AND SAVING GRAIN, AND KEEPING OUT OF DEBT.

A Practical, Intelligent Farmer Gives His Views and the Result of His Experience.

KAYSVILLE, Nov. 6th, 1885.

Editor Deseret News:

Having read in your valuable paper a number of articles on the storing of wheat and the cost of raising the same, together with advice to the farmers of Utah, and being somewhat of a farmer, I am unable to agree with some of the advice given and statements made. In the first place I do not think the reason given by U. N. V., in his communication of the 2nd inst., a sufficient justification for the advice contained in his article of the 13th ult. wherein he counseled the farmers not to sell their wheat at present prices to pay debts justly due their creditors. As a farmer I am thankful for proper advice, but anything savoring of fraud I despise. The great Lawgiver has said what-soever ye would that men should do unto you do ye even so unto them, and who besides U. N. V. can see any propriety in a farmer or any one else withholding the payment of a just debt when he has the wherewith to pay.

COST OF RAISING GRAIN.

The idea that it costs from \$1 to \$1.20 per bushel to raise wheat in this Territory is sheer nonsense and shows plainly that those who make the assertion don't understand the business, and in order to prove my assertion I submit that a crop of over 3,000 bushels raised by me this year at 55c. per bushel (at the machine—machine measure weighing seventy pounds to the bushel) netted me the snug little sum (after every expense except taxes had been deducted) of \$946. In other words, this wheat cost me less than 35 cents per bushel, while a similar crop last year cost me 35 cents per bushel. This wheat, Mr. Editor, was raised without irrigation, and I can produce the figures necessary to prove what I have here stated at any time; but, lest some may say this is not a fair criterion, I will give a statement of the cost of producing ten acres of wheat by irrigation this season, happening to have a patch of this size:

Plowing 10 acres twice.....	\$ 30 00
Thirteen bushels of seed at 60c.....	7 80
Preparing or vitalizing the seed.....	1 00
Sowing.....	1 50
Harrowing.....	5 00
Irrigating.....	4 50
Cleaning out water ditches, etc.....	4 00
Cutting with binder.....	20 00
Shocking.....	2 50
Hauling and stacking.....	17 00
Thrashing—11 hands one day each.....	16 00
Boarding threshers.....	6 00
Taxes on land for two years.....	6 20

Total cost of production..... \$122 00

The product of this ten acres was 414 bushels, of 60 lbs. to the bushel, after the toll for threshing had been paid, which at 60 cents per bushel, amounts to \$248.40 or a profit of \$126.40 as interest on the land for two years, as this land was summer followed, it being a rule of mine not to raise grain two years in succession on the same ground.

This piece of land is hardly an average of our bench land, much of it being what is known as adobe land; indeed, I have been told some of it is fit for nothing but adobes and does not by any means compare with our rich bottom land.

I could give figures with similar results on another piece of twenty acres, but believe the foregoing is sufficient. I do most assuredly consider it to be the imperative duty of every Latter-day Saint to

STORE UP GRAIN AGAINST A DAY OF NEED.

which will surely come; but first let every man pay his debts, even if he has to sell wheat at 60 cents per bushel in order to do so.

I have carefully watched the grain markets of the East for some time past, and must confess I cannot see anything to warrant such a very great advance in the price of wheat in Utah as U. N. V. seems to expect. I think the gentleman has lost sight of the one hundred and twenty millions of old wheat on hand in addition to the crop of 1885.

As to farmers

KEEPING OUT OF DEBT,

this they can generally do if they will, and I am satisfied many of them do so, and all should. My rule has ever been not to buy anything unless I have the means to pay for it, and I would advise my brother farmers to do likewise. This may require some economizing on the part of some, but the rule once adopted will work like a charm, and I will venture the assertion that the merchants of Utah would hail the day with delight, for they in turn could pay for their merchandise as they bought it, thereby availing themselves, in some lines of goods, of a nice little discount, besides doing away with a feeling of uncertainty, which all must more or less experience when selling goods on credit.

I am glad to be able to state that in this neighborhood the best houses and the best furniture are owned by farmers.

I shall not be surprised if the foregoing meets with criticism, but facts are facts and figures do not lie.

May God speed the day when naught but true intelligence shall guide us in our efforts to benefit each other, and when the interest of one will be the interest of all.

A FARMER.

ACADEMY ESTABLISHED AT FILLMORE.

Our Millard County Friends Take a Stride Ahead in Educational Matters.

FILLMORE CITY, Millard County,
Utah, Nov. 4, 1884.

Editor Deseret News:

A new era in relation to education has dawned upon Fillmore. Since our last quarterly conference, August 23d and 24th, when the initiatory steps were taken we have organized

AN ACADEMY

and got it in good running order with president, board of directors, secretary, treasurer, principal, teachers and about eighty students. Since the return of Brother Alma Greenwood from his mission to New Zealand, the propriety and feasibility of the establishment of such an institution for Millard Stake, and others who might wish to give it their patronage, have been agitated by the leading men of this Stake; and at our last conference the subject was spoken of to Apostle J. H. Smith, who gave it his hearty endorsement, and spoke in favor of it in our Priesthood meetings.

On the 24th of August, the authorities, Bishops and leading brethren of the Stake met and elected a board of directors as follows: Ira N. Hinckley, Joseph V. Robison, T. C. Callister, D. R. Stevens and J. S. Black; C. Anderson, secretary, and J. L. Robison, treasurer. At a subsequent board meeting the proposed high school was named

"MILLARD STAKE ACADEMY."

The service of Brother Alma Greenwood as principal was secured and an executive committee was appointed, consisting of President Ira N. Hinckley, J. V. Robison and T. C. Callister. President Taylor was corresponded with, who approved of what had been done and encouraged the brethren to go ahead with the good work.

On Monday, the 2nd of November, the inauguration of the first term of the Millard Stake Academy took place in the Fillmore meeting house. On the stand were the officers and teachers of the academy, who, at the solicitation of the board, had come to assist in the organization of the school. On the first seats to the right in the hall were the male students and to the left the female students, and the balance of the room was filled with spectators.

The following programme was carried out:

Called to order at 9 a.m. by President I. N. Hinckley.
Singing by the choir: "The morning breaks."

Prayer by Bishop T. C. Callister.
Singing by the choir: "Though deepening trials throng your way."

Introductory remarks by President Hinckley, who also presented the board, secretary, treasurer, principal and assistant teacher, all of whom were unanimously sustained by the vote of those present.

Prof. Maeser offered the dedicatory prayer.

Singing by the choir: "O awake! my slumbering minstrel."

Remarks by members of the board.

President Hinckley then formally turned the Academy over to the principal, Alma Greenwood.

Prof. Alma Greenwood made a few remarks expressing his realization of the great responsibility which had now been placed upon him; appealed to the students and all interested to stand by and uphold him; made also some excellent remarks in relation to true education, after which he introduced

Miss Lectia Curtis as Assistant teacher, who was sustained by the votes of those present.

Singing by the choir and benediction by C. Anderson.

A procession then formed and

marched in the following order to the court house, the upper story of which had been hired for the academy:

1st. The lady students led by Bishop T. C. Callister and Miss Curtis; the gentlemen students, led by Professors Maeser and Greenwood; Officers of the Academy: Citizens.

After the students and spectators had been seated and called to order, the school was opened with singing and music by the school choir and prayer by J. L. Robison.

Prof. Maeser then delivered a lengthy discourse, giving much excellent instruction to the teachers and students, some of whom were moved to tears by the kind and fatherly manner in which he spoke.

President Hinckley made a few remarks, expressing his joy over what had been said and done this day, and declared the Academy in session.

Prof. Greenwood gave the students some instructions in relation to the rules to be observed, etc, after which intermission for half an hour was had, and in the afternoon the school was graded and classified and the students assigned their lessons, etc.

Much gratitude is felt toward Prof. Maeser, of the B. Y. Academy, for the interest which he has manifested and the assistance which he has rendered in the establishment of this institution. Brother Greenwood, our principal, is one of Brother Maeser's first students, a graduate of the B. Y. Academy, and is proved and well known in this locality as a thorough and efficient teacher. Miss Curtis the assistant teacher, is one of Brother Maeser's normal students and is highly recommended by him.

Yours Respectfully,
C. ANDERSON, Secretary.

MORE ON THE WHEAT QUESTION.

U. N. V. REPLIES TO THE TWO CORRESPONDENTS OF YESTERDAY.

SALT LAKE CITY,
November 11, 1885.

Editor Deseret News:

I noticed and read with interest two letters in last evening's issue, one by the representation of the "ninety and nine" and one written by some person who is "somewhat of a farmer." Both these letters pitch into U. N. V. because he advised the farmers to hold on to their wheat for a higher price, even at the risk of bringing down the wrath of their creditors upon them. Now these two gentlemen, both evidently

INTERESTED IN THE COLLECTION OF DEBTS

and perhaps merchants (for I suspect your Kaysville correspondent is one part farmer and forty-nine parts merchant), are very indignant at my counsel, and are evidently very much in favor of the rules of business that require debtors to pay their debts to the merchants "just as soon as their wheat is threshed." But, Mr. Editor, let me ask this question, supposing the farmers who have held their wheat and obtained the rise of about 12 cents a bushel, or 25%, which has already taken place had not done so, who would have got that increase? Why the merchant would, and it looks as though the loss of that little profit hurt some people's feelings.

One of my friends challenges me because I asserted that in the course of a few years the merchant or merchants have accumulated from \$20,000 to \$50,000 while the farmers gained only from \$2,000 to \$3,000. I can show a great number of instances; in fact, that is the rule; anything differing from that is the exception, and I ask the farmers to look around them in their settlements and see for themselves. But my friends have not touched the vital question; they have not shown how the farmers can keep out of debt while the present system of things remains. Great evils need strong remedies. The fact exists that the wealth of the Territory is flowing into channels which lead to few pockets while the labors of the many go to fill them. What do the few accomplish in return? Do they establish factories, industrial institutions, or any means of furnishing employment? The Territory is to-day comparatively empty so far as those things are concerned, and

THE RANKS OF THE FARMERS ARE! OVERRUN

with people who do not properly belong there, but who fall into the protecting arms of that business because they cannot find employment at their legitimate labor. They must take a little land, say 10 or 20 acres or starve. And here let me show the fallacy of the "merchant farmers" position about the cost of raising wheat. I don't dispute his position and figures from the merchants' standpoint, but let us look at it from the poor farmer's position; he has not the money to pay for the plowing twice at \$3.00 per acre, and the bill of expenses as laid down, so he has to do the work himself. Now while he is doing it he and his family have to live and be clothed; his expenses have to be met, and woe to him if he happens to have the proverbial poor man's family. While he is raising the 10 acres of wheat on one year's summer, fallow or two years plowing, 414 bushels is the amount he

receives for his two years' work, or at the price of wheat when my advice was given, \$207. But my friends may say he need not work two years for the ten acres of wheat, let him work elsewhere. Well,

WHERE CAN HE GET WORK?

He can get work during harvest during the very time he has to attend to his own crops and he can exchange labor and get his threshing done, but who will furnish him work during any part of the remainder of the year?

I say, Mr. Editor, that it is all very well for the merchant farmers to boast of their good farming and cheap wheat, but the poor man forced into farming finds that his wheat costs him (and he gets a bare subsistence while he raises it) the full price mentioned by the representative of the "ninety and nine" when he said "We know that wheat costs from \$1 to \$1.20."

Your Kaysville correspondent says, "anything savoring of fraud I despise." I am glad to hear that, because if he should really be a merchant, it must be so very refreshing for the happy people residing in his neighborhood to know that everything they buy at his store is exactly what it is represented to be, and sold at a strictly reasonable and fair profit, and as the same correspondent expresses a wish that "God may speed the day when the interest of one shall be the interest of all," as he despises fraud, I expect that he has seen fit to take just so much profits from the pockets of his customers as would allow him to grow just as fast and no faster, than the poor farmers from whom he has had his trade.

One of your correspondents says that there is not the necessity for excitement on the question that my advice would imply, and that I have not taken into account the 120 millions of bushels left over at the last crop. I cannot find any more than 70 million bushels as the surplus after feeding the people the full harvest year. The other correspondent joins issue with me for claiming that Utah's crop would affect the crop of the world; I plead "not guilty" to the soft impeachment. I did not advance the idea that the tail could wag the dog, but I did say that Kansas was short, and was already looking to Utah for supply; since I said this thousands of bushels have gone to Kansas, and the price here has gone up 25 per cent.

But, Mr. Editor, in my first letter I stated that this is a good time for "farmers to think for themselves." I reiterate the expression. And if my advice has kept a little of their hard earnings in their pockets, I am glad, provided in the doing so they have not robbed anybody; and I shall be twice glad if that little profit be properly husbanded so that it will enable them soon to take the Kaysville farmer's advice and "not buy things before they can pay for them," for that is the very

ACME OF SHREWDSNESS,

and when they reach that point, they can take the advice of the leading merchant of the Territory and "buy of the manufacturer and save paying profits to a number of middle men."

But, sir, maybe enough has been said by way of controversy; I have no desire to arouse any antagonism between any classes of our people, but my sympathies are always with the weaker party. I am anxious that the weaker should do a little more thinking for themselves and I am also anxious that the time shall come when "the interest of one shall be the interest of all." To that end I would be glad to see those who, commencing with nothing, as we all did, have made wealth, do something for those who, less capable, or less ambitious than themselves, have not been able to keep from filling the underling's position.

There is a great responsibility in the possession of wealth which Latter-day Saints would do well to study, and they can rest assured that there will be no good derived from that kind of

"TRUE INTELLIGENCE"

which is actuated by selfishness nor from that advice which tries to overawe the judgment by the terrorism of business rules while it flitches from the poor man's possession his earnings and leaves his family impoverished.

Sir, I have a horror of what is called communism I have no sympathy with a feeling of greed for the wealth of the rich, but I recognize the fact that we are all one family, that some have greater capacity to secure wealth than others, but I also comprehend that the truly great man will see that others less able are generously benefitted by his wealth.

Then are many men great because they are rich, but there are

FEW MEN RICH BECAUSE THEY ARE GREAT.

The latter class will disseminate blessing all around them; beaming with liberality they will help their less capable brethren, and furnish opportunity for employment by expending their means in some needed industry. They would despise to exact the strict payment of a debt in wheat "just as soon as it is threshed," so as to secure the benefit of the advance in price, but would be willing that the farmer should have all that there is in his hard earnings. Such is the gentlemanly creditor; the opposite to this is the importunate, impetuous and ungentlemanly." No more at present.

U. N. V.

MOTHERS.

If you are failing; broken, worn out and nervous, use "Wells' Health Renewer." \$1. Druggists.