

GOVERNMENT SALES BY EXPERIMENT SERIES

Hundred and Sixty Million Dollars May Be Added to Country's Profits Annually as Result of Tests Held at Jamestown Exposition.

(Washington Bureau of The Journal.)
Washington, Aug. 14.—The fuel-testing plant of the United States geological survey, which was moved from St. Louis, Missouri, several months ago to Norfolk, Virginia, will begin on August 15 a series of experiments on eastern and southern coals that may be of far-reaching importance to the government and to the people in general.
For two years the plant was in operation at St. Louis, Missouri, and as a result the waste of the fuel resources of the country that congress ordered the government to conserve has been reduced. Government experts connected with the plant have indicated the possibility of saving 10 per cent of the cost of fuel for each year—the sum is \$150,000,000—through increased efficiency in burning coal. Now the fuels of the east and south are to be tested under the same conditions as those of the west and south. In the gas producer and gas engines and by briquetting, in the hope that this saving may be further demonstrated.
The plant is located not far from the main entrance gate of the Jamestown exposition, and already has attracted thousands of visitors, many of whom were manufacturers interested in the economy of fuel.
The law under which the fuel-testing plant is to be operated contemplates two classes of work—increasing efficiency and preventing waste in the utilization of the fuel resources of the country, and testing coals that are used by the government.

Power Tests.

Perhaps the most important tests will be those comparing the amount of power obtained from a certain amount of coal under the steam boiler and in the gas producer. The gas engine has demonstrated in former tests its ability to do from two to nearly three times as much work with a pound of coal as the steam engine. Professor Robert H. Fernald of St. Louis, Missouri, engineer in charge of the gas producer tests, will continue the experiments of the large 335 horsepower gas engine which has been installed in the plant. This engine will be supplied with gas made in two large producers and from the same fuels that will be used under boilers. In this way the comparative efficiency of the steam boiler, the gas producer, the gas engine, and even peat will be determined, for the tests made will show just what all these poorer fuels can stand.

Important Experiments.

A series of important experiments with fuel under boilers recently completed indicate that stationary boilers ought to do 10 to 20 times as much

work per unit of heating surface as they do now. These tests are to be continued on three modern boilers which have just been installed in the plant. Two of these boilers are of the water-tube type, of 210 horsepower each, and the third is of the fire-tube type, of 100 horsepower. Forced, induced and natural draft will be used on these boilers and the furnaces will be of three distinct types: one hand-fired with special fire-brick combustion chamber and automatic air admission, the second a mechanical stoker of the chain type, and the third a mechanical stoker of the overfeed type, so that each fuel may be tested in every mode of combustion in order to get the highest efficiency possible out of them.
There will also be a series of experiments leading to show just what is necessary to burn these coals without smoke. The results will be important not only to the government, but to every city in the country that is fighting the exasperating smoke evil.
A considerable portion of the fuel-testing plant is to be given over to testing fuels for the navy, and the entire briquetting plant will be put at its disposal. Three briquetting machines are almost ready for work. One received recently from Germany is for briquetting lignite and already has attracted attention. This machine is of great power and is the only one of its kind in the United States. A second machine is of English make and has been used for some time at the plant in St. Louis. The third is an American-made machine, of which much is expected.

Expensive Air Smokeless.

The experts hope to show that the briquettes have more efficiency than lump coal from the same mine and that they are practically smokeless, the latter being a big factor to the navy as the first. The results already obtained from briquetting prove that on a boiler requiring forced draft, like locomotive boilers, the briquette so increases efficiency as to more than equal the increase in cost of the briquetting process. These briquettes are made by taking the waste or slack coal, culm, lignite or peat and mixing it with sufficient tar or other binding material to bind the coal together, the whole being pressed into blocks by machinery.
Five small, horsepower gas engine tests have been made at the plant, and on these engines important tests will be made of the relative efficiency of gas, kerosene, oil, and other fuels. It is thought that the comparative efficiency of these fuels under proper conditions.
In addition to all these experiments, tests will be made to discover the exact cause of the spontaneous combustion of stored coal, in order that loss from this source may be prevented.
The tests are under the general direction of Joseph A. Holmes, chief of the technological branch of the geological survey, and the plant is under the immediate supervision of H. M. Wilson, chief engineer.

MINE WORKERS DEMAND RAISE

Fifteen Per Cent Increase and Shorter Hours Asked of Employers.

(Special Dispatch to The Journal.)
Seattle, Aug. 15.—An increase in wages amounting to an average of 15 per cent and a reduction of hours averaging 25 per cent is asked by the United Mineworkers in session here. The demands were handed to the operators just before noon yesterday and it is improbable that an answer will be returned for some time. The operators will figure out the effect of the increase in each mine.
There is little likelihood that the demands will be agreed to in full. The big companies all have contracts that they claim could not be filed at the new wage scale. The reduction in the working time, they maintain, from 8 to 6 or 6 1/2 hours, would result in a curtailment of output of from 25 to 35 per cent, something the trade will not stand.
At present an eight-hour day is in force in nearly all the mines of the state, time counting from the time the miners reach the face of the workings. Under the new rule, time would count from the time the men start from the top of the shaft and half an hour would be taken out for lunch. It is figured



If you're fishing for a bargain drop us a line. Here are Wash Suits that will stand all kinds of water and all kinds of hard rubs, and all varieties of vacation experiences.
Good, serviceable Wool Suits, with double breasted coats, Russian and sailor blouse, all this season's make, \$3.85. They were \$4.50 and \$5.00.

LION Clothing Co

Gas Kuhn Prop.
166 and 168 Third St., Mohawk Bldg.

TRUNK MYSTERY SOLVED AT LAST

Goold Admits Murdering Emma Levin and Hangs Himself in His Cell.

PROSECUTORS FEEL RELIEVED AT DEATH

Frenchmen Puzzled Over How Case Should Be Conducted, Prisoner Being English and Crime Committed Outside Country.

(Journal Special Service.)
Marseilles, France, Aug. 15.—The famous Monte Carlo "trunk mystery," which has baffled the police for so long was cleared up Tuesday when Vero St. Ledger Goold confessed that he murdered Emma Levin. Still another obstacle was removed when Goold was found dead in his cell at hour later, having hanged himself, for eminent legal authorities were puzzled as to how they could prosecute him. Goold was an Englishman, and the crime was committed out of France, making a complicated legal problem.
Goold confessed to the murder, saying he stabbed the woman during a quarrel over \$100. He then dismembered the body and his wife helped him pack it in a trunk. They then journeyed to Marseilles, where they planned to cast the body into the sea. Referring to the murder Goold said:
"I had been drinking, and becoming angry, seized a hunting knife and buried it in Emma's back. She fell dead. The next day I dismembered the body with a saw and knife and placed the torso in a trunk and the head and legs in a valise. I only stabbed the woman once. The other wounds on her body must have been caused by shaking around in the trunk."
Goold said he took the dead woman's jewels.
Goold said his grandfather was a baronet and his father an Irish magistrate. He said he had served secretly on the Irish land commission in Dublin. In 1888 he moved to Montreal, where, he says, he made a fortune. He then went to Holland and later went to Monte Carlo.

Mrs. Goold corroborated everything her husband said.
Goold and his wife, who are both elderly and of good English families, arrived at Marseilles from Monte Carlo August 6. Their baggage consisted of a trunk and a suit case.
The trunk was left at the station to be registered for London, while Goold and his wife, taking the train, went to a hotel. Blood oozing from the trunk aroused suspicion.

FANATICAL MOORS IN DESPERATE BATTLE

Hundreds of Moors Slain in Charge in Which Outpost Is Captured.

(Journal Special Service.)
Tangier, Aug. 15.—Fighting at Casablanca, which lasted nearly 24 hours, resulted in the death of hundreds of Moors. Several hundred were injured. Seven thousand fanatical Moors rushed the outposts and drove out the French and Spanish defenders from one of the stations and held it against the other troops for over an hour. Only the most desperate fighting by the soldiers enabled them to regain possession of the outpost which was accomplished finally by a bayonet charge. The attack of the Moors was made shortly after midnight.
Mounted on fleet horses the natives charged directly against the guns unflinching alike on both sides. The shrill cry of the Moors and the outer defenses were rushed, the soldiers being compelled to withdraw. The Moors established themselves there and were driven out only after desperate fighting.

Savings Are Stolen.

(Special Dispatch to The Journal.)
Walla Walla, Wash., Aug. 15.—After saving up \$25 to send to his wife, S. J. Sturgeon, a hardware merchant, was the misfortune of having it stolen from him yesterday morning. Sturgeon reported his loss to the police, but no trace of the thief was found, and Sturgeon returned to the harvest fields to replenish his pocketbook. The money was stolen from Sturgeon's room in a local lodging house.

Touchet Farmer Dead.

Walla Walla, Wash., Aug. 15.—Philip De Gruchy, a retired farmer of the Touchet district, died at St. Mary's hospital early yesterday following an illness of several months. Mr. De Gruchy, in the early days made quite a fortune by shipping blooded cattle to the Pacific coast. The funeral occurred from a local undertaking parlor at 2 o'clock this afternoon. Mrs. De Gruchy is survived by Mrs. De Gruchy.

PHONE COMPANY SUES UNIONS IN MONTANA

(Special Dispatch to The Journal.)
Helena, Mont., Aug. 15.—The Montana Federation of Labor, the Telephone Operators' union of the several affected cities, the organization of linemen, the Clerks' union, their officers and a number of individuals have been made defendants in an injunction suit filed in the federal court here by the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company to prevent further alleged ruination of its business. Judge Hunt is in New York on his vacation and is not expected back until the middle of September. It is unlikely that any action will be taken by the court unless a substitute judge be sent here to hear the case. At all, there are 52 respondents, being residents of Helena, Butte, Anaconda, Great Falls, Livingston, Billings and other cities of the state who are involved in the strike of telephone linemen and operators.
The complaint, which is a very lengthy one, sets forth that the value of the subject matter of the suit exceeds \$200,000, being the right of the uninterrupted conduct and operation of the company's business in the affected cities. It is asserted that, by reason of the wrongs and unlawful and malicious acts of the several unions who number upward of 50 persons and organizations, the company has been damaged upward of \$25,000.

SECRETARY ROOT IS AFRAID OF PANIC

(Journal Special Service.)
New York, Aug. 15.—As a result of the distressing situation in Wall Street an extraordinary session of President Roosevelt's cabinet was held at Oyster Bay yesterday. Attorney General Bonaparte was conspicuous by his absence.
That there is an acute split in the president's official family over the government's policy for the immediate future is not in general doubt, but it is said to be too wide to be bridged. A rift has come between Secretary Root and Attorney General Bonaparte.
The fear of a "Roosevelt panic" is strong in the breasts of Secretary Root and his following in the cabinet. If the policy of heavily fining offending corporations is continued, they are believed to be likely to go so far as to advise the attorney general to leave the cabinet. Some vigorous methods must be adopted.

EMOSE OBBEY BY BEEF RUST

Exorbitant Rates for Meat Asked While Farmer Is Stolen From.

PAY LOWEST PRICE SELL FOR HIGHEST

Seattle Farm Paper Demands Federal Investigation of Outrageous Cases of Extortion—Packers Get All the Profits.

(Journal Special Service.)
Seattle, Wash., Aug. 15.—The Seattle farm paper, The Ranch, in its issue of today states that farmers of the northwest, as well as the consumers are robbed by the beef trust. The Ranch says:
The farmers of the Pacific northwest are not only imposed upon, but robbed. The consumers of beef, pork and mutton in the Pacific northwest are paying the highest price for these meats that they ever paid in the history of the country. They are forced to get higher prices because the packers of these meats are forced to charge such prices because of the increased cost of raw material; that they are forced to get more for their beef, pork and mutton because the farmers of the Pacific northwest are getting so much more for their beef, pork and mutton than they are getting in the east and middle west. They are not. Trust Takes the Profits.
All through the Mississippi valley at the present time farmers are receiving a big price for their cattle. The stock-raising industry as a consequence is booming. But farmers in the Pacific northwest are not getting these prices. In fact, the northwestern farmers are not getting one half as much for their cattle as the stockmen in the middle west are only getting from 3 to 4 cents a pound for their beef. This is said to be not more than half what it costs the stockman to raise his stock. They are actually forced under present conditions to sell out their stock at a big loss or not market it at all. And yet the meat eaters in Seattle, Tacoma, Portland and other cities of the Pacific northwest are paying unheard of prices for this same beef in the markets.
Does it seem right or just that when beef is costing the consumers exorbitant prices that the packers should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to the cattle raiser on the other end? Doesn't it look as though there is something wrong somewhere when producers of cattle in the Pacific northwest are actually receiving half of what they are paying in the Mississippi valley, and yet the consumers of beef are paying from 25 to 30 per cent more? Who comes in for the swag that is pocketed between the time when the farmer sells his beef to the packer and the time when the packer sells it to the consumer? Does it seem right that the packer should be actually compelled to sell their cattle to the meat packers at a price which is not half the cost of raising them? Is it an equitable condition which means unheard-of prices for the consumers on one end and starvation prices to