Facts About the Tobacco Growers Cooperative Association

Number 1—THE AUDIT

Opponents of cooperative marketing sought to discredit the Audit of the tobacco growers' books, which showed economy in the second year of operation.

The committee of State officials, invited by the Association to investigate its operations, reports as follows:

"F. W. Lafrentz and Co., public accountants, withe executive offices at 100 Brodway, New York City, and a branch office in Richmond, Va., have audited the books of the Tobacco Growers Cooperative Association for 1922 and 1923, and are now auditing for 1924. The investigating committee inquired of a number of the leading bankers and business men in Richmond and surrounding cities as to the reputation and reliability of this firm. The committee was assured that this company was one of the leading firms of auditrs in this section of the United States and was reliable in every particular. It was further established that this company audits for many of the largest business firms in the country. It was established to the satisfaction of the committee that any facts given by this firm could be depended upon.

"At the request of the committee, Mr. Allan Talbott, manager of the Richmond office, and three other members of the firm appeared before the committee and explained in detail the statements appearing in their audit and supplied to the committee detailed information regarding many points bearing on the finances of the Association. The auditors showed a desire to be of every possible assistance and gave to the committee all the information requestedof them."

EVERYBODY'S RESPONSIBILITY

With the raising of the American Legion Endowment fund, those who had no active part in the World war service are given an opportunity of sharing their responsibility of the care for the casualties which continue.

For the casualties of a war do not cease when the last gun is fired. They have continued for the past six years, since the World War closed. There are those thousands of men whose lives are wrecked and whose bodies are maimed. Government reports show that lst year alone there were 5,000 men who died as a result of wounds directly sustained in the war. They are casualties of the war. Those other men who are disabled and, thus, unable to provide for themselves and their families are surely casualties of that terrible war period.

And just as truly as these men are casualties of the great war, so are the children who were left orphaned when their fathers gave their lives in battle. There are thousand and thousands of little boys and girls, who are left, many of them without the necessities of life, others without a chance at receiving any education or training for self support.

Aren't those boys and girls just as much entitled to proper care and education as are the boys and girls whose fathers, some for one reason, some for another, never saw war service? Shouldn't there be practical, some sure means, of providing for them the kind of care and training that would have been theirs if their fathers, instead of dying on the battlefields of France, had lived to see that they received the proper financing through the years of their childhood. Then, aren't all of us responsible for these children—isn't it up to us to see that the necessary funds for their care are provided?

The American legion is composed of the men who have already given of their service—the men who fought in some branch of the nation's forces along with the fathers of these needy orphans. It doesn't seem fair for them to have to shoulder the responsibility for the care and education of the children of the men who were killed in service. During the war they took upon themselves the responsibility of their nation's safety. It seems that those who were prevented by some means or another from serving their country that time should contribute of their material gain to this worthy cause.

But this is not something which the American legion is not going to have to share in, for theirs will, undoubtedly, be the biggest share of all. It is just that it seems that it is a respnsibility in which we all have a part. It is our common duty and privilege.

Choosing One's Work

By THOMAS ARKLE CLARK
Dean of Men, University of Illinois.

YEARS ago, when Mr. W. E. Curtis was writing his remarkable and interesting series of articles for the Chicago Record-Herald, our hired man whose training in the gentle art of composition consisted of six months in the country school and whose travels had taken him at one time as far afield as Veedersburg, Ind., came to father and announced that he was going to give up agricultural pursuits.

"What are you intending to do?" father asked.

"I think I'll take up newspaper writin'," he answered, "like this man Curtis. It looks easy, it's good pay, I guess, and it'd give a fellar a chanct to see the world."

"No doubt," was my father's reply.

A boy should begin early to think about how he is to earn his living, even if the chances are that he may never have to.

Every one ought to do the work he likes. Every profession and occupation involves about so many unpleasant and distasteful duties, and if one cannot go at his work with eagerness and enthusiasm, if he must drag himself to it with regret and reluctance, if he were always wishing that he were through with it, these unpleasant things are magnified a hundred fold. If a man likes his work it is half done; if he does it because he must or simply to earn a living he has a sad outlook.

Whatever a young fellow takes up, it should be his own choice. Fathers and mothers and teachers may advise and suggest, but they should not dominate the choice. It is natural that the proud father, trundling his young heir ahead of him in a perambulator, should plan a definite and successful future for him, but it is the boy himself who must live the life, and do the work, and in the end succeed or fail, and it is he who should make the choice.

Every one should choose the work for which he is best fitted. The accurate and honest analysis of one's own talents is not an easy matter, but it should at least be attempted.

Lowell, in one of his essays, says: "We are designed in the cradle, perhaps earlier, and it is in finding out this design and shaping ourselves to it that our years are spent wisely. It is the vain endeavor to make ourselves what we are not that has strewn history with so many broken purposes and lives left in the rough." If possible, before we begin to build, we should study the design.

No young person should take up any life work for purely commercial reasons. It is justifiable to look after one's self, but every one who enters upon a life work, no matter how humble or how distinguished, should do so with some idea, at least, to be of service to the community or commonwealth in which he lives. Only that profession is honorable which contributes to the betterment of the individual and to the advancement of the state.

F. Suastegui

F. Suastegui, who has just assumed his duties as commercial attache of the Mexican embassy in Washington, being the first to hold this post. He was formerly commercial agent of Mexico at San Francisco and believes that much can be done to increase business relations between the United States and Mexico, after importers and exporters know more of the true facts about Mexico.

One experiment station kept a record for three years on a garden plot, one-twentieth of an acre in size. The average profit was $47.38.