

Stock.**Chatty Letter from the States.**

[From our Chicago Correspondent.]

The best 1,400 @ 700-lb. native beeves have been selling at about \$3.90 to \$4.15, with good 1,100 @ 1,400-lb. steers at \$4.20 to \$4.30.

Native cows sold during July at \$1.50 to \$3.25; store cattle at \$2.20 to \$3.20. The slop feeders bought freely of 950-lb. steers at about \$2.60 to \$2.75.

Comparative prices for hogs for several years past, at this season, are shown below:—

Date.	Mixed 200 @ 240 lbs. Average.	Heavy 250 @ 400 lbs. Average.	Light 140 @ 200 lbs. Average.
1889	\$4.20 @ \$4.25	\$4.15 @ \$4.35	\$4.35 @ \$4.65
1888	5.50 @ 5.90	5.80 @ 6.00	5.55 @ 5.90
1887	5.40 @ 5.65	5.50 @ 5.75	5.35 @ 5.65
1886	4.45 @ 5.00	4.75 @ 5.15	4.40 @ 5.00
1885	4.00 @ 4.30	4.25 @ 4.50	4.25 @ 4.70
1884	5.00 @ 5.25	5.30 @ 5.65	5.00 @ 5.30
1883	5.20 @ 5.60	5.55 @ 6.00	5.65 @ 6.25
1882	7.35 @ 8.05	8.10 @ 8.75	7.40 @ 8.10
1881	5.90 @ 6.30	6.25 @ 6.75	6.00 @ 6.50

From the above it will be seen that hogs, as well as cattle, are a good deal lower than five or six years ago.

The receipts of cattle at Chicago for the year are about 200,000 head larger than in 1888. The receipts have consisted chiefly of good, heavy cattle. Texas rangers have not been marketed so freely as last year; and it is claimed that the crop of grass cattle from the far west will also show a shortage. These predictions, however, are not very reliable; they come mainly from interested parties.

For many months the rainfall in Texas has been so great that neither live stock nor crops have done well. In the coast country south of San Antonio cattle are in some cases wading in water trying to find grass, while the cotton crop has already been seriously damaged by exposure to rain. The northern range country in Montana and Wyoming is still too dry.

The writer has just returned from a trip through Kansas and Colorado. Beyond the "rain belt" in Kansas, and in the entire State of Colorado, farmers are dependent upon their irrigating canals and ditches. Perhaps it might be said that they are independent of rain fall, for when the work of constructing good irrigating canals and ditches is done, farmers can easily turn the water upon their crops or withhold it as seems best.

The great crop of crops in that western country is alfalfa, or lucerne, as it used to be called in the older British works on agriculture.

Mining has made Colorado, and is still the chief industry; but farming, with alfalfa growing for a basis, is said to be rapidly taking second place, leaving cattle raising behind.

Old fashioned cattle raising on free Government lands in that State is out of date. The great cattle trail from Texas to the northern ranges is also closed, never to be opened. The railroads, however, are getting the benefit. Formerly cattle were started on the trail early in the spring, arriving at their destination late in the fall, sometimes very thin, and in bad condition. Now they are taken out of their pastures in good condition, put on cars, and landed at the northern grazing grounds before they have had time to run down in flesh. This ought to make a great difference in winter losses, as the greatest losses have always been among the southern cattle recently arrived from their long and tedi-

ous drive. With whom "the wish is father to the thought," the claim is again made, that many western ranchmen will only ship a part of their cattle if prices do not improve. We have heard this for several years past, but it may be that owners are now in better condition to be independent than heretofore.

Some successful cattlemen, who have been out of the ranch business since 1883, have recently re-invested, showing returning confidence in the business.

Sheep Killing Dogs a Great Hindrance to Agricultural Progress.

BY D. NICOL.

To account for the present depressed state of agriculture in Ontario, there are some causes for which the farmers have no remedies within their power. They cannot make the rains come just when they are most needed, neither can they avert a deluge; but that this very serious hindrance to the progress of agriculture has been so long endured is almost entirely the fault of the farmers themselves. There are comparatively few farmers in Ontario who have not in some measure suffered loss by other people's dogs.

Mr. Dryden, in his article on sheep, in the last number of the *Advocate*, speaks of a large area of country north and east of Kingston as being remarkably well suited for sheep husbandry, and wonders what can be the reason so few sheep are raised there. I know that part of the country, and what its capabilities are. I also know the people, and somewhat how most of them are circumstanced. In many cases there may be, as Mr. Dryden supposes, a deplorable lack of enterprise; but the majority of the most enterprising farmers of that country are quite well aware that sheep-raising would be the most profitable business they could engage in on their farms were it not the fact that it is unsafe. If Mr. Dryden were to ask each individual farmer in the districts mentioned, "Why do you not raise sheep?" I venture to say that in nine cases out of ten, the reply he would receive would be, "Because of sheep-killing dogs."

Two years ago an enterprising young farmer, who was desirous of investing his capital exclusively in the business of sheep-raising in the County of Frontenac, with a view of being convenient to the American market, asked my advice on the matter. I told him that unless protection from dogs could be obtained he would find it a very unsafe speculation, and the many ravages on flocks since that time has more than justified the conclusion. Three weeks ago one flock of Southdowns was one night left out of the fold. The result was six sheep killed and several others badly worried. Since then four other flocks in this neighborhood have been attacked, and a great deal of damage done. In only one instance has the sufferer been able to collect anything for damages. In another instance the guilty dog was discovered, but as the dog was the owner's only personal property, remuneration was simply out of the question.

Frontenac County is not by any means an exception in regard to this evil. All the counties to the east, and many to the west of us are infested, and suffer nearly equally from the same cause.

Now, this is an evil which the farmers can, if they wish, have remedied by legislative enactment; the more easily, because there can be no ground for introducing party politics into the question. The Ontario farmers are very nearly united in opinion regarding the threatened Jesuit aggression. Will they not unite to dispell this existing torment, which can be done without making any one the worse off? I do

not mean that every dog in the Province should at once be killed, because it may be that in some instances dogs are of some use, although I am not aware of any such. I know that the butchers and drovers are now very generally agreed that dogs for their purpose do more harm than good, because of the difficulty in getting assistants who can prevent the dogs from harassing and annoying the animals being driven.

I would not try to deprive the city lady of the pleasure of leading around with a string her blanketed little pure-bred poodle. Sheep raisers have no need to dread that class of dogs. The great majority of dogs kept in Canadian cities, towns and villages are despicable mongrels, large enough to worry sheep, and are utterly worthless for any good purpose. They lie around home during the day time, and prowl around the country during the night. They are now more to be dreaded than formerly was the wolf, the lynx, or the bear. On many farms, dogs of this class are kept, and although they are seldom known to attack their owner's sheep, they will travel many miles to get a favorable opportunity on some other farm, and should be dealt with as wild animals.

Every farmer is now required to take care of his bulls, boars and rams, and to see that they do not injure or destroy their neighbor's property, or in anyway hinder their neighbor's progress in their chosen branch of husbandry, yet in some districts if they were altogether allowed their freedom, the evil would not be as great as that of dogs under the existing laws.

It is hardly probable that every farmer in Ontario would engage in sheep husbandry, even if they were protected from the ravages of depredating dogs; but many, whose farms are better adapted for sheep raising than for anything else, would then be enabled to make a livelihood. It is very unfair that they should be prevented from making the best of their farms by others who have no interest in such matters.

It is contrary to the golden rule:—"Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you." It is high time for the Government to amend the laws regarding dogs. At Farmer's Institute meetings many subjects of far less importance have been freely discussed; therefore I would recommend the following text for deliberate consideration at every Farmer's Institute meeting to be held next fall and winter throughout the Province:—

"Would legislative enactment requiring every dog owner to take care that his dog or dogs do not kill or injure his neighbor's sheep, be for the best interests of the farming community?"

If the tax on dogs were made compulsory, it would mitigate the evil in some degree, but it would not by any means be an efficient remedy.

Every dog should be chained, kenneled or otherwise confined during the night time, and every unmuzzled dog found at any time away from his home, not in charge of some person, should be taken dead or alive, and the owner prosecuted for allowing his dog or dogs to go at large. This would be on the principal of equal rights. It is the law in all large cities in Europe. It is a law that can justly be demanded by the sheep raisers of Ontario.

Mutual Live Stock Insurance Association of Ontario.

The above Association was recently organized, with Mr. Jno. McMillan, M. P., of Constance, Ont., as President, Jno. Avery, Clinton, as Secretary, and Mr. N. Y. McLean, of Seaforth, as Treasurer. The following gentlemen are Directors:—Alex. Innes, W. D. Sorby, D. D. Wilson, D. McIntosh, Jno. Beattie, A. Bishop, R. Beith, Thos. Evans, Idington McLaughlin, Bissitt, Meyer, Graham, Blackwell, Moore.

A correspondent of the Country Gentlemen, calling attention to the statement of a speaker at a meeting of the board of agriculture who said that he could make butter at a cost of ten cents a pound for feed, says: "Farming of this kind pays well, and one great reason why it does not pay in so many instances is that so many men do not put enough faith in their business to cause them to put more money, labor and brains in it."