

severe as that which comes from a craving thirst. Further, the animal is diseased, and as already seen, the meat of such an animal is unfit for consumption. These shippers and railroad managers, therefore, for a little gain are willing to attack the health and lives of the public. And still we keep a police force in all our large cities principally for the purpose of watching a class of men who seldom deliberately plot crime that is so black as this.

Besides all this such downright dishonesty in time always overleaps itself. It is a blind man who thinks that the great houses who buy cattle to slaughter will continue to buy cattle of this character, or that if it becomes uncertain whether they can get cattle whose meat will keep, they will not cut down the price so as to cover a possible loss. It is equally blind to expect that when it shall become known that beef is poisoned before it is slaughtered that the consumption will not fall off enough to affect the price. These people, therefore, are working directly against their own interest, but when an average man gets his eye on a dollar he will get it if he breaks his neck in doing it.

What ought to be done? Enforce the national law that provides that stock shall be watered and fed every so often. If the roads over which stock is shipped will not see that the law is complied with, summon them into a United States court and compel them to pay for their criminal indifference or their criminal design. Humane societies ought to see to this. We have one in Illinois, and we respectfully call their attention to this serious abuse of the cattle that are transported over our railroads. For the sake of the animals and for the sake of the people who consume the meats let a determined effort be put forth to stop this monstrous cruelty and wrong. The matter can be remedied if the managers of the railroads will simply issue their orders to their representatives that a failure to have stock watered and fed as the law directs, will secure their dismissal. The managers know this well enough. Some of their representatives in the yards frankly say that they can do nothing without such orders, but that with them they could act efficiently. The entire responsibility, therefore, rests upon the railroad managers.

No trifling part of a jockey's education is a knowledge of how to hold his tongue. One young man has recently had a warning, but it came too late—had he possessed this most desirable accomplishment I should have been richer myself and some of my friends would have benefited by several thousand pounds. Thus it happened. Archer was the other day riding a colt that appears to be invincible. He cantered to the post, and was joined there by a lad, a successful jockey in his way, who promptly struck up conversation by observing, "I'm going to beat you to-day!" "Are you?" Archer carelessly replied. "Yes, I am!" the other replied. "You think I'm not. All right. You'll see?" The lad in truth was "as near as a toucher" doing what he said he should do, and we who were in that desirable thing which they call "the know" thought for a few comfortable seconds that our money was in our pockets. But Archer won. "He'd have done me to a certainty if he hadn't talked about his mare," Archer said afterwards, "I should have laughed at the idea of his being dangerous if he hadn't said what he did, and should have taken no notice of his getting ahead—felt sure he would come back or I would catch him when I started; but after what he said I thought I had better keep an eye on him. He astonished me I can tell you, and he would have won the race if he hadn't given me warning." Those who backed the second at from 12 to 1 to 20 to 1 are naturally delighted with the jockey. They propose, indeed, to present him with a testimonial. A muzzle is the most favored suggestion.—*English Paper.*

THE RANGEMAN.

Colorado Live Stock Journal.

The *Breeders' Gazette*, published at Chicago, assumes that because the men engaged in cattle raising in the arid belt are moving to form an International Range Association, that they propose to array themselves in an attitude of war toward the live stock men of other sections. The assumption is both false and mischievous. While the farm cattle raisers and the range stockmen are not in conflict, their methods are utterly dissimilar, and in convention they present incongruous elements. The farmers and millers, for instance, are dependent on each other, and in one sense their interests are mutual, yet a convention of farmers and millers would not bring together a body that would be harmonious in its deliberations. The interests of range men are known only to themselves, and cannot be intelligently considered and discussed by those engaged in stock-raising in the country east of the rooth meridian. To sit for hours listening to dairy statistics, or to the given number of pounds of hay or corn fed to a cow or steer during the winter months, is a source of neither pleasure nor profit to the rangeman, while the dairyman is equally indifferent to questions touching range interests. Either interest might as appropriately attend a convention of cotton growers at New Orleans. They meet on common ground only when the question of contagious cattle diseases, or that of transportation, is under discussion. So that while the rangemen are not hostile to the cattle interests of other sections, they believe that their interests can be more conveniently considered and better served by coming together at some point in the range country, where they will be glad to meet live stock men from every part of the world.

THE BEST KIND OF STOCK TO RAISE.

Iowa Homestead.

Whether horses, cattle, sheep or hogs are the most profitable is not an abstract question to be settled by discussion, but a concrete case to be determined not so much by the merits of the stock as by the character, capacity and tastes of the farmer, the kind and quality of the land, the climate and local surroundings. There are some farmers whose tastes lie in the direction of cattle. They have a natural love for them, are adepts in milking and feeding, the calves grow as if by magic, whilst others have no luck because no tact nor skill nor taste for that branch of stock-raising. Other men who have no luck, as they say, with cattle, have a natural love for horses, whilst some who have no special success with either, are perfect artists when it comes to shaping up the pig. So that whether one kind of stock is better than another depends on the adaptation of the farmer himself. There is also an adaptation of the land. Because large, heavy cattle do admirably on one farm it does not follow that with the same farmer they would do well on the adjoining farm. We have often called attention to the fact that the large breeds have their home in level, rich soils, whilst the small breeds are the product of rough, thin soils. And this arrangement of nature cannot be reversed. The man who wishes to breed Shorthorns that weigh from 1,600 to 1,800 pounds must have smooth land, free from bogs and deep sloughs. He can put Jerseys or scrubs on his rough lands, but he had better keep his Shorthorns or Herefords off them.

On the other hand, the farmer who wishes to raise horses that have wear in them, that will stand the rough work of roads and streets will find on a rather hilly farm with gravelly or even stony land, the soil adapted to them, and will succeed far better than on the level prairie or wet bottom. So

that to have the highest success there must be an adaptation of the farmer and the land and the stock to the end to be gained, and until all these factors are taken into account it is impossible to say which is best or most profitable.

All kinds of stock have their ups and downs. The farmer who has a pride in any one kind of stock, and a natural liking for it, and a farm adapted to it should not change because for a time it is under a cloud. So long as human wants remain as they are, there will be a demand and reasonably fair prices for good horses, good beef, for pork and wool and mutton. No invention can supplant them until it provides some way in which man himself can live without food or go unclothed. Inventive genius can supplant human labor, but it can't supplant the labor of the horse. So that the one thing for the stock farmer to do is to select the kind of stock adapted to his taste, his farm and his purse, and go ahead.

GREEN MANURING.

In a letter to the *Scottish Agricultural Gazette*, Sir John B. Lawes summarizes the result of eight years' experiments on the question of turning under green crops for manure, the results of which were that an acre of clover fed off by sheep, without other food, gave an annual increase in live weight of 249½ pounds, while sheep which received in addition 728 pounds of cotton cake, gave 362 pounds of live weight per acre. At four cents a pound for the increase of weight, which would be a very low price for the increase alone, the increase on an acre of clover alone would therefore be worth (in America) \$10.00, or that on clover and cotton cake \$14.48. From these experiments Sir John argues that "it is evident that wherever there is a demand for meat it is much more profitable to feed green crops with stock than to plough them under. In districts of the United States where there is little or no demand for meat, I have often advocated the ploughing under of such green crops as peas and clover, as being a much cheaper method of fertilizing the soil than can be effected by the application of nitrogenous manures. In this country (Great Britain), on the other hand, the cultivation of arable land without stock, and fertilizing the soil by ploughing under green crops, as also the continuous growth of grain crops by means of purchased manures, appear to be processes which can hardly be supported by practical science." [When it is remembered that the writer of the above has applied, during a period of more than forty years, the most rigorous tests possible to all forms of manures, including those which he denominates "purchased" manures, and that he has conclusively demonstrated that these "purchased" chemical manures may be so employed as to yield even greater crops than stable manure (though at enormous expense), his assertion that "the continuous growth of grain crops by means of purchased manures can hardly be supported by practical science" should be carefully pondered here in America, where these manures are more expensive, and the resultant crops less valuable than in England. The fact is that the farmers in America cannot afford to make a practice of ploughing under green crops, or of buying commercial fertilizers. The only excuse for temporarily following the one practice or the other is the lack of capital for handling live stock.]

Recently in the transportation of 550 head of cattle by rail, from Colorado to Texas, all arrived in good condition, only one being trampled to death while on the cars.

The annual beef production of Scotland is estimated at 110,000 tons, which, at a value of about \$385 a ton, makes a total of \$41,250,000. The mutton production is said to reach 70,000 tons, valued at about \$33,750,000.