

THE FLORIDA AGRICULTURIST

DEVOTED TO
A JOURNAL
STATE INTERESTS

VOL. XXXIII No. 4649

Jacksonville and DeLand, Fla., Wednesday, December 5, 1906.

Whole No. 1677.

The Going Citrus Crop.*Editor Florida Agriculturist:*

The agitation against shipment of green oranges has about blown over since the fruit has assumed the Journalistic color—yellow. Nevertheless, the prices have been good, owing largely to the scarcity and high prices for lemons!

The purpose of this letter is mainly to rail against the depredations of the buyers who "beared" the market on the plea of a great crop of oranges in Florida, and a great apple, grape and pear crop in the North. All of which were lies, pure and simple, for the parties making these claims knew the falsity of them. Nevertheless, they bought perhaps a million boxes on which they must have "coined" 25 per cent, or \$250,000, this was the grower's profit for the prices he realized left him only his pains and labor for his pay. 85 cents per box is not enough. The fellows who annually go over the state harvesting what is called "suckers," and obtaining oranges by false representations, ought to be subject to that law which punishes for obtaining goods under false pretenses. I don't see any difference. I heard one of these fellows who bought oranges at \$1.00, delivered, say that he sold at \$1.80 f. o. b., to N. C. parties, and later to parties at the North, \$1.60. It is notorious now that they have made another "Jack" this year. The unsophisticated are an easy mark for these depredators.

Several of these men who sold so early, have told me, as of old, that they were not prepared for putting up the fruit and not posted on markets or the prospects, nor acquainted with reliable parties to ship to, that they were in debt or in need of money, and were afraid to take any chances on cold, and thought best to sell even below a fair price—"any old price" in order to get "out of the woods," as it is called.

I want to say that \$1.10 on trees, or \$1.25 delivered, would have been a fair price this season. Buyers could have made a profit even at this, and at this price after the demand for lemons had fallen off, the green stuff would have remained on the trees until the season and demand for oranges had come around. The prospect for a prosperous season for the orange people has never been better and the season has just now opened with oranges bringing \$2.50 to \$3.50 per box. Fruit that should have brought the growers \$1.25 to \$1.40 on the trees, dumped off while three-fourths grown, at 85, or at about 65 cents per box! had it

matured, the measurement would have given the grower \$1.00 instead of the 85 cents on the basis of prices paid.

It is a pity that the many can be literally "guttled" by the few. But it is so, it is sure so, and the poor simpletons wince and whine, but know not what to do except to "grin and bear it." Their friends, the enemy, tell 'em there is no help for master and slave, robber and robbed, 'twas ever thus! "Survival of the fittest!" Gee Whillikins, Gee!!

Now, Mr. Editor, if I was in search of the intelligence of Florida, I would simply go and copy your subscription list, for your paper does not interest the man with long ears. I submit this letter to their discretion and judgment, and ask for a light on the subject, and the way out of this state of affairs.

I have the presumption to say that I know its complete solution, and perfect adjustment, so that equity and justice be promoted and the general good subserved, but to waste ink and paper on an uninterested public, not I.

Wm. Need.

Sheep or Dogs.

Every farmer needs a good dog, but if three-fourths of all the dogs in the United States were to die tonight, there would be much mourning among the children, but the country would be millions of dollars richer than it was the day before.

The farmers of this state ought to raise sheep. We have no doubt that the wool would be found profitable, but even if not they still should be grown as a means of furnishing a cheap source of a supply of fresh meat.

Which would be worth the most to this state, a few thousand more sheep or the almost innumerable worthless curs which infest the country? Why should dogs be allowed to roam about at will and destroy property? If they are valuable keep them at home, but make every one, found at large without an owner, an outlaw liable to be shot at sight.

The following editorial, from the Ohio Farmer, gives facts and figures which ought to be convincing to the most intense dog partizan in the state.

Sheep vs. Dogs in West Virginia.—The American people are often accused of being a race of "money grabbers." It has been asserted that we are losing our grasp of principle, our sense of right and justice, and even our sentiment, in the mad rush for financial gain. This will hardly apply in the light of the patience shown by our great sheep industry in tolerating the

dog nuisance. The Ohio Farmer has argued the dog question for years and has drawn some harsh criticisms for its pains. We believe that we are endowed with a normal regard for the dumb animals which have been placed in our care. We have a just and wholesome appreciation for the animal that responds to our kindness and care with mute devotion. We even confess to a sentimental regard for the dog that protects his master's goods. But we cannot allow that sentiment to blind us to the fact that the dog is the greatest menace to one of the most important industries of the country. We have presented facts and figures to show that loss to the sheep growers occasioned by dogs, amounts to hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. It is the weakest kind of sentiment which keeps one blinded to this fact. In most states some remuneration is made for the loss. It is not always adequate, but goes a great way in providing protection. Other states are less fortunate. We give below a communication received from one of our readers in West Virginia. We do not believe the situation is overstated, yet it discloses the astonishing fact that dogs cost the state of West Virginia five million dollars annually. We quote as follows:

"It is a lamentable fact that there are 18,000,000 less sheep in the United States than we had ten years ago, and 1,000,000 less in West Virginia. West Virginia ought to have at least 5,000,000 sheep instead of the 750,000 that she now has. She has enough going to waste each year, on the farms and in the brush pastures to keep at least 1,000,000 more sheep. I don't know a farm on which there are no sheep that has not enough going to waste to keep anywhere from 10 to 50 sheep according to the size of the farm. Now these sheep would yield not less than \$5 per head, which is only half what the best flock masters get. This means \$5,000,000 for what is now going to waste, to say nothing about the advantage derived from having the weed seeds eaten, the briars cropped off and the brush kept back. Now why do we not have the sheep? There is but one answer, sheep and dogs don't flock together. West Virginia is teeming with worthless dogs without any restriction whatever being placed upon them. In many places they put the flock master 'out of business' in a single night. I have made it a point to ask farmers, who are most in need of sheep, whenever I meet them, why they keep no sheep. One man said, 'I had a fine flock and the dogs put me

out of business in one night;' another said, 'I had a bunch and sold them. The dogs got into my neighbor's flock, killed, crippled, and scared them until they were a total loss. I will have no more until there is some protection from dogs.' Each one gives the same reason in each locality.

"Now I think I have made this matter so clear that even a casual observer will know that I have stated facts, and have rather under-rated the amount. I have only placed the income of these sheep at five dollars when many people get ten or more. I have said nothing about the annual loss on all kinds of stock from hydrophobia or of the occasional loss of human life from the same cause. No one will deny that the dogs are the most effective agents for spreading this frightful and in most cases fatal malady. Rabies is also on the increase in the state. Why can we not have some kind of restriction placed upon these dogs? I don't think it wise to legislate him out of existence; far from it. If he is worth more than a million sheep and the safety of human life, why not protect him? Make him property and make the owners of so valuable a property responsible for its depredations."—R. E. Thrasher, W. Va.

The damage done by dogs cannot be computed upon the basis of those killed and mangled. One visit from sheep-hunting dogs, practically ruins a flock. Sheep and dogs will not "mix." Either the dog must be held responsible or the sheep industry must fail or at best be a doubtful undertaking. West Virginia might and should be one of the leading sheep and wool growing states of the Union. On its rough hillsides it has thousands of acres of bluegrass grazing lands which should be covered with flocks. The dogs have driven the sheep men out and the state ranks 24th in the production of sheep and 25th in the production of wool. They have tried for years to secure the passage of a state dog-tax law without success. They have a local option tax law which is in force in only three counties in the state. It is time for all farmers and friends of agriculture in West Virginia to combine and present this matter to their state legislature in such a way that it cannot be ignored.

Two items from the New England Farmer, show that the dog nuisance is not confined to any one section or state:

It is certainly a senseless state of affairs when valuable, high-bred sheep are sacrificed to the appetites or whims