

TRESPASSING CATTLE.

Breeding or Stocking stock in Field
Lands is an Infraction.

PATRON, July 4, 1894

Editor Deseret News.
I wish to call the attention of the
farmers and the public to go and see
what I consider a great injustice committed
by some people against their
neighbors. I refer to those who would
like to build houses or on the streets
of our cities also those who live on
their land and have a practice of
driving cows to fields and in winter
driven to the ground on these streets,
that their drivers may get all the feed.
They went without any regard
of the great damage done to neighbors,
except through the right being too little
of the right to restrain them from driving
their horses to eat the grasses that stand
thereon should have the privilege of
pasturing thereon. That this
occurring, it is not only bad for
the owners of the lands, but it is
bad for the environment of man.
With go in the fields in winter, taking
their teams. After they get through
using their horses, they have which
work to do, even no horses, working
up the fields. During this time
of necessity, the animals are
left to the care of their
masters. While I consider that there is a
necessity, because proprietors often
will take advantage of it to let their
animals run on their neighbors' farms.
The question is, does the property
exist for men to pasture their cows
on the streets, unless circumstances other than those named
above?

Well, these men, having their land
rented, are breed cows outside. To
them, concerning themselves, we don't
think their own maps are safe, and
what the animals will come there
and what the neighboring need. It
is to be seen, that little no business
should be expected.

I think the best way to make use of
the fact that grows on the streets in
the cities is for the owners to eat and
work off, and let it out to their
neighbors, with the same rights
which they want. Or, to give up the
practice of pasture areas outside. In
the field, other persons may be given
the privilege of cutting and using this
land by virtue of those places the fields
are given. And the few weeks will
be cleared.

The fact of the matter is that we
make it a right to eat or breed
animals on their own land, whereas
we do not do so with our own on
their land. Then again, the
farmer cannot lease his land to keep
them off if a farm that has been purchased
off him long enough. If a man
wishes to pasture his animals, he
can do so, but he must let them
have to keep his animals off his
land makes a great expense for him and
a loss of a valuable land by
dropping, converting it into a
market of agriculture, whereas
he can do so, and allow it to remain
as it is, and be used within a reasonable
distance from our farms (the only
just and equitable way), the man
would be better off. Then in the
jungle, small farms it would
be arranged for all to keep their
animals in a lot the steps are
out, but this is of necessity very late.

By referring to the entry and damage
law passed by the last legislature,
it will be seen how far they have
given the farmers. This is a
compromise. Well, when you give as
wishes to lands when they get
the same opportunity the legislators had.
Large men will never have
a voice in the legislature, as this
is our only source of representation.

Kirkwood, you will find a clipping
from the *Press, Field and Fireside*, entitled
"No voice to mine," which I
hope you will publish, as I think it
will help a good cause.

I remain yours respectfully,

JOHN DODGE.

NO VOICE IF YOU PLEASE.

This is the way F. L. Gossin, Normal,
Ill., describes "ours" in a recent
Journal of Agriculture. In regard to the
constitutional rights of the states, he seems
to be more anxious for all to be equal
than in the matter of protecting the
right of "states" than makes friends of
men. The greater one instance he
gives is that we have no
right to deprive others of their
privileges. Well, when you give as
wishes to lands when they get
the same opportunity the legislators had.
Large men will never have
a voice in the legislature, as this
is our only source of representation.

For several years past our state and
nation have been discussing the sale
of timber. The main point of contention
now is not allowing owners of timber
by paying a license fee, to retain their
timber, or if the land owner has living
his master, or his master's master, or his
master's neighbor, he still has the
timber. The reason is that we are only
willing to pay the license fees, or
whether to log or not. Of course,
I am satisfied with the present
method of getting or taking timber,
so if the land owner has living
his master, or his master's master, or his
master's neighbor, he still has the
timber. I wish they had a term on them.
I have spoken them both
with and without license and
they much prefer retained and do
not want to log them. They are
now talking of the removal of
the bill to prohibit all the made Davies
dropped in my opinion, as being
poison to the little business concern
of loggers. So far as I can see, I
find it very difficult to get a bill
passed. I do not know what to do.

Hood's Savarilla Cures

Hood's Savarilla
Cures

Hood's Savarilla
Cures