

every district to collect its own tax, (c) fund thus raised available to prosecute owners and harborers of bad dogs, and to pay for sheep killed; (d) any dog seen chasing sheep to be shot without notice.

C. J. Cook, Colchester Co.—A great many sheep have been killed by dogs this season. Unless something is done to control dogs quickly, the farmer may as well give up sheep-raising.

W. W. Black, Cumberland Co.—Dogs affect the sheep-raising here to quite an extent.

Hugh Fraser, Hants Co.—I think dogs are to blame for decrease in sheep. The Government should quit playing with this matter and put a double tax on dogs. Then we will have more sheep.

W. F. Newcombe, King's Co.—Dogs have been the cause of farmers giving up sheep-keeping in this district. I favor a tax.

R. J. Messenger, Annapolis Co.—Dogs are accountable for 75 per cent. of the decrease. There is not a farmer here who will not endorse the Act.

It is thus impossible to avoid the conclusion that something should be done, and done speedily, by the governing bodies to safeguard the sheep industry of the country from the attacks of dogs. We can certainly get along better without dogs than without sheep, if there is no alternative. But, properly regulated, we should be able to enjoy the benefits of both animals thoroughly.

A. E. BURKE.

HORSES.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN CLYDESDALES AND SHIRES.

One of the questions that never will down is the hypothetical difference between a Clydesdale and a Shire. It came up last month in the lecture-room of the Ontario Winter Fair, at the conclusion of Mr. John Gardhouse's address on the selection of a stallion and proper type in mating. The inquirer said that he lived near St. Thomas, Ont., to which region there has been a very heavy importation of Shire horses, and he found himself unable to distinguish between the Clydesdales and the Shires. "This is not the first time that question has been brought up in this hall," said Mr. Gardhouse, diplomatically adding, "I might not be able to answer the question, but I will say that there is not very much difference in the best kind of either breed. I have heard it said, and I believe it is correct, that many years ago, probably before my time, there was practically one kind of draft horse in the Old Country, and the difference at the present time is just what little difference they may have made in breeding them in Scotland and in England."

The answer, so far as it goes, is perfectly correct. There are no points possessed by either breed which are disqualifications in the other. In color, both exhibit all variations from black to gray, bay being the commonest shade. In conformation, there are no sharply-defined distinctions. A good point in a Clydesdale is a good point in a Shire, and there are numerous individuals of each breed that might be easily mistaken for the other. On the whole, however, it may be safely claimed that the Shires average somewhat heavier in muscle, especially of forearm and gaskin. The Clydesdale breeders, on the other hand, have paid more especial attention to quality of bone, and to quality and set of underpinning. The most approved size and shape of foot, quality of hoof, slope and length of pastern, hard, flat-boned, tendonous legs, and free action, are more commonly met with in the Scotch breed. In a word, the Shire, as a breed, is the better embodiment of draft-horse scale, while, of all heavy breeds, the Clydesdale epitomizes quality.

PREVENTING HORSES FROM PAWING IN THEIR STALLS.

Many horses have the habit of stamping and pawing in their stalls. A good way to correct the habit is to strap to the leg, just above the knee, a short piece of fairly-heavy chain, about three or four links. When pawing begins, the chain swings free, and, after a rap or two from it on the cannon bone, the horse learns to keep his feet on the floor. This simple appliance is said to be an effectual cure for the habit. It possesses, at all events, the merit of simplicity, and may be tested easily.—[Farmer's Advocate & Home Journal, Winnipeg.]

SELECTING AND MATING A DRAFT STALLION.

[Address by John Gardhouse, at the Ontario Winter Fair, 1907.]

It is very important always to select a good sire, and, in selecting the sire, it is very important to know the mare. You should know just what kind of an animal you have, and just what kind of a horse would be suitable to mate her with. As a farmer, and speaking largely to farmers, I believe that the farm is the proper place to raise horses in this country, because you must have the land for them to run on and develop their muscle. I will, therefore, confine my remarks more particularly to the heavy class of horses.

We get no one horse that is perfect. There are some defects in every animal, and it is necessary that any defects in the mare be made up in the selection of the sire. Be sure that the sire is exceptionally strong in any weak points the mare may have. It is important to stick to one breed or another; don't cross breeds. When we were out on the Ontario Commission, we ran across animals bred from pretty nearly every breed of horses in the Province of Ontario, probably crosses of Shire, Percheron and Clydesdale, and then we had farmers who thought they could get first-class horses by breeding to light horses, so as to get good steppers on the road; therefore, we would have, say, a mixture of all kinds in one animal, or an animal that was very little good for anything. If you have a Clydesdale mare, breed her to a Clydesdale horse; if you have a Cleveland Bay or a Standard-bred, or a roadster, stick to that type if you want to get the best results. Look over your horse carefully, and get the best possible one you can. There are too many poor ones in the country at present. The Hon. Mr. Monteith said, in his opening remarks, that we had nearly three-quarters of a million horses in the Province; and if you could raise the standard of these horses so that they would be worth from five to ten dollars apiece more, it would be worth while. Have you ever stopped for a moment to think that it costs no more time to look after a good horse than a poor one? It only requires one stall in your stable to keep a good horse. You have to have just as good feed and just as much of it to feed a poor horse as you do to feed a good one, and in some cases a little more. To get the best results out of stock-raising, you first require to have the animals, and then give them the best care and attention. Put a poorly-bred horse in a good stable, and give him the best care, and you will only have a poor horse.

When I am going to select a sire, I first look at the head of the animal. I like to get one with a good broad forehead, bright, intelligent eye, and nicely-set ear. I believe that a horse is a very intelligent animal, and that he can be taught nearly anything, and I have sometimes seen men handling horses which I thought knew more than the men handling them. Therefore, I say, get a horse with a nice, bright, intelligent eye and a broad forehead, and a nicely-set ear, and you are apt to have a horse that has some brains, and he can be taught something. Not only that, but I like a horse that has an open jaw, not meaty and thick in flesh, nice clean-cut throat, to insure good breathing power, and a nicely-set neck, well blended into the shoulder. Get all the flesh on the shoulder that you can. I don't want to see a narrow, thin neck going into a broad-set shoulder. You need not be at all afraid in selecting

a horse that there will be no place for the collar to rest on; you will always find a stopping-place somewhere. If the neck is thick and well planted into the shoulder, you are likely to have a good covering of muscle over the shoulder, and if the horse gets a little thin in condition, he is not so apt to get sore shoulders. Then, he should have a deep chest, with the legs well set back under the body. I don't want a horse with the legs set out on each corner; it will make him appear a broad horse, and he will be broad between the front legs; but if you have a horse with legs set out on each corner, what are you likely to have? A horse with a hollow chest and weak fore-flank, two things we want to avoid in breeding animals at all times, because they denote a weak constitution, and that is a great detriment to breeding stock of any kind. The legs should be well set back under the body, a fair width apart. I am not advocating a narrow horse; we want all the chest width we can get. He should be well muscled down on the inside of the leg, and a fair length from the elbow to the knee; a broad, flat knee; as much of the knee to the outside of the leg as you can reasonably get. The bone should be as large as you can get it with the right quality. It is an important thing in draft horses to get the right quality of bone. Get all the bone you can in draft horses, but don't sacrifice quality in order to get quantity. You will notice the same thing in draft horses that you notice in a man's hands. You will find some men that can do any sort of hard labor, and get their hands as rough and dirty as possible, and they can come in and wash them, and they will hardly have a crack or break, whereas the hands of another man doing the same work will become rough, sore and chafed; and we have the same thing exactly in horses. A horse with hard, flinty bone, covered with a nice skin and with a good quality of hair, will not likely have any trouble in the way of scratches or anything of that kind. A horse should have nice, springy pasterns, of medium length, and hard, flinty foot, of good material. I don't advocate a great big foot; I think a medium-sized foot will wear a little better, and is not quite so apt to get down on the heel or flat-footed. I like a horse with the withers carrying far back. The back should be short and strong, and well muscled; get the ribs springing out well from the backbone, and as long as possible, with a nice arch. It is a difficult matter to get the same spring of rib that we like to find, and that depth of rib, in the same animal, but aim to have as much of both as you can. If you want a man exceptionally strong, you should get a man that is built with strong muscles down his back and over his hips; as a rule, you will find he is a pretty strong man, and you will find the same thing in a horse. I have heard some men say, "I want a good dinner-basket." So we do, but that is not all. You can have enough barrel to carry a good feed, with a good deep fore-rib to provide lots of room for lung power, and, as a rule, you will find a strong horse with a good constitution, and he will travel well and wear well.

Coming back to the hook bones, I remember we used to have them very much more square and flat. I don't advocate that; I want a horse with a nice smooth hook-bone that will cover well with muscle and flesh—the same thing that we look for in Shorthorn cattle. We want the quarters fairly long, well-laid down in the thighs, and well-muscled down in the inside of the leg, and as broad as you can possibly get them on



Off for the Hills.