

perience in driving horses, except, probably, for pleasure. The man or woman who does considerable driving under conditions that necessitate allowing his horse to stand frequently, either tied or untied, will have discovered that if he be unchecked, he is continually getting into trouble by getting the reins under the shaft, or, if it be summer time, while nibbling grass, getting his feet upon the reins, etc., either of which causes the average horse to rush backwards, in most cases breaking something or injuring somebody, and in many cases running away; while, if he had a moderately tight check, not sufficiently tight to cause distress, but sufficiently tight to cause him to attend to business, it would be safer, and save the driver not only anxiety, but considerable trouble and worry in getting out of his rig to adjust the reins, etc.

Then, again, there are many horses which become so dull and careless if driven without a check, that they hang their heads and look mean unless constantly kept to attention by either word or whip. With the average horseman or horsewoman appearances count for a good deal, and we think he is justified in driving with a moderately tight check when circumstances demand it, even though the loafing inclination of his horse is interfered with. There are horses whose manners and general tendencies are so bad, either through want of proper education or congenital cussedness, that it is not safe to drive them unless they are tightly checked. No person but one who has had experience with this kind of a horse can appreciate how much more easily he is controlled when tightly checked than when his head is at liberty. Under such circumstances, we consider the safety of the driver more to be considered than the comfort of the horse, and do not consider that we would be justified in refusing him the privilege of using a tight overdraw, or any other kind of check necessary.

While, on general principles, we think the side-check more comfortable, we claim that the intelligent use of either is quite justifiable, and in most cases advisable. We do not object to very tight checking for racing purposes. We know that most horses go faster when so rigged, but the duration of this rigging is only for a few minutes at a time. But, on the other hand, we consider that the tight checking of a horse for ordinary driving purposes, when he is often in harness for hours at a time, causes him such agony that no man is justified in subjecting him to it, unless he is a vicious horse that cannot be safely driven under other conditions. "WHIP."

Action, Hair and Feather.

A great alteration for the better has taken place in the movement of the Shire horse. There is manifest a desire to breed faster horses, and at the trot there are fewer animals that go wide at the hocks. Close hock action must be cultivated, for only by getting the hocks well below them can horses make the full use of their tractive powers.

Is not the hair craze being a little overdone? It may be a characteristic of the Shire, but the breeder has still to show a solid reason, beyond the æsthetic pleasure of the eye, why a horse or filly that is as full of hair as a bear is better than a good clean-legged animal that has a reasonable amount of hirsute adornment.

If a foreign trade for Shires is to be cultivated to any extent, the demand for hairy heels and knees and hocks coupled with it, will have to be greatly modified. Can any breeder say that, in farm practice, very feathery horses are an advantage? It used to be considered that hair, Samson-like, denoted strength, and indicated the quality of bone, but we do not believe that nowadays.—[Farmer and Stockbreeder, England.]

LIVE STOCK.

Good Stock Pays.

Stock your farm with good horses and good cattle, and keep them well, said Robt. Miller, in an address at the Trafalgar Agricultural Society's annual meeting and banquet, at Oakville, Ont. You do not need to keep them like champions, he continued, but feed them plenty of good, wholesome, satisfying feed; a little well-saved hay, well-saved straw, corn silage or dried corn, roots and grain. It does not pay to feed but one or two things. Give a well-balanced assortment, and thus turn your raw material into a finished article, in the shape of good beef, good butter, cream or cheese; or, if the machinery is more after the nature of the horse kind, you will have a draft horse that never has to seek a customer at a good big price, or you will have a horse for the carriage with plenty of buyers. Breed the best you can, feed them well; they will keep you, instead of your having to keep them. They work while you sleep, and they make your farm richer. Send your produce to market on foot, where brains count. Do not sell the raw material. Anybody can do that, and you have the whole world to compete with.

Martinetism in Quarantine Restrictions.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

As an exhibitor at the last International Exhibition at Chicago, I wish to state a few facts. In the first place, the Board of Directors of the International got the United States Government to pass special legislation to allow Canadian exhibitors to take their sheep to Chicago and quarantine them there, counting the thirty days from the day they arrived in the United States. It was this act of the United States Government that allowed Canadians to take their show sheep to Chicago, and sell them there. This was a generous act on the part of the United States Government, and, realizing and appreciating the work of the International management, some Canadians decided to venture to show and sell there.

Shortly after we were located at the show in Chicago, the United States papers stated that the Canadian exhibits could not return to Canada, copied, I suppose, from Canadian papers. I am informed that some of the exhibitors were told this when they crossed the line. The exhibitors met in Chicago, and passed a resolution asking special legislation to allow the Canadian exhibit to return to Canada. And what was the reply? That all stock originating or passing through the affected States (naming them), and a whole lot more rubbish, could not enter Canada. A second message to Mr. Heide, the secretary of the show, that all men with stock would have to burn their clothes in which they passed through Michigan—more rubbish.

That was the reply to our petition by our own Dominion Government, or the Veterinary Department, or both—just as you like.

Now, I would be the last to ask our Government to do anything that would take foot-and-mouth or any other disease into our country. But what are the facts? No stock from the affected States was allowed to go to the International, for they were all quarantined; there was no disease at the Show or in the State. The Grand Trunk Railway kept for us in the yards the same cars we left Ontario in for us to return in. The United States allowed us to go through Michigan, an infected State, in sealed cars, but our Government would not let us return in sealed cars through the same State. Now, we heard that the reason why the Canadian Government would not allow stock to enter Canada that passed through any affected State was that England would quarantine Canada against shipping stock there. More rubbish.

England would not quarantine Canadian stock unless we had the disease.

This is more like the reason the Government made such regulations: The shippers of our West poured hot shot into our Government, and, it seems, bulldozed our Government into believing it. Of course, it paid them well to do so; for, if the American cattle were delayed in shipment but a few days, it would make a considerable difference to our shippers.

Be that as it may, that was no reason for not passing special legislation, as our case was entirely different, and when the Government or certain members were interviewed with the Acting Veterinary Director-General, he did not know that the Ontario stock could not get back to Ontario without passing through Michigan or New York States. What do you think of that?

It looks to me as if the Veterinary Department was running the Government. Look at the army of inspectors sent out, and if any disease had been found, they would certainly have spread it all over the country; that is my opinion, at any rate.

Just as soon as the American sheepmen saw the Canadian regulations, they said to themselves we will get some cheap sheep—and they did. One exhibitor sold about a dozen sheep by private sale, and in less than five minutes they were resold for over \$90 more. Another instance, sheep that were sold by auction changed hands to the tune of about \$200; and so I might go on. I believe that if our Government had sent 25 or 50 circulars in envelopes to the Canadian exhibitors, with the regulations, and not published it broadcast in the papers, it would have been policy on the part of our Government. Then, the Government state, for various reasons, they are not willing to pay the exhibitors for loss or extra expense of keeping the stock which they could not or would not sell at a sacrifice, but do not state the reasons. Had our Government arranged for our stock to be quarantined at Sarnia a reasonable length of time, there would have been a chance for us to get our stock home, but we could not bring them into the country for six months.

Now, there are at present some sheep in Ohio, at the expense of an Ontario sheepman, one of which was the champion Shropshire ram of that great show, and there is also in the State of Illinois a flock which will cost its owner a large sum for wintering, as the man could not sell, except at a slaughtering price.

In the meantime the Government passed special legislation to let American race-horses come

through the affected States. I believe our Government did right in doing so, but why not let Ontario sheep come home, also?

To-day our sheep are going through the thirty-day quarantine at Port Huron, and shipped into different States, passing through Michigan, yet our Government will not let Ontario sheep in Illinois come home through Michigan.

Further, our Government allowed the feed troughs, bags, and so forth, that were taken to the International to be shipped back into Canada, and our winning sheep might as well have come with them.

In conclusion, I sincerely hope that pressure will be brought to bear on our Government to compensate those who have been to the expense and loss brought about by the unfair regulations to the enterprising stockmen of Canada who brought honor and glory to our country.

Brant Co., Ont.

JOHN LLOYD-JONES.

Legislation Respecting Sale of Feeding Stuffs.

At the meeting of the Agricultural Committee of the House of Commons, held at Ottawa, March 3rd, Frank T. Shutt, Chemist of the Dominion Experimental Farms, gave his annual evidence respecting the work done during the past year by the Chemical Division. After briefly reviewing the important branches of this work, Mr. Shutt devoted the rest of the session to a consideration of the feeding stuffs on the markets of Eastern Canada, of which he brought a number with him for the purpose of illustration. A greater interest than usual had been evinced in this matter during the past winter by farmers and dairymen, largely due, no doubt, to the high prices that prevailed and the shortage of fodder crops generally, consequent upon the drouth that was experienced last season in many sections of the country. In all, about 80 samples had been analyzed in the Farm laboratory during the year, all of which had been sent in for analysis and valuation. These consisted of products from the starch and glucose factories, oatmeal mills, from the preparation of breakfast foods, from beet-sugar factories, from the screenings obtained at elevators, etc. The composition of a large number of these feeds was displayed on a large chart, which clearly showed that very great differences existed in the nutritive values of these products. Basing the comparison essentially on the percentages of protein and fat—the two most valuable constituents from the nutritive standpoint, Mr. Shutt gave a number of examples in which the selling price was at variance with the nutritive qualities. While there were many most excellent feeding stuffs offered at fair prices, there were many others—from the presence of oat hulls, mill sweepings, etc.—that were comparatively worthless.

Gluten meal was a high-class feed that should contain from 30 to 35 per cent. protein, and, while some manufacturers put out such an article, others, under this term, offered material containing from 12 to 18 per cent. protein. Under existing circumstances, the name might or might not be an indication of the real nature of the feed. If there were no means of preventing a manufacturer from selling "Gluten Feed" under the name of "Gluten Meal," then it became necessary to protect farmers' interests by compelling the manufacturers to furnish a guarantee as to the percentages of protein and fat present. Mr. Shutt was of the opinion that the time was ripe for legislation in the matter, and thought there should be an annual collection and analysis of all feed stuffs sold for more than \$10 per ton, and that manufacturers should be compelled to attach tags to every package or consignment, bearing the percentages of protein and fat the feed contained.

If it is desirable to protect by law the farmers' interests in the matter of fertilizers, which are plant food, it is equally desirable that the same law should apply to feeding stuffs. Continuing, Mr. Shutt exhibited several samples of pea meal containing large proportions of pea bran, and possessing less than half the percentage of protein found in pure pea meal. Again, a number of "milling products" and mixtures were shown, the analysis of which proved that they were largely oat hulls, and consequently had a very low feeding value. One very serious difficulty that the farmer had to contend against was that many of these feeds were finely ground, and thus their true nature disguised.

Among the many feeds that were considered in detail were several samples of bran and shorts that had been adulterated with hulls, broken straw and sweepings. Examples of inferior brands of cottonseed meal were shown; these were upon the market competing with those of genuine quality. Mr. Shutt said that several of the manufacturers—reputable firms—had told him that they were strongly in favor of such a law as he had outlined, as it would protect their interests, as well as give the purchaser the necessary information on which to base a valuation.

At the conclusion of the evidence, a spirited