

Because they found it to be a failure and had a tendency to hasten on the disease that might have laid dormant for quite a number of years. Will it not have the same effect on our cattle and hasten the disease that might have laid dormant until they went to the block and helped to feed the people with wholesome meat? In speaking to one of our Inspectors lately he said there was no danger of tuberculin giving the disease to healthy animals, for it was all boiled before it was used, therefore the germs were all killed. Would not boiling or cooking meat kill the germs as well if there were any to kill? I would ask what good is testing anyhow when the animals are let live after they have reacted sufficiently to show they are diseased, or is it an infallible test under all circumstances? If not, I think it will do more harm than good, and again I would shout, *Danger Ahead.*

As consumption is so very contagious, as stated by our Inspectors, and is more prevalent in the human family than in our cattle, I would offer this suggestion to the Government: Have every one of the Inspectors tested with tuberculin, commencing with the Dominion Inspector, then the Provincial Inspectors and all the County Inspectors, and let not one of them go near a beast to inspect or to treat it who would not stand the test. And if there were any doubts about their soundness test them again and double the dose. Just serve them the way the Duke of Wellington served a man who came to him with a bullet-proof coat and wanted a royalty on each coat for all his soldiers. The Duke ordered him to put the coat upon himself and then ordered some of his soldiers to take him out and try the coat with a few shots. But the man left in a hurry, and that was the last heard of his bullet-proof coats.

Sunderland, Ont., March 29th, 1899.

W. S.

An Experience with Commercial Fertilizers

To the Editor of FARMING:

As spring approaches, crops, cultivation, and fertilizers become subjects of thought and discussion, and I notice articles in your columns descriptive of the values and functions of the various crops such as clover, etc. Considerable space has also been devoted to a description of Alberts' Thomas-Phosphate Powder as a fertilizer and renovator of worn-out or run-down soils. I have watched closely for some statements of results obtained from its use by Canadian farmers but so far have not seen any. Now, it sometimes happens that what would appear to be very clearly proven by the logic of argument does not appear so when tried by the test of experience, and with your permission will give you my own experience with this highly recommended fertilizer. Last spring I met the representative of the firm supplying it and heard from him of the grand results from its use as seen in increased crops, improved quality, and freedom from fungus diseases. The awakening into life of clover germs lying dormant in the soil, and a consequent crop of this very valuable plant were among the claims made for this wonderful powder. I ordered half a ton through Mr. A. Carter, the agent here. The powder is furnished in sacks containing 225 lbs. each. I got five sacks at a cost of \$16 87½, or at the rate of \$30 per ton, and had it sown at once and worked into the soil in accordance with directions given by said representative. It was sown at the rate of a sack per half acre on parts of two different fields on farms half a mile apart and on soils varying from clay loam to sandy loam. Tests were as follows:—Corn, two plots in different fields; turnips, two plots in different fields; potatoes, one plot. Field No. 1 had been in grass two years and oats one year previous to the test, and had received a liberal dressing of barnyard manure in preparation for the root and corn crops. Field No. 2 had been in grain three years previously and had also received a liberal dressing of barnyard manure. Now for results. After watching closely and estimating carefully, no results were discernible either in quality or quantity in the crops on either of the plots named last season but, as the powder is said to have beneficial effects for four years following its application,

I have not given up hope, but would be glad to hear from others of your readers who may have had success with it, as I may say I know of no more convenient way of helping each other than by telling what we have learned by experience. Thanking you for space in your columns,

Elora, Ont., March 22nd, 1899.

C. WRIGHT.

NOTE.—Mr. Wright's request is a good one, and we would like to hear from others of our readers who have had experience with this or any other commercial fertilizer. The use of commercial fertilizers in Canada is a comparatively new thing, and it is only during the past year or two that any special interest has been aroused in the subject. In Great Britain as well as in the United States, thousands of tons of commercial fertilizers are used every year, and if it is a good thing for the farmers of these countries to use them why would it not be a benefit to Canadian farmers, especially in the older sections, to do so? In England it is not the use or non use that is being discussed, but which is the best kind to use, and we might add that Alberts' Thomas-Phosphate Powder is used very extensively there, and from reports that appear in the British agricultural press would appear to be giving excellent results. We would, therefore, be glad to have the experience of any farmer who has used commercial fertilizers of any kind.—EDITOR.

Sheep vs. Dogs in Indiana

To the Editor of FARMING:

The wool growers of Indiana have had a varied and wide experience in securing an efficient dog law at the hands of their legislators, and we believe that we have one now that is the best we ever had, if not the best in the United States.

In the first place, you must have a law that is just to both parties interested and protects the farmer, as well as the dog-owner, and not conflict with the rights of either.

The farmer owns his farm, and the dog is a trespasser when on another man's premises besides his master's. The farmer must have the right to kill a dog when away from his master and also found worrying his stock.

(The farmer need not tell everybody what he does on his farm and must protect his interest by whatever means are in his hands.)

The owner of the dog must not be taxed unreasonably. If he is he makes a great fuss and gets the law repealed, and when he pays his tax his dog is not to be molested unless found to be a wrong-doer. All dog fanciers are willing, and will permit a law to be passed, that if his dog does wrong he may be killed. Here some of the trouble comes in, to prove whose dog has done the mischief; but, if killed in the act, no question is raised.

One dollar for a male dog and two dollars for a female is about the notch, and an additional fee for extras or more dogs than one. We do not have an inspector. The township assessor lists all dogs (when he lists property the 1st of April) and collects the dog tax and gives each dog-owner a receipt. If not paid then the dog must be killed, and he prescribes the rule of action, etc.

The man who has his sheep killed gets two disinterested farmers to appraise the sheep killed, maimed and worried, and goes before the township trustee inside of ten days and swears to the amount of damage sustained as to ownership, etc., and his claim is recorded, as are the oaths of the men subscribing to the statement; and, if the trustee has money, he pays the claim; if not, it takes its turn. The farmer must use all the vigilance he can in finding the dogs which did the devilish deed.

The owner of the dog, when proof is made that his dog has killed sheep, if he refuses to kill it, must pay a fine for each day he keeps his dog. If he refuses to pay the fine, he is put in jail.

It is very important that the tax be collected when the dog is listed. There are ample provisions for enforcing this part of the law. Costs have gone as high as twenty dollars where the law is not complied with.

Very truly,

J. W. ROBE.

Greencastle, Indiana, U.S., March 24th, 1899.