

couraged as it should be. Meantime, our energy is frittered away in vicarious effort, whilst competent and authoritative headship throughout the Dominion could do little less than turn it to immeasurably superior profit everywhere. Who will lead in this great work of unification and direction? It is a pressing need.

A. E. BURKE.

HORSES.

BREED REGISTRATION.

The following article, taken from a recent issue of the London Live-stock Journal, will be of interest to breeders in Canada at the present juncture:

Nowadays, when every recognized breed of horses, cattle, sheep and pigs in the United Kingdom possesses its Stud, Herd or Flock Book, and when the offshoots of these, in many cases, in foreign countries exceed in size the parent volumes, it is difficult to realize that at one time no such records existed. One might almost speak of the romance of breed registration, for the difficulties that were encountered and surmounted by the early promoters were numerous and formidable. It was many years after the General Studbook was originally issued, in 1793, before it had any companions or imitators, and the recent multiplication of breed registers, which have increased within the last few years with astonishing rapidity, makes it almost impossible to appreciate the trouble that beset the pioneers of the work.

There was, at the outset, no general recognition of the need of pedigree records, or any idea, except on the part of a few, that they would serve a useful purpose. Some of the great breeders of early times were resolutely opposed to the publication of the pedigrees of their stock, because they considered that the particulars required were of the nature of trade secrets that ought not to be divulged. Most people will remember the indignant reply of a very eminent breeder when he was asked for the pedigree of an animal he had sold: "Tell him that he was bred by So-and-So; that is pedigree enough for anybody." In the absence of hearty co-operation, it is wonderful that the work proceeded at all. In a number of cases the withholding of information by some prominent breeders undoubtedly caused the initial volumes to be less complete and accurate than they might otherwise have been.

In several instances the idea of having a breed record occurred to one individual, who set about collecting materials, and then, when the stage of publication had been reached, the difficulty of cost arose, and time after time the work was rescued from its difficulties by the munificence and public spirit of some enthusiasts gifted with the means as well as the will. How much is due both to the individuals who started and pushed the project, and to those who did not hesitate to risk loss by financing the undertaking, it would be difficult to calculate. They certainly deserve far more credit for what they did than they have ever yet received.

It is interesting to speculate as to the inspiring motives of those who first originated the idea of breed registers. Probably the enterprise was not begun with a single object, but with several. There is no doubt as to one purpose which was entertained by the first editor and compiler of the oldest Studbook in existence—that for Thoroughbred horses, and still entitled "The General Studbook." The author expressly stated in the preface (which, however, did not appear in the first edition, published in 1793, or in the second, published in 1803, but only in that of 1808), that, "with a view to correct the then-increasing evil of false and inaccurate pedigrees, he was, in the year 1791, prevailed upon to publish 'An Introduction to the General Studbook.'" That was clearly his object in the collection of the pedigrees, and it is an object which is served by this and all subsequent registers. But the author of the General Studbook further claimed that his volume "contained, in the most concise and most approved form, a greater mass of authentic information respecting the pedigrees of horses than had ever before been collected together." That, it is believed, more accurately expresses the aim of most of the compilers; the wish was to give correct information. The art of breeding was no longer to be one of mystery, but was to be carried out in the full light of day, with all available information accurately printed for the use of breeders and others alike. Moreover, the publication of pedigrees enabled breeders to know what was being done outside their own herds, studs or flocks. The pedigrees showed clearly how, by the use of certain ingredients, a high-class animal had been produced, and their intelligent study is one of the sources of the breeder's power. It was seen that

the use of such a sire or dam, the union of certain strains, produced certain results, and what has once been done could be repeated on the same lines. The breed registers thus became of the greatest and most practical assistance in carrying on operations upon intelligible principles.

Of course, too, careful registration tended to the preservation of the purity of breeds and to the exclusion of alien strains. Probably this is the most valuable influence of all, and has done much to maintain distinctive breeds, and to enforce improvements within the lines of the breed, instead of relying more upon the introduction of outside blood. Although the records of human genealogy, in the form of peerages and lists of titled personages, doubtless supplied a hint in the institution of live-stock registers, yet it cannot be said that much has been done in this direction. Every animal, indeed, if it be of ascertained pure blood, can secure admission to the breed register, and no cognizance is taken of individual merit. There has been some attempt in America to form an advanced register, based upon merit of performance, but, as a rule, the test is one of blood alone, and not of excellence as well.

It is only natural that the plan of published pedigrees of live stock should have originated in this old-settled country, rather than in those of more recent growth. Curiously enough, however, the newer countries have seized upon the idea and pushed it further than its originators would have dreamt of. Some of these developments are perhaps scarcely advisable, and the building up of registry walls against imported stock in some cases may suggest other views as well as zeal for the purity of the race. One would think, indeed, that the qualification of an animal for entry in a register that is regarded as sufficient in the home of the breed, might reasonably be considered adequate in the land of its adoption. However, that is a matter of domestic arrangement, on which the opinions of outsiders may not, perhaps, be required.

The expansion of some of the breed registers is wonderful. This is seen in the decision of the Shorthorn Society to revert to an earlier plan of issuing the volumes giving the pedigrees of bulls separately from those recording the entries of the cows. Other recent developments have suggested these observations. As would have been noticed from the report of the excellent paper contributed by Mr. Herbert Gibson, of Buenos Ayres, to the International Conference of Sheep-breeders, at Lincoln, he threw out the suggestion that in sheep registration the time had arrived for individualizing the dams as well as the sires of the animals registered. He remarked that the importance of individualizing the dam was beyond debate. "She is the mother of the one, the sire the father of many. To suggest that registration of the sire alone is sufficient individualization of the offspring is to admit a minimum of 50-per-cent. ignorance of origin. There is no technical difficulty in keeping an individual record of dams. The genuine shepherd keeps one in his head. But for the effects of registration—above all, for the effects of the private registration of a flock, which is the true craft of the breeder—systems, such as ear notches, of numerical value, paint brands, or even collars with numbered tags, present themselves, and are already in use in many parts of the world." It must be said, however, that, whether practicable or not, the individual registration of ewes in large flocks would entail a great amount of labor, and with a flock registered, and all its proceedings open to the public gaze, there does not seem to be sufficient cause for adding so much to the work of the breeder. In Canada, a new regulation as to the registration of a leading breed of imported horses may cause considerable inconvenience, requiring the registration at the time of export of every animal purchased.

These facts show that the custodians of breed registers in this country have not only to conduct them on lines approved by themselves, but that distant countries may put forward schemes that cannot be dismissed without careful study, and that may, if adopted, lead to further elaboration of the system of breed registration. These are among the accompaniments of celebrity, and from this point of view the various suggestions may be welcomed.

BREED THE RIGHT KIND.

High-class horses are bringing more money than ever, but the common horse is less in demand and getting cheaper, and there are indications that, while the better class will sell even higher, the cheaper kind will command less money. Breeders, especially the smaller breeder, the farmer breeder, should pay particular attention to their brood mares. If they wish to obtain the high dollar for their colts, they will find it a profitable investment to sell the poorer brood mares and substitute mares of good individuality and breeding. Farmers do not hesitate to discard old machinery for new and improved patterns on the score of economy, and for the same reason they will find it the best of economy to discard all brood mares not up to a high standard.—[Western Horseman.]

COLOR IN HORSES.

Breeding to color in horses has long been a subject of more than ordinary interest, and Sir Walter Gilbey, Bart., is the latest author to give the world his opinion upon the matter as it applies to Thoroughbreds, Hackneys and Shires. Sir Walter explains the different colors in horses, and the reason for the increasing frequency of some and the decrease of others. Suggestions are also offered as to how horses may be bred to color. Sir Walter's ideas upon chestnut Hackneys are especially worth repeating. The reason why the color is becoming more common is easily explained when we glance at the "color pedigree" of the best modern Hackney stallions. Danegelt (foaled 1879), a most successful sire, was a whole-colored dark chestnut; his sire, Denmark (foaled 1862), and his grandsire, Sir Charles (foaled 1843), were both chestnuts. Performer (foaled 1840), the sire of Sir Charles, was a brown. The chestnuts may be said to have lain dormant for a few generations, as Performer traces back to Jenkinson's Fireaway, whose sire, Driver, and grandsire, The Original Shales, were both chestnuts.

The success of chestnut Hackneys at the most important shows held during recent years, is a matter of common knowledge; it has been noteworthy ever since the date of the establishment of the Hackney Horse Society, in 1884. As a natural consequence, the services of these chestnuts have been in great demand by breeders, and the color has been inherited with other characteristics by the progeny. There can be no doubt but that the chestnut is an impressive color; in other words, that it has a strong tendency to reproduce itself. A chestnut mare, put to a stallion of the same color, will almost certainly throw a chestnut foal. To illustrate the truth of this, it may be mentioned that during the fifteen years, 1891 to 1906, considerably more than 100 chestnut foals were bred at the Elsenham stud by mating mares of this color with Danegelt and his son, Royal Danegelt, both of which were chestnuts.

Sir Walter traces, also, the coloring of gray, bay, and brown, and roan Hackneys, and his findings make a capital study. In the same style he treats the original color (and those developed since) from the racehorse, and the many-colored Shires. Illustrating his work are many excellent illustrations, from Sir Walter Gilbey's private collection of paintings. They include Mr. Fulwar Craven and his Norfolk Hackney; Grey Diomed, the property of the Duke of Bedford; Danegelt, and other noted horses. The volume is full of interesting and instructive information, and will be read with profit by breeders and others.—[Live-stock Journal.]

THE CLYDESDALE SITUATION.

As far as can be gathered from the correspondence read at the meeting of the Council of the Clydesdale Horse Society the week of the Highland Society's Show, at Edinburgh, what the Canadian Association wants is this: Every animal, male or female, exported to Canada must have a registered number in the Clydesdale Studbook here. Every such animal must have a registered—that is, a numbered—sire and dam here; and, further, that numbered sire and that numbered dam must, in turn, have a numbered sire and dam here.

It does not require a profound knowledge of the system of registration which has been followed in Scotland to see that these regulations to be enforced here now two questions would arise. First of all, there is the question of the whole system of registration; that is, the system of beginning with the brood mare and registering her with a number, and her produce, year by year, as they may be foaled, under her name and number. This is the system of the Shorthorn Herdbook, and it is an ideal system if it be faithfully and regularly carried out. By means of it, representations as to the produce of a mare can always be checked by reference to the entries in the Studbook and the memoranda in the hands of the Council. On the other hand, if the system be not regularly carried out by breeders, it involves much labor on the part of those having control of the Book to check entries; but even then, having a basis in the numbered brood mare to work from or back to, a solid foundation can be reached and something like accuracy secured. All this would be lost if the system were discarded.

The second thing which the rules adopted in Canada entails is the disqualification of a large number of well-bred animals, because of the neglect of the owners of their ancestors to register them. This is what has happened through the restrictions imposed in the Argentine on the pedigrees recorded in Coates' Herdbook of Shorthorn cattle. Many of the very best tribes are excluded from the Argentine because their pedigrees do not trace to the twentieth volume of the Herdbook. The only sufferer by this is the Argentine. This country does not suffer, because it is allowed to retain the best for itself. The Canadian Clydesdale men say: We won't have any animal whose sire and dam has not a sire and dam with a registered number. Apart from animals descended