

which nearly all the horses of the present day are descended. Macgregor, a son of the great Darnley, has been called the king of the Clydesdale horses of the present day. He is now twenty-one years old, is still fresh and sound, and was hired not long ago as a stud horse for the season. His progeny are now distributed over the whole world, and both horses and mares of his breeding have won many valuable prizes at American shows.

Hackneys of To-day

The Question of Color

I know some of your readers are ardent lovers of a "good goer," and this is the season when every farmer and horse lover is looking over his stock and wondering if the filly in the field will be fit for next summer's show ring, or if he has made a mistake in his mating of the old mare that has done such good work for him to station and market, and often not a little bit of hacking over the farm.

The Shire has many points that appeal to the ordinary farmer, but many prefer the old half-bred or Hackney mare to all the "carters" in the big stables. Why? Because it is his own ride and drive, seldom handled by anyone but himself, and loved accordingly. Now the season for service approaches, and the Agricultural Hall will shortly resound with the yells of excited stable boys and grooms. It is to be hoped the excitement of cheering the winner of the cup will not turn the farmer's brain, even if it does the millionaire stud owner's, so far, at least, as to forget that the sire he requires is not the under-sized, white-faced, white-legged cob, but a sound-colored, big, upstanding horse with action, and bone, and substance, and shoulder good enough to carry a saddle. One cannot err if the blood is right, and the action is bold and high, if the latter standard is accepted. But if the former is chosen, many will regret it, as they have for the past ten years, when too late.

Having bred some fifteen to twenty foals annually from all the best sires for years past, I most unhesitatingly affirm no loss is made when the sire is as I suggested, but the big-priced ones are seldom from amongst the former, and the wasters are unsaleable if bad-colored, small and lacking in bone, even should they beat the big, sound-colored bays and browns in "snappy-action."

Experience teaches wisdom, and I for one should like our coming shows to be some guide as to the best to breed for sale purposes, and so aid the horse owner, and not bewilder and embarrass him in his choice of a sire that in all common sense and fairness should be fit to produce a marketable animal of the highest class.

Every jobmaster in England will agree with me that there is an opening for more 15.2h. to 16h. bays and browns with no white at very good prices, when there is no demand for 14.3h. cobs and "Tits" with plenty of white and not much else to recommend—or, more likely, bar them altogether when a good sale is looked for.—*Farmer and Stockbreeder.*

Some Horse Statistics

According to the year books of the U. S. Department of Agriculture horses reached their highest point in regard to number in 1893, when the United States had 16,206,802 horses at an average value of \$61.22 and total value of \$769,224,799. The highest average value was in 1884, when 11,169,683 horses averaged \$74.64 each. The largest amount of money that was returned in horses was in 1892, when 15,498,140 horses were worth \$1,007,593,636, an average of \$65.01 each.

In 1897 the stock of horses in the United States had decreased to 14,364,667 and their value to \$452,649,396, an average of only \$31.51 each, which is the low point in total and average values. A loss in total value from the highest point in 1892 of \$554,944,240, or about 55 per cent., and from the highest average in 1884 of \$43.13 per head, or 57 per cent.

In 1898 the total number had further decreased to 13,960,911, but the average price had advanced to \$34.26, making a total value of \$478,362,407. Thus in 1898 the total number of horses was 463,756 less than in 1897, but the total value was \$25,613,011 greater.

CORRESPONDENCE

Sheep vs. Dogs

To the Editor of FARMING:

I have of late read a good deal from the pages of your (to me) valuable journal in regard to sheep *versus* dogs, and on each occasion thought I would give to your readers the value of my short experience. I have for the past few years kept quite a number of sheep. I live, I might say, in the village, as a good portion of it is on a part of my lot. Said village, like most others, is overrun with dogs of a variety of shapes, sizes and breeds.

When I first purchased a few sheep I had three worried, then was advised to put bells on my sheep, being assured this would prevent dogs from injuring them. I took the advice and have since that time kept about one bell for each six sheep, and in now nearly eight years have not had one sheep or lamb hurt, and at no time during that period have I had less than twenty and at times as many as two hundred in the fall.

I verily believe that anyone having sheep will, if they secure a good-sized bell, say half the size of a cow bell, suffer no loss from the dog nuisance.

Hoping that my limited experience may be of benefit to some of the readers of FARMING, and thanking you for space,

ISAAC M. CROSS.

Bond Head, Ont., April 5th, 1899.

Alberts' Thomas-Phosphate

A Reply to Mr. Wright's Letter

To the Editor of FARMING:

I am sorry to see a report from so prominent a farmer as Mr. Wright that he had seemingly failed to obtain any benefit from his first application of Alberts' Thomas Phosphate Powder. While it is too bad that he should have so entirely misunderstood the bearing of this excellent phosphate manure on the soil and the crop, it is also very regrettable that he should have published his failure broadcast without considering the conditions more fully, as by so doing he might do more general harm than good. I had heard of Mr. Wright's case, and by way of investigating it, I wrote him to obtain full particulars and have not been favored with a reply. From other sources, however, which are quite reliable, I find that the phosphate was applied much too late to have any perceptible effect on the crop, especially when it is taken into consideration that the season of 1898 was very early and dreadfully dry. At the time of application of the manure the soil was thoroughly drained of all surplus gravity water and was pretty dry, and it has been repeatedly explained that under such circumstances the manure could be of little benefit the first season, unless it had been applied in the fall, winter or spring, before the gravity water had drained from the soil. Thomas Phosphate is not a special fertilizer but stands in the same category with farm yard manure, and when farmers understand this, and grasp the fundamental principles of manuring better, such difficulties as Mr. Wright's will not arise. It may be necessary to explain that the application of water to the land after planting would not have given the best results, as enough water to ensure the best effect of the manure would have been too much for the crops. In explanation of this I would draw special attention to the sixth part of my address on manures. A special fertilizer, such as superphosphates, nitrate or potash salts would only need sufficient moisture for ordinary crop requirements to give their results. I will look for satisfactory results and a further report from Mr. Wright later on after the second crop, for I can assure him his mistake has been in the time of application, and the dry season also prevented the proper development of the plants.

Thanking you for the space,

T. C. WALLACE.

Toronto, April 13th, 1899.