

THE CANADIAN POULTRY REVIEW

DEVOTED TO POULTRY, IN ALL ITS BRANCHES

For the FANCIER, the FARMER, and the SMALL BREEDER

VOL. XXII.

124 VICTORIA STREET, TORONTO, FEBRUARY, 1899.

No. 2

POULTRY CULTURE.

A WEALTH-PRODUCING INDUSTRY, SHOULD BE PROTECTED BY THE STATE.

BY I. K. FELCH, NATICK, MASS., PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN POULTRY ASSOCIATION.

None will deny that poultry culture, when intelligently controlled pays a profit as large, and I assert, a larger per cent of profit for money and labor expended, than does any other live stock of our farms.

Our boards of agriculture have been slow to recognize this truth but are now giving the industry support—but are they doing it to secure the greatest benefit to the greatest number of those who are making poultry culture a calling. We see that some of the States are giving from \$600 to even \$2,000 as prizes to encourage the exhibitions, hoping thereby to increase the industry, but they are giving the whole lump sum to some one society, and it raises the question, Is this best for all interested, or does it work to the advantage of a very few and to the discouragement of many. Let us take Massachusetts for instance—the State gives to one society the lump sum, say \$2,000, and this secures a very large exhibit, so large that its judging is done by comparison. This gives the emolument of winning to a very few of its exhibitors, while it gives no record of merit to the individual specimens, beyond the fact that a few of each class are the best shown. Take a class of 300 birds, two or three of the fifty competitors secure the prizes, the balance go to their homes their birds not recognized. But suppose the State should give to each of

her counties \$200, which would insure such counties in making an exhibit without the risks or loss to the few who give their time to making the exhibitions, the exhibits probably being a congregation of 500 to 1,500 specimens, would enable the management to have every specimen scored, each bird getting a score card record in points, and showing the relative difference between the competing specimens, and showing oftentimes twenty birds in our large classes, scoring within one point of the winner, while it shows the real merit of the winner. If a specimen that scores 94 points is worth \$25, then if it can be shown there are twenty scoring 93 and 93½, it shows them to be worth a corresponding price, and it shows also what the possibility of such specimens is to beget progeny of like merit. But do comparison-judged exhibitions do this?

Now, what would be the influence in and for the wealth of the State to force a system by which these exhibitions shall be held under, that will show to the world the true merit of an entire exhibition, or to leave it to a system that merely discloses the fact that a few have won and not give even the winner's individual value in point of merit.

We ask the question, "Which system would advertise the whole number of specimens and enable the entire exhibit to sell for several thousand dollars more?"

Now, what does the State offer this bounty for if not in the belief that it is to be an incentive to a greater productive wealth that shall pay for the distribution she has offered. If this be the motive, then such a distribution as will reach the largest number in each of its counties will cause in the combined exhibitions several times as many birds to be shown,