

much food to bring them out in spring in this imperfect and unprofitable condition? And has not the growth of a young animal under this treatment received a severe check, and is it not, in consequence, being imperfectly developed, unfit for the continuation of the species? And thus the stamina of the flock or herd deteriorates from year to year, until a set of the veriest scrubs is the result, unsightly, unprofitable, and a disgrace to the owner. You might as well try to fatten and produce a piece of delicate flesh out of a crow. Besides, the comfortable quarters are all that you need additional to enable you to keep an improved variety with success, and you need them with any variety so that they shall be profitable, and by keeping an improved variety, under these conditions you will receive eggs during most of the winter, when they are such a price that a hen will soon pay for her year's feed, besides being in a better state in the spring to continue the process through the summer than she would have been had she laid none during the winter.

Then there is the item of grain, &c., destroyed during winter, consequent upon this bad management, which, from its being done gradually, a little here and a little there, is not noticeable. The severe weather of winter, or exposure to its influences, begets an insatiable and cruel demand for food, which impels them to search for every available means of ingress into barns and granaries in quest of both shelter and food, and this gives rise to unreasonable complaints about their destructive habits.

Now, my friend, would your other stock be any less so if treated in the same manner, and possessed of the same ability to help themselves? What a hole an old cow, which had been half frozen and just as nearly starved, would make in a load of barley? But here is where one of your usual objections comes in: You can guard against larger animals so much more easily and successfully than against poultry, for if a door but be left open for a moment a troop of them make a rush for the inside, and frequently all are not got out again. The smallest hole is taken advantage of—and a small hole, indeed, will suffice, as many of the mongrels which are kept on farms can pass through where a good sized rat would.

Now, sir, is not this only a stronger argument in favor of better accommodations, or a building for their own exclusive use, if you keep them at all.

I notice in last REVIEW a few words from our old fancier, Thomas, and learn with pleasure that there is a brisk trade doing in Delaware in poultry, at prices which are seldom realized here, and we may safely conclude that better times are in the near future for the fanciers of Ontario as well as for farmers.

Friend "J. L." comes right down on the situation in last REVIEW, as does Mr. Lambing. May their shadow never grow less.

Farmers are receiving five cents per pound here for poultry at present, which price can be at least doubled, and that simply by increasing the supply and improving the quality. Now, my farming friends, made a note of this, and if you can show us that such is not the case, let us have it.

Yours fraternally,

GALLINÆ.

Lefroy, Ont., Dec. 26th, 1879.

How Much Trimming is Justifiable?

That is what I am anxious to learn. I read with deep interest the letters on this vexed subject, and yet it appears to me that we are as far as ever from the solution of this really important question. Is it permissible to pluck a broken feather from a bird? Is it forbidden to draw out a foul feather? If the broken feather be also a foul feather, should it, for the sake of fair play, be left in? If it be allowable to pluck out a foul broken feather, may faulty feathers, not broken, be also withdrawn? If so, how many? May the tip of a broken sickle be trimmed with scissors? May twisted feathers be drawn from the wing of an otherwise perfect bird?

It would be vain to multiply the questions which are raised by discussion of this subject, but as poultry shows increase yearly, as exhibitors become daily more numerous, and as, now and then, some unfortunate trimmer gets disqualified for awkwardly doing what, perhaps, the cup winner has cleverly done without detection, it is high time that some decision was arrived at.

We know that many persons showing poultry think it perfectly justifiable to pluck the white feather from a Creve tuft, and the black feathers from a Cuckoo Dorking or Scotch-grey, but these same persons would shrink from painting, cutting combs, or inserting false sickles.

Where is the difference? Who is the conscience to dictate where "preparing for show" ends, and "trimming" begins?

Is it right that persons who make it a moral duty not to draw a faulty feather or prune a tell-tale spur should have to compete, and, perhaps—nay, probably—be beaten by exhibitors who think nothing of a borrowed sickle, a neatly-arranged wire, and the eradication without number of faulty feathers? Who is to draw the delicate line as to how far into the head a Spanish fowl may be trimmed? It is justifiable—I speak under correction—to pull with tweezers the tiny hairs on the white cheeks; but cheating to cut off the feathers round the white, to enlarge that feature. It would not be permissible to paint flesh-color an Aylesbury's bill; but we know they are rubbed with pumice and vinegar,