

in the past two years that Preservaline has been used in this city. This decrease in the death-rate is not due to improved municipal sanitation, neither do we believe it is due to the grace of God unaided."

There may be a trade advantage to the promoters of Preservaline, but I believe there is a much greater advantage to humanity, and we should not condemn a thing simple because it does not coincide with our preconceived notions. Progress is as possible in the feeding of infants as it is in warfare, and I will here state that if infants brought up on artificial food could at all times receive a supply of cows' milk which was free from putrefactive bacteria and not otherwise injured, as it always is by heat "sterilization" a benefit would be conferred on humanity, besides which any other advance in sanitary science of the past half-century would stand insignificant. And I further state that milk preserved with this agent comes nearer to perfection than any method now known. G. M. RANDALL, M.D.

Lowell, Mass., Feb. 22nd, 1900.

## Assistance to Local Poultry Shows

To the Editor of FARMING:

Will you kindly give me space in your valuable journal to reply to a communication over the signature of Mr. G. W. Miller, of London, who acted in the capacity of assistant secretary at the Ontario Poultry Show in Peterboro' January last, and who, it appears, wrote that specially-prepared report of that show for FARMING, which appeared in January 23rd issue, and of which I complained on account of its inaccuracies. First, Mr. Miller says there were only 1,008 entries of poultry at the Ontario show in Peterboro', and that there were 1,339, as stated by me, if rabbits, guinea pigs, etc., are birds. Now, sir, he knows that he is equivocating, as there were only about 12 or 15 rabbits there and no guinea pigs at all; and I, as well as most of the other common people, count turkeys, geese, ducks and pigeons when summing up the number of entries. During the progress of the "Ontario" I learned something new, and it was, that dressed turkeys and geese and ducks were not recognized as dressed fowl (by the judges or powers that be). Consequently, some fine specimens on exhibition, fit to be winners anywhere, were not awarded prizes, much to the disgust of the owners.

Mr. Miller says he is very sorry I said anything about the meeting called at Peterboro' to discuss my resolution and that when I say that the amount of grant asked for each county was not mentioned I "was quibbling." Now, of course, it was asked how much it was proposed to ask for each county. I do not deny saying I thought about \$100; but do emphatically deny putting in \$100 or any other amount in the resolution. Mr. Bogue did ask me to change the motion from a grant for a county to a district of four counties, which I refused to do; but, at the same time, invited Mr. Bogue to bring his in as an amendment if he wished, and let those present choose which they preferred. This Mr. Bogue did not do, and my resolution was carried by at least a two-third majority.

Mr. Miller gets a little funny streak on about the poultrymen hurting my feelings by sitting on my hobby, saying they carried the resolution and then effectually killed it by refusing to appoint the delegates now referred to. Now, the time between closing this meeting, 12.15 p.m., and 1 p.m., the time to open the annual meeting, was so short that the appointment of delegates was left over at that time; but, in answer to circulars containing resolutions, ten out of thirteen poultry associations appointed delegates, and, among those who did not, Brantford did not reply, while London positively refused. Consequently, the associations were not unanimous. Then, friend Miller says it is as dead as a door-nail as far as the "Ontario" is concerned. I would like Mr. Miller to state at what time prior to his last letter I ever wrote or spoke, or in way, by word or deed, did anything derogatory to the

"Ontario." If he says I did, it is certain that a stronger term than quibbling will be applied to him by me. He then gives his views as to the Government giving grants to electoral district agricultural societies, to be applied to all live stock, poultry included, and says if poultry does not receive its share the poultrymen are to blame. He knows well that not one in twenty of those societies have even a shed to put the poultry in, and he would not like to be obliged to keep guard on his exhibit all night, or take the chances of having them stolen, as that is the most likely thing to happen where there is no poultry building. He speaks of 20,000 visitors being present at the show in 1898, when there was a free gate. Peterboro' citizens would probably be as liberal as those of London if they were as financially able (which they might have been had they been the headquarters of the "Ontario" for a quarter of a century). Then, again, a twenty-five cent entrance fee (does he not mean admission fee?) is a barrier the farmer does not get over easily, and it is the farmer we poultrymen are seeking to interest in what? I would ask—bantams and pigeons at the expense of the utility breeds, or farmers' fowls and the dressed poultry, which have been practically ignored by men of his way of thinking? Next, he says that no show can be run on \$100, even if the Government could spare it, for each county, and yet he thinks I should have accepted Mr. Bogue's amendment to my resolution and asked for \$100 for a district of four counties instead of for one. Consistency, thou art a jewel.

Then again, he states, there was not room in Ontario for more than two winter poultry shows, and what could be done with careful management. They could be made of untold advantage to the province. Every inducement should be made to get farmers to attend them. Ample provision should be made for their instruction as to best breeds, methods of feeding, housing, preparing for market, etc. In this way the country would get value for the grants it makes and Canadian poultry would take a long slide forward. He was happy to point out that steps looking to this end are being taken by the "Ontario Executive." (As the boys say in the song, "Let it be soon.") We with our local show offer six times as much in prizes as does the "Ontario" for dressed poultry, and still Mr. Miller says there is only room in Ontario for two winter shows. What bosh from an ex-journalist and poultryman of Mr. Miller's ability who wrote (I have every reason to believe) the report of the Ontario show for the February number of the *Poultry Review* and then to go and make a garbled report for FARMING of a meeting held in Peterboro' at the time of the same show, by the poultrymen for what they think is in their best interests, is something that is not easily understood by quite a number of poultrymen, whom I met in Toronto a few days ago, men who have just as good an idea of what is wanted for the best interests of the farmers and poultry men of Ontario as our learned and respected friend, Mr. G. W. Miller.

In conclusion I must say that the mentioning of the "Ontario" at all in this controversy by me has been compulsory as your correspondent has so securely entrenched and hidden himself behind the "Ontario," that nothing could be seen of him but his hand. Therefore, if an odd shot should strike the breastworks of the "Ontario" it is largely the fault of the so-called friend who came out in defence before an attack was made by any one except in his own mind or imagination. In this I am reminded of an old stanza which reads thus:

"Sometimes we with false brethren meet,  
Whose hearts are filled with vain deceit,  
They appear quite fair just at the first,  
But of all men those are the worst."

WM. COLLINS.

Peterboro', March 6th 1900.

NOTE.—While these columns are open to discussions upon all subjects affecting the farmer and his interests which we welcome and are pleased to note a greatly increased interest along this line, yet we would like our correspondents to be as free from personalities as possible in their writing. This is not intended to apply especially to the above letter but is given as a piece of advice for future guidance.—EDITOR.