

Poultry Department.

Address all Communications to Canadian Poultry Review, 168 King Street East, Toronto.

NOTES.

The Provincial Exhibition is to be held this year in Guelph. We trust they may be favored with better weather than they had at its last visit to the Royal City.

Mr. W. McNeill, London, has again been appointed superintendent of the Poultry department, exhibits will fare well under his supervision.

At the annual meeting of the Industrial Exhibition Board, Toronto, the Poultry committee appointed so far consists of Messrs. A. McGregor, chairman; J. C. Mitchell, W. Barber, C. Bonnick, J. Dilworth and H. B. Donovan.

Mr. John Hewer sold his third prize Chinese Geese at Guelph, to Mr. A. Giffin, Edmonton, who was surprised to find them both turn out to be ganders. Pretty hard on the judge.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

Q. 1.—Is there any publication extant, on Poultry breeding, and their treatment in general; such as feeding, treatment of diseases, etc.?

Q. 2.—How many eggs should a well kept hen lay during the course of one year?

Q. 3.—How should fowls be mated to breed cocks or hens at pleasure?

Q. 4.—How can the hatching quality of an egg be destroyed without destroying its market value?—A.B.C., Barrie.

A. 1.—There are numerous books published on this subject, but Louis Wright's is probably the most exhaustive and best. The price of the latest edition is much reduced. Mr. J. M. Macpherson, late publisher of REVIEW, we believe has this book in stock.

A. 2.—This is a difficult question to answer, as varieties differ greatly in laying qualities. Some have claimed that

their Leghorn hens have layed as many as 250 eggs in a year, but 175 is a good average for this variety, and the average through all the standard varieties will not exceed 125 a year.

A. 3.—You cannot mate to produce the different sexes at will with any degree of certainty. Young and vigorous males mated with a small number of females will generally give a preponderance of males, while mating a large number of females to a male will have an opposite result. Nearly all the claims made by parties of their ability to produce the sexes at will have proved fallacious.

A. 4.—Perhaps no better means can be employed for the purpose than to immerse for a few seconds in boiling water—just sufficiently long to cause a thickening of the skin under the shell.

"JUDGING AT GUELPH, 1886."

Editor Review:

Under above heading, in February Review, Mr. J. C. McKay makes an attack upon Mr. L. G. Jarvis, of London, one of the judges at the late Ontario Show at Guelph. Mr. McKay must be mistaken when he says his pullet, which scored 92 by I. K. Felch, Esq., at Toronto, was disqualified by Mr. Jarvis. I was at Guelph, and must say that I did not see any of the Plymouth Rock coops marked disqualified. I did see a good number of them marked as birds not worthy to be scored. As only prize winners were to be scored, it was not necessary to apply the disqualifying clause, the Rocks being well represented. Mr. McKay must also be mistaken about his cockerel scoring 95½ points; had he scored that high he would not have been left out, as the 3rd prize bird scored only 93½. I might say for the information of Mr. McKay that I know of birds being disqualified at the Listowel show by Mr. Jarvis, and same birds were awarded prizes at Stratford by Mr. Stevens, some of them scoring

as high as 94 points. Does that prove that Mr. Stevens was incompetent or biassed in his judgment? Not a bit of it; but it shows that disqualified birds may be awarded prizes, the disqualification, not being noticed by the judges. A bird is not disqualified without cause. As to the "fair field, and no favor," Mr. Jarvis' incompetence or biassed judgment, etc., I am glad Mr. McKay has relieved himself in getting that off. No doubt he feels better now. If he will explain why his cockerel, which he says scored 95½, did not get a prize, and one scoring 93½ was awarded 3rd prize, and also if there was a card of disqualification on coop covering his pullet, then exhibitors will be in a position to judge of the matter. If Mr. Jarvis is guilty of what Mr. McKay says, the public want to know. Give us the facts in next REVIEW.

Yours truly,

R. ELLIOTT.

Listowel, Feb., 1886.

Editor Review:

Being a lover of the feathered tribe, and also of harmony at our poultry shows, it grieves me to read such a letter as that appearing over the signature of J. C. McKay.

This gentleman must not have had his glasses with him, or some one must have told him that his cockerel scored 95½ at Guelph—just high enough to have him left out. I see by the REVIEW the cockerel that took third scored 93½, so Mr. McKay must be entitled to third prize.

I don't see why men in favor of the United States Judges do not go to the U. S. with their poultry. We have a poultry trade of our own to establish in Canada, and we cannot do it by cutting each other's throats or by paying big money to American judges to judge our shows when we have competent men of our own, and I think Mr. Jarvis is the best all round judge we have, and I think as fair a one. I do not think it fair to slander a man through