

Poultry Department.

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

CURE FOR EGG EATING.

About a week ago I received the following from a fancier from whom I had ordered eggs:—"I am sorry to disappoint you, but under the circumstances think you will excuse me. The two pullets I got from ——— I found, a few days after they arrived, were regular egg-eaters; so I at once darkened the nests and placed three china eggs in each. All went fairly well until last week, but the day after I wrote you they broke out afresh, and I have only three eggs saved since. I gave them a dose to-day which made them take a back seat. I took the inside out of an egg, then mixed powdered ammonia with the yolk, and it was some satisfaction to see them shake their heads when they broke the shell and dipped into the contents. I am making the nests still darker and more difficult to get at, am also filling empty shells with Plaster of Paris, and placing them in the pen. These they pick at for a time, but soon become disgusted and quit. They soon forget, and try again however, but with less persistency each time. I think this treatment has a tendency to wean them from attacking the eggs in the nests. I am also filling with Plaster of Paris three eggs for each nest, taking care to have brown eggs so that they cannot tell them from their own (the culprits are Langshans). I am bound to come out victorious in the contest if I have to hire a small boy to watch them all the time. My fowls get meat two or three times a week, and always have plenty of straw to scratch among. As none but those two have the habit I must conclude that it was acquired before I got them."

When a live fancier makes up his mind to cure his fowls of a bad habit he will succeed every time. In this case success crowned the writer's efforts speedily. I got a post card from him

last night, in which he appeared to crow almost with satisfaction:—"Glad to say I am boss of the ranche, and will ship eggs on Wednesday."—and he did. The plan he adopted will cure in nine cases out of ten, and the tenth case had better go to the chopping block.

J. F.

PRICES.

[WRITTEN FOR APRIL REVIEW.]

Editor Review :—

It has often been remarked that the prices asked and received by fanciers are not represented by any substantial value in the thing sold, and to prove this absence of value those reasoners don't take into consideration what the improved varieties have done and are capable of doing for the improvement of our ordinary stock—that is, for the increase in quality and quantity of food. Now, sir, though our improved varieties have done and are capable of doing a great deal in this direction, no one can be deceived in the fact that this is not the fancier's object in keeping and producing fine poultry, but, my utilitarian friend will enquire with no little astonishment, "Then why are they raised, and what represents the money asked and paid?" In reply I would say, simply "Beauty." But does beauty supply any need of the human race, and does it constitute any value? In answer to the latter we have only to take a walk along the street and note how much ornamentation costs in connection with buildings, gardens, clothing, and indeed in all human surroundings. Let any man who needs a good and useful horse be offered one, true in every respect but lacking that beauty of color and proportions which attract the eye, then let him be offered one just similar to the first in usefulness but having color, &c., to please the eye, and the man will pay fifty dollars, probably more, for the latter animal. Now that fifty is paid for beauty alone. Then

beauty is bought and sold, and is as much value received as wheat. But does it supply any need? I think it supplies a divinely created need. And this innate love of the beautiful in the whole human race, from the most cultured to the most brutish savage furnishes a strong proof of the correctness of the biblical account of man's creation. God said, when viewing what he had supplied for man's satisfaction, that it was "Beautiful" and good for food. Thus premising the fact that man was created with a disposition to admire the beautiful.

But many do not see any beauty in a fine bird. Still that is not proof that it is not beautiful. Many do not see beauty in the rose, nor in the thousands of beautiful objects with which we are surrounded. But is the fault in their surroundings or in themselves is the question.

Now, the supply of really beautiful birds is bound to be limited, as no more than 10 per cent of birds raised are 95 per cent of perfection in race or that perfect arrangement of parts and colors which fanciers have defined to be the perfection of beauty, and as demand and supply regulate prices, we may safely conclude that the demand for high scoring birds is bound to be maintained. Such a bird,—that is one 95 per cent, perfect,—is worth from \$25.00 to \$35.00, just as much as any other article of merchandise is worth its price.

I must say in conclusion that I am much pleased, and have been not a little benefitted, by many of the suggestions thrown out by friend Peters, and hope he will continue to give us a monthly treat. I am also pleased to have "Simcoe" taking an active part in the discussions of the day, but as I am in a hurry to-day I shall be obliged to leave off for this time.

Yours truly,

STANLEY SPILLET.

Nantye, March 15th, 1886.