

POULTRY

POULTRY—REPLY TO J. H. CAYFORD.

P. T. H. ERMATINGER.

Individually speaking I am certain that each and every fancier, on no matter how small a scale he contributes to the above mentioned trade in the way of keeping a few fancy fowl, is somewhat ignorant of the importance of this industry.

I am of the opinion that the "boom" in poultry (fancy breeds) these last years has in no small way contributed to the rapid development of "poultry" as a trade. Fowls to-day are finer all round than they were 15 or 20 years ago. Take for instance the farmers in the back countries, their respective flocks have all got a dash of *pure blood* in their veins, some are a mixture of Brahma, Cochin, Plymouth Rock, etc., etc. This I attribute to the liking our amateur fanciers have taken to the large breeds and also through the sale of eggs by our American cousins as well as many Canadians. Therefore it will be seen that through the efforts of all fanciers and also the poultry journals, poultry has taken and is bound to take a leading part in our markets both at home and abroad, and I contend that this industry is even more lucrative than many others in proportion. The English poultry do not supply enough eggs to meet the home demand, this is partly due to the number used in manufactures, but the deficiency is made up by importations chiefly from France. The importations of eggs to the English market have largely increased within these few years back, we have for instance. In 1880 above 600,000,000 eggs were imported valued at over *eleven million dollars*, and no doubt since this date the importations have augmented considerably, the imported eggs however are seldom

equal in quality to those home produced, they are often packed in straw (damp) odor from which penetrates the shell and imparts an unpleasant flavor to the egg.

As regards the raising of poultry for the market with the intention of making it pay I must say here at once that amongst our many farmers the raising of poultry is only a secondary consideration with them, and I may even venture to add that the rearing of poultry is regarded by them as a very subordinate branch of rural economy, the skilful enterprising farmer generally entertaining the false idea that it is beneath his attention, or finding that he has no time to attend to it and often looking on the feathered inmates of his barn-yard almost as a nuisance because of their oft repeated invasions of his fields. This idea of course should not be entertained, for if he only took the trouble to consider seriously whether if the care given to his horses, cows and pigs was bestowed instead, of his feathered-cattle, would turn out as profitable in the end. I am certain he would alter his opinion on the pecuniary results derived from "chanticlear family."

The above mentioned figures any way show the prejudiced farmer that a henery on his farm should certainly meet with his serious consideration, and that if properly managed would certainly turn out most profitable. I believe the present Ottawa government are contemplating the idea of establishing an experimental farm in the North West or British Columbia and it is to be hoped that the poultry department of this great farm will not be overlooked, for now would be the time to give this branch of industry a fair and square trial by the purchasing of different breeds of poultry to be placed on this farm and with a thoroughly competent man at the head of this department to manage and cross-breed in a scientific manner, with the object of establishing what would make the best egg producers and also the best table

or market fowl. The American fanciers breed in a much more systematic way than we do. In many States I am certain it would not be hard to point out some of these fanciers who make the henery their sole business and make money out of their pets. But of course to make this branch pay, the farmer must give his fowls more care than heretofore for he cannot expect to derive any benefit from fowls that shift for themselves.

The May number of the REVIEW just to hand and I beg leave to thank MR. CAYFORD for all his "chestnuts" about my "criticism of the Montreal Association" in March number, notwithstanding all the *raps* over the knuckles he administers me for having (what many fanciers have not got) viz., enough back-bone to express my opinion and sign my name to it. I am really sorry I cannot take back even at the risk of displeasing the worthy secretary-treasurer of the Montreal Association.

As regards the advertising of the show I am sure that it does not speak in very flattering terms of the Association to say that in the "Metropolis of Canada" they could not find a suitable hall four weeks previous to the holding of their show, and therefore they could not advertise it. Now for the strange judges. I did not want to throw the slightest indelicate remark upon our local judges, for I myself have perfect confidence in their fairness and integrity. I mentioned the fact that strange judges would give more satisfaction to the exhibitors, especially when these judges (local) are exhibitors themselves and if I said so in March number and repeat it here again, it is simply because I have heard other fanciers express themselves in a like manner.

If, in the person of that *genius* (who MR. CAYFORD would like to find to show how to expend large sums of money with small receipts) the worthy secretary means me, this genius can be found at the Montreal post office, but