

Mandalay, and as we have many soldiers out there now, there may be opportunities of getting some more birds home. They have proved very delicate in our climate in the winter months, and nearly all imported hitherto have died. That was also the case with my imported Pekins, but the present generation of Pekins are hardy enough."

In regard to the Cochins or Pekin Bantams, we can speak with authority, having, as we before said, imported eggs from England last season.

The black are as sound in color as a black rose-comb, short in legs, well feathered, and in all points the equal of the regular buff Pekins shown at our exhibitions.

The partridge don't seem quite equal in quality, indeed, it would be unfair to pit these against a whole colored variety, but Mr. Entwistle assures us they are equal in color to the large Cochins, and a couple of pullets we have succeeded in raising, bear this out.

The little white Polish hen, shown in our illustration, weighs, in fair condition, only from twelve to fifteen ounces, has blue legs, good crest and full beard and whiskers. She has never been shown without winning, and her honors include 1st both at the Crystal Palace and Manchester.

DONT'S.

BY A. A. W.

DON'T allow snow drifts in the poultry house and wonder why your hens don't lay as well as your neighbors.

DON'T forget to remove the droppings and store them in some out building for the garden in spring.

DON'T allow the drinking water to freeze, keep it warm in cold weather.

DON'T feed too much soft food, good sound grain in variety is better.

DON'T force your breeding hens and

then expect fertile eggs and strong healthy chickens.

DON'T feed every egg food advertised, the best egg food is proper care in every detail, not neglecting the small things.

DON'T be selfish, but if you have learned anything in poultry culture give it to the REVIEW readers.

DON'T impose upon a modest editor and fill his columns with your grievances (?) which neither edify nor instruct his readers, nor draw any sympathy to yourself.

DON'T expect every issue of the publication to please you in every particular, if it did it might not please its other readers.

DON'T look for improvement in your poultry journal while your subscription or advertising dues are not paid.

(DON'T fail to come again.—ED.)

LET SYMMETRY GO.

BY A. R. N.

In December REVIEW friend Peter advocates the retention of symmetry and gives us a chapter from his own experience in proof of his opinion, or rather as a reason for having formed it. He says he sent a bird he "thought too long in back; it was cut two." I suppose he means it was cut two in back. If I am right a cut of two in back would call for a cut in symmetry to correspond, and the bird would suffer by being cut twice for the same defect. If the cut was only in symmetry, how did he know it was all on account of the long back?—unless the bird was also cut in back, which would be double cut again.

I have never seen an argument advanced by the symmetry-retaining writers that equalled the objection, that every cut on symmetry means a cut in the affected part also, and thus a double cut.

They say symmetry is a harmonious blending of perfect parts into a perfect whole; just as though it would be possible to make an imperfect whole out of perfect parts. Does anyone imagine that a judge fit for a place in a show-room would consider that the neck that would be perfect on a light Brahma would be proper on a bantam? Does not the judge, in examining a bird, at once compare the different sections in regard to their proportionate shape, size, carriage, etc., and if the neck were too long would cut in symmetry? How if there were no symmetry section? The neck would be too long just the same, and would be cut, as it should be; not cut for want of symmetry, and again cut under neck section.

It seems that nearly all writers in advancing their views in regard to *Standard* changes or amendments consider that after deducting condition, weight and symmetry about one-half of the remaining sections should be for shape and the other half for color and shape of plumage. Now, I can hardly conceive that a man as well able to find words to properly convey his meaning as is Mr. Peter, would not be able to read the different descriptive sections of the *Standard* so as to know when the plumage of his bird was perfect or not, and if he found the feathers O. K. he would know that the cut in back meant that the shape was not correct, even if symmetry were struck off the score card.

Mr. Peter asks a question of buying by the score card without seeing the bird. I would say don't do it. See what you are buying every time. Now, I would like to ask Mr. Peter in the case he quotes, how would he know the cut was all for shape, even with symmetry to guide him, unless the bird was cut twice for the same defect?

I have already quoted the definition given to symmetry. I believe the proper definition would be more like this: Symmetry, a section under which the judge may cut Mr. A's bird so as to