

wonder that that difference of opinion exists.

In conclusion, I would say to a farmer who pur-poses improving his stock, or keeping an improved variety, keep but one variety. To cross the common with several varieties will not make much improvement. I have found that a cross of Light Brahma upon the common produces a fine useful bird; also a cross of Light Brahma upon White Leghorn, but better still, the Light Brahma alone, and pure, or the Plymouth Rock.

Permit me to say that I was well pleased to see a favorable notice of C. A. Keefer in September number of your journal, as I am confident he is worthy. In my last I spoke doubtfully of beaks and legs of Plymouth Rocks hatched from eggs obtained from him, but these have greatly improved since that time, and I refused \$10 for one of these birds a few days ago.

Yours fraternally,
GALLINÆ.

Lefroy, Oct. 30th, 1879.

Notes from Waterloo.

No. 11.

It seems that a remark in the "Notes from Waterloo," in Review of last May, has been the means of misleading "Amateur," judging from his letter in October number. Now these notes have not been written as rules or guides for any one to follow, but feeling the need for Canadian poultrymen to write their opinions and experiences, I have attempted to throw out hints and to make suggestions, often home-spun and crude, in the hope of stimulating others, better qualified than I am, to give the results of their methods and experiments; and I trust that I am at all times willing to acknowledge an error or rectify a mistake if possible, and if I stated what was untrue or calculated to mislead, I shall assuredly apologize.

In the article referred to above, the subject was the resolution amending the *Standard of Excellence*, passed by the American Poultry Association, at Buffalo, regarding Light Brahmas, in commenting on which the following sentence occurred:—"Light Brahmas are the only fowls in which under-color is a consideration at all." This is strictly correct, for the word under-color does not occur in the *Standard* unless when applied to Light Brahmas. The nearest approach to this is in the description of Black Cochins, where it states, "Gray or white under-feathers permissible in adult cocks, but still objectionable." This, as I understand it, refers to gray or white feathers which do sometimes appear in aged fowls of this particular breed, and for which provision has been made so that an aged fowl might not be disqualified by what is a fault of the variety rather than of that particular fowl.

I have had no experience in breeding Black Cochins, but only express what seems to be a reasonable interpretation of the *Standard*, for in other black fowls, such as Black Spanish or Black Hamburgs, no such exception is allowed, so in the case of White Cochins, White Leghorns and other purely white fowls, no allowance is made for colored feathers. But this is entirely different from the under-color referred to in Light Brahmas, which are parti-colored fowls, having both white and black in their plumage, and by thus having, as it were, the two extremes in colors in one fowl, not intermixed as in the Houdan, but each color confined to certain limits, there is a tendency to commingle—that is, for the part that should be black to become whiter, and the portion that ought to be white to be mixed with black. I believe it is generally admitted that while there are numbers of Light Brahmas with pure white under-color on the back, yet to breed from both male and female thus feathered, the progeny is likely to have the hackle, wings and tail faded or lighter in color, and for these and other reasons, the *Standard* disqualification clause is now "Under-color any other than white, bluish-white, or slate-color; in under-color of back, black running into the web of the feather."

Now, friend "Amateur," I hope this explanation will be satisfactory. You very wisely decided not to breed from your chicks that "showed the white feather." The best are never too good to breed from, and only by selecting the best can we hope to overcome the tendency to foul-feathers, or other defects, and expect a permanent improvement of the breed or variety

J. L.

Waterloo, Nov. 5th, 1879.

Eastern Pennsylvania.

Editor Review,

Week after week has slipped away, and the Berks County (Penna.) Poultry Association has not yet arranged for their annual holiday exhibition. Ample and excellent material for a successful show should exert them onwards and upwards.

The Central Pennsylvania Society will have the largest, best and most interesting exhibit ever seen at Pottsville, Schuylkill county, at the approaching show.

The second annual exhibition of the Montgomery County Society will soon be held at Pottsville, Penna.

Lancaster county is also arranging for a show, to be held in the City of Lancaster, at an early day. Although an entirely new society, they are full-fledged and promise well.

In Leigh county, as well as their neighbor, Northampton county, they are doing wonders in the fancy poultry business. As all the counties mentioned take kindly to the fancy poultry fever, Eastern Pennsylvania expects to make a good report during the coming season.

O. D. S.

Hamburg, Pa., Oct. 30th.