

is about to engage in the poultry business should know the different breeds and their purposes. The poultry keeper should have an object in view. If he desires to make eggs a specialty, he should breed from those strains that lay best, without regard to size or table purposes. If he wishes chicks and poultry for market, he should select the breeds best adapted for such. One thing to impress upon beginners, and that is—no single breed in itself possesses all the characteristics that are best for market—eggs, chicks, and hardness combined; but, by judicious crossing, the good qualities of several breeds may be blended, and better results obtained. There are times when prices are high for certain weights, at particular periods; and the poultry-keeper will have to learn from experience when to send them to market, and at what age and weight. The better plan is to base your profits on the average market prices, and the expense on the ordinary cost of food. There is a profit in poultry keeping. In proportion to the capital required, it is equal to any other, but there is no grand fortune in it for every one. Like in any other business, failure may occur, but there are failures in all pursuits. He who wishes to succeed must be attentive to his stock, and attend to his affairs with the same energy that he would bestow in any other direction.

POULTRY KEEPER.

Mr. Doel's Letter.—No. 2.

Editor Review.

The June number of REVIEW would have received a communication from me, but such an ado was raised around my ears in April, I waited for more in June. If you will allow me to answer, I will make it as short as possible.

Re Wyandottes—"An admirer of the breed" is much mistaken in April number in some points. The Wyandotte was admitted to the *American Standard* in 1883. Instead of having a separate class in the largest and best shows in England for the last two years, the first English show it had a class to itself was at Chesterfield, December 1884, and has not been noticed separately at the Palace, Birmingham or Dairy shows. It was as the American Sebright I bred them, and they bred truer to feather than they do now as Wyandottes, (see report in *New York Bulletin* of February 1885, on quality at New York Show). If I mistake not it went under other names also, until Wyandottes was given it in '83. As Mr. Graf says, another name was Sebright Cochins. My stock was not of a very poor sample, but of some of the best in N. Y. State. Mr Graf is mistaken about Guelph. I told him his Wyandottes were of a different strain to mine, not breed. Strain and breed are entirely differ-

ent in meaning. If there were eight different varieties of Wyandottes claiming admittance to the *American Standard* in 1883, that itself proves the Wyandotte is not an established breed, and this proves my statement that we in Canada should be careful how we press a new breed upon the public as a useful fowl, until fully tried and proved good by some of our old and known breeders. and not merely trust to those who push it forward as a money making machine to them. Mr Graf goes farther, and supports me in my claim, when he says—a good deal of disappointment, &c.. (see C. A. Graf in April number).

I am pleased to see my old friend, Mr. Bicknell, come out in defence of scoring. I believe in friend Bicknell, but still assert, you can take a first class bird and score him 20 points less than a bird a fancier would not breed from, and no fault could be found with the scoring, allow me to add, point by point. I have known birds sent from the U. S. into Canada scoring into the 90s, and such birds as one in Ontario would not breed from. The last 1 call to mind were sent to Peterboro'. We have also had some high scoring in Canada which were much inferior in quality to those scored much lower.

In my letter in your April number I am not, as you say, the mouthpiece of others, for no one knew I was going to write, or had written. until I had done so; nor was I asked by any person or persons to write; but the reason I wrote was, I thought and still think that the March number was spiteful and written expressly to do injury. All I have heretofore done has been for the poultry interest generally, and frequently to my own injury. I never yet wrote under a *nom-de-plume* to attack another, but only on general matters.

The times I especially refer to in my April letter, when I said I had experienced attacks under *nom-de-plume* in your paper intended to injure me, were in the year, I think, 1879, which were extremely abusive if not worse. The time I refer to your remarks of judging was after the Brantford show, when your remarks in your report were entirely and uncalled for different towards Messers Buck and Jarvis, Bogue and myself.

But what can be expected when a person gets a disappointed man to report on classes that the person himself is entirely ignorant of, and unable himself to report on them.

When as president, in 1884 I named the nominating committee, I believed it had been the custom for the president to nominate, as I then stated, otherwise I certainly should not have done so. it being generally customary for a