

made a point of complaining against them at every opportunity, and, as far as possible, prevented them from getting any of the grain which he would bestow so lavishly upon his hogs, which, when fattened, just about paid for the pease used for that purpose. And why, may we ask, does she persevere in keeping them at all where she is not supplied with plenty of food and accommodations; or why should she have the exclusive care of them at all, or why not, as in other matters, allow him to keep them or not as he choose? Is it because she is fond of pets? Hardly. She generally has pets enough in-doors to attend to without going out in search of any. The reason is apparent from what has been said. She has the best opportunity to know their value, and this is her decision in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, "I cannot do without them." But as my letter is already getting very lengthy, and being desirous of saying a few words upon the subject of fowl purchasing, I shall defer further discussion of the subject till next month, when the next feature will be considered.

Fanciers are at present specially active and anxious that they may secure as great a share of the prizes as possible; some, no doubt, for the honor alone, but the greater number that their stock may be in greater demand in consequence. Yet as things are at present, when all the prizes have been won, the winner has only partly succeeded in the object aimed at. The public are already acquainted with the fact that many others who have not been exhibitors are the possessors of first-class stock, and would, in not a few cases, gladly become the possessors of a specimen or two of this good stock, and pay for them too. But what guarantee have they that, upon paying their money, they shall be supplied with a first-class article? It is all very well to let the public know that we have good stock, but a little more satisfactory to give them some guarantee that some of this first-class article will be forwarded upon the receipt of so much of the "root." It is all right for a seller to protect himself from being imposed upon, but where the seller has the full price of the goods in his own hands before parting with his goods, there is not much room for fraud on the part of the purchaser. But the seller needs not to be told that he has the matter altogether in his own hands. At present when a man wishes to purchase a superior specimen he finds no difficulty in ascertaining who has good stock, but the trouble is, who will supply good when paid for? On looking over the advertisements in poultry journals he finds that about all the guarantee which is offered is, "if they are not found as represented, send them back, paying express both ways." We find that being paid beforehand is not a sufficient evidence of the purchaser's honesty, but it is further necessary that he be

induced to keep what is sent him; and this is a very good way of doing it, for as the carriage both ways will amount to no inconsiderable part of the price of the bird, he is most likely to decide to keep it, even if it is not at all up to the mark of what he has a right to expect for his money. It sounds very nicely to read the assertions, "No poor birds sold at any price; fair dealing my specialty." But the conditions of sale do not convey any such feeling of security. Where, or in what business, do we find goods advertised upon the same conditions? Suppose the firm of Rogers & Co., of Toronto, who do a large business in this part of Ontario at least, were to offer their goods, watches worth \$25 each, for example, upon the same conditions, how many would they sell? Very few indeed. This firm, and indeed nearly all others doing business in the same way as the fancier, generally does, that is where it is impossible for the purchaser to inspect the goods before buying, send goods C. O. D., and permit an inspection of them at express office before the bargain is completed. And I am also informed that the Grangers are furnished goods upon the same conditions by Toronto houses. Now, the carriage on poultry being so high, I do not think that a fancier can be expected to do business exactly upon this principle, but he can afford to give some security that the purchaser will be dealt fairly with. Surely the raisers of poultry do not find such a ready sale for all they can raise that they can afford to lessen their sales to so great an extent as they do by this one-sided way of doing business. If a fancier have the genuine article to dispose of he cannot be imposed upon to any great extent in giving the purchaser the guarantee that in case the bird or birds shipped do not prove satisfactory that the seller will pay the return charges. A man is not likely to amuse himself to any great extent sending for birds and returning them, when he has first to deposit the price as earnest money, and pay the carriage to the tune of two or three dollars.

In conclusion I would say, that if any successful breeder is really desirous of disposing of a few good birds, he will find that, in addition to convincing the public that he has such, it is to his interest to give some guarantee that such will be supplied on receipt of so much money, or on so much money being deposited in the hands of the editor of some poultry journal till the bargain is completed to their mutual satisfaction. But a fancier has a right to do his own business in his own way, and if he does not think he is sufficiently protected by the purchaser agreeing to pay the carriage one way in the event of not being satisfied with what is sent, to require what he may think fit to secure himself. But after all he cannot make the offer look like an honest intention