

quality of Irish fowls has so improved of late years that the price of fine Surrey and Sussex fowls has necessarily fallen. This does not look like general deterioration: it is simply the work going on everywhere of a better *general* supply, lessening the profits of *choice* productions. We see precisely the same thing in fruit; the former prices for the best hot-house productions being no longer obtainable, simply because the supply of a *good*, but somewhat *lower* class, has increased so enormously and brought prices down.

Other causes are also at work, and produce a peculiar state of things which may or may not be temporary, or of a transitory character. The tendency of business in England, for years, has been to throw more and more of profit into the hands of middlemen, or factors, or salesmen, as they are differently called. The effect in the case of poultry and a great deal of other small produce, vegetables included, is that the original producer gets now *much less of the price* than he did years ago. With this against him, and the prices of *common* fowls gone down so much, while their average quality and size are better (and this general benefit is the more true test of good done by poultry cultivation) everything has been against the high-class breeder. In France buyers will pay 18s to 30s for a splendid table fowl; in England the people have got fewer and fewer, who will pay 10s. These are the facts of the case: and yet Sir Henry Thompson rushes in and puts the decline of first-class poultry at prices which did not *pay* to produce them, down to fancy breeding! It shows, at least, that a man may be a very able surgeon and yet very foolish as a good economist.

Of course there are other reasons in plenty why France probably always will, and at all events ought to, beat England in poultry products; but they have been so often pointed out that it is needless to dwell on them. When the great surgeon says, for instance, that we ought to beat France, he is ludicrously mistaken even as regards the two countries, for the French climate is far better adapted for poultry than the British. Also, France is a country of small occupations, which make so many barn poultry-keepers where we have none; also, there is, as already hinted, a constant *demand* at prices we know nothing of; partly arising from England being a more meat-eating nation and caring less for the taste of tender fowl than the French do. Let there be only a *demand* here for first-class fatted fowls at even 10s to 12s each, and the supply would soon be forthcoming, for we have the fowls to do it with. But I do not wish to dwell further on such mistakes; but rather to turn in the second place to what may be true in Sir H. Thompson's indictment, and what it may be desirable and possible to amend in our present exhibition system. As already stated, what is true is not new—it has been taught years ago, all of it. Still, if there are

evils which it is at all possible to set right, it is well to accept all helps and occasions toward doing it. In another article, therefore, I will try in some degree to disentangle the impossible from the possible as regards some needed reform, as I think, in poultry judging.

LEWIS WRIGHT.

London, Eng., Aug. 31.

Poultry Association of Ontario.

The usual annual meeting of the Executive of the Poultry Association of Ontario was held in the board room of the Industrial Fair Association, Toronto, on Wednesday, September 16. There were present Messrs. Thos. Gowdy, president; Allan Bogue, 1st vice-president; John McClelland, 2nd vice-president; Wm. McNeil, R. Mackay, John Finch, J. W. Buck, S. Butterfield, W. Barber, directors, and Assistant-Secretary Mackenzie. It was decided to hold the annual show on _____ of January.

The prize list was amended by striking 50 cents off the 1st and 2nd premiums, thus reducing 1st to \$2 and 2nd to \$1, 3rd remaining at 50 cents. Creve-Coeurs and La Fleche were added to the list, with prizes same as other classes.

The popular feeling, as shown in the response to the circular issued by the president and secretary, was very largely in favor of scoring, over fifty asking for scoring, while but four were in favor of judging by the old method.

It was resolved that the winning birds be scored at the show of 1886.

The judges appointed were: Messrs. Butterfield, Asiatics; Daniel Allen, games and game bantams; L. G. Jarvis, the remaining classes of poultry, and Jas. O. Weldon, the pigeons.

The directors have done well in appointing an early date for the show.

They have done an unjust thing in indiscriminately reducing the prize list. If has been found necessary to reduce the list, on account of the Government withdrawing the supplementary grant of \$100, the reduction should be made on those varieties only that have failed to pay the society. There are several varieties that have never yet received one cent of benefit from the Government grant, and have been made for years to contribute to the "encouragement" of pauper varieties. Is this fair? We think not. Were the funds of the society largely made up of door receipts there would be some plea for equality in prizes, but there is no such plea. The duty of the executive in such a case was to have equally apportioned the Government grant to each variety, using enough of the entry fees to cover running expenses, and distribute the surplus to each variety as it furnished it. By the present arrangement the Government grant, and all the profits, find their way into the pockets of a few exhibitors of numerous varieties in which there is little or no competition. There is