

or Kingston, the Western Fair, the Industrial, and Hamilton and Guelph societies are required to carry on the work for the whole western part of Canada, as only comparatively a very few will visit Ottawa.

Is it not the same with the poultry interest? I do not mean to say that the show of the P. A. of O. has yet got so feeble as the Provincial, but why will it not? And is it wisdom to allow it to become so before a lesson is learned from the history of the Provincial?

Now, Sir, I deny that the vote taken at Guelph represented the feeling of the majority of the fanciers of Canada. If so, how is it that all the other shows in Canada have scoring? Let justice be done. Let each show have a share of the government grant, according to results, if you like, as is likely to be the case with the Provincial grant, thus giving each a fair field and no favor, and we shall see which system will triumph. Scoring has triumphed in the United States, where there is natural, not stimulated prosperity.

I assert that a too heavily bonused institution is likely to outlive its usefulness, simply because it is not depending upon its usefulness for its popularity. This, I hold, is the case with the Provincial; it had died long ago—its very itinerancy would have killed it—but for its foreign strength.

Again, it draws to itself a kind of popularity not begotten of its usefulness, nor arising from its proficiency. We all admire success, and will support apparent success. The grants given to institutions of this kind enables them to keep up this appearance of success and efficiency. A railroad can pay dividends under these circumstances, and thus maintain an appearance of prosperity. An association which can pay large prizes can reckon on large support, even though they refuse to afford that education and encouragement which is the very object of their existence, and for which they are assisted by the state.

Again, in cases of too much stimulation there is a greater danger of being managed by rings. I do not say the P. A. of O. is, but I do say we have hundreds of instances of this being true in the United States, if not nearer home, in other interests.

Just a word or two on scoring. Can any man, let him be a novice or an experienced fancier, lay claim to perfection of knowledge? Then can he, during the excitement and limited time of a show gain that knowledge which he desires? To most persons study is a very slow process, coming grain by grain. The experienced man takes his cards home, and thus his mind is brought into contact with the judge's mind as expressed on his score-cards, and little by little, as he exam-

ines and compares becomes more familiar with perfection and imperfection. So with the beginner. His cards furnish for him a text-book, of the greatest value, for a year. Men don't drink down ideas, or are not perfectly trained by one lesson, but by the everlasting repetition of the same thing. This the score-card furnishes an opportunity for doing.

"You can ask information of the judge under the look-and-say system." Well, suppose he condescended to go over the stock with you in which you are interested, will your mind retain all this instruction? If it does you are an apt student. But if you get both, surely it is better. Now, Mr. Novice, suppose you have a dozen birds, and go over them ever so carefully, noting just where your own birds differ from the winning birds—and yet these are not perfect specimens or standards for comparison—can you hope to retain all this in your mind till next show; or while you are studying tail, has the wings, or what you have gone over of them with the judge, gone off into the sea of oblivion? But can the judge do all this? No. You will have to do all this finding out by yourself. I don't blame the judge. It is impossible. Now, suppose you do all this comparing and then for 25c per head carry your score-card home with you, surely you are in a better position to learn to improve.

Yours sincerely,
STANLEY SPILLET.

Nantye, Feb. 23th, 1885.

I must admit that this letter seems to me superfluous, as in March number of REVIEW the art of scoring is put beyond a doubt. It is proved to be an established fact, and practicable beyond the shadow of a reasonable objection; but as I have not time to prepare anything else for this month I must let your readers have this letter, if it be pouring water on a drowned man—metaphorically speaking.

Nantye, April 1st, 1885.

S. S.

Wyandottes.

Editor Review.

Mr. Doel's answer to there being no class for Wyandottes at the Ontario show has completely taken my breath away with astonishment. Does that gentleman take any of the American and English poultry journals? Why my dear sir, the Wyandotte fowl was admitted to the *Standard* in 1883, after being for years bred and tested by some of the oldest and most experienced breeders in the United States, and to-day they stand at the head of recognized American varieties, competing successfully with those general favorites, the Plymouth Rocks. All the largest and best shows, both in England and the States have had a separate class for them for the past two years, and fine specimens are in great demand.