

not, (the italics are mine,) shall present in writing such criticisms upon the present Standard, and such suggestions in regard to the proposed revision as to them seem right, and that we request that the same shall be in writing and on foolscap paper, written on only one side; and it is further requested that a separate communication be made on each variety, to the end that they may be referred to separate committees on the different varieties.

"These communications should be made as early as possible and addressed to Geo. S. Josselyn, Secretary of the American Poultry Association, Fredonia, N. Y., before the first day of December, 1881. Also that the said revision be unchanged for not less than five years."

Now we have it all in a nut-shell. The charge of "ring," favored few, &c., is all knocked in the head, as *all* are requested to put in their say, no matter whether members or not. This is as it should be, for although all should be members of the A. P. A., and help make it a bond of unity—as it really is—between all fanciers of America, all are not members, and heretofore have felt themselves outsiders, as it were. Now these *outsiders* can come in and talk as loud and long as the president—or any other man. So now get your thinking caps on, and if you want *white feathers* to read *red feathers* in the new revision, or *white faces* to read *red faces*, get out your foolscap paper and write it all down just as you think it should be, and send it to head-quarters, and it will be properly respected in the revision. And remember while you are at it that it is to stand at least for five years—and if I get a chance I will vote "early and often" to make it *ten years*.

So in this you see all get a chance to help revise, and when it is revised it will stay revised long enough for a man to get a hen set before it is changed by some one who can talk fast enough to get a vote taken before every man who breeds the variety under consideration can give expression to his just indignation, and vote it down. For it is a notorious fact that, "by count," three out of four of all changes made in the Standard since its formation have been steps backward instead of forward—have been lowering the Standard to inferior birds rather than letting it alone and trying to build up to it. And in this connection also I might say with all that has been said against the Standard and its imperfections, I am certain all fair minded men will agree with me that it is as near perfect as it was possible to frame it and harmonize all the conflicting elements that existed at the time of its adoption—and exists even yet. But one thing you will all notice, and that is, the Standard is always appealed to as the final umpire in all controversies. And this is right and an argument in its favor,

since we must have an *authority* lodged somewhere, and here is where it should be and is lodged in poultry matters. And I might also say right here, that I venture the prediction that when the new Standard is completed, and placed before the public, it will be found to contain fewer changes than most casual observers might think it would.

But, Mr. Editor, as I wrote you personally, my time is quite limited for the reasons given, and I will leave the balance of this for another time.

JAMES M. LAMBING.

Parker's Landing, April 15th, 1881.

Duty on Poultry.

FRIEND FULLERTON,—With your permission I shall offer a few remarks upon the subject of "duty on poultry." In the first place, let it be granted that this 20 per cent. duty is not a revenue tax, or not put on by our government solely with the view of increasing an insufficient revenue, but that its sole object is to stimulate, build up or foster the poultry business in Canada.

Now if it be found, upon a fair trial, that this duty does not conduce to the best interests of the poultry business, it remains with poultry men themselves to remedy the evil, and by representing the case to the government, secure its repeal. But, if on the other hand, this duty on all goods coming into Canada is necessary to raise a revenue by which the government shall be able to efficiently govern our country, then I have nothing to say on the subject, as I believe money is requisite to good government. But has not our government assured us that the latter is not the case, and that the duty is put on to benefit us and not the government. Therefore our duty as patriotic citizens is to secure the repeal of this law if it is not calculated to secure for us the advantages which it promised. Now sir, my opinion, based upon my own experience and observation, is that it is not favorable to the growth of the poultry business in Canada. If I import a fine specimen I am asked by the friends of this system why do you not buy from Canadian fanciers, and thus encourage them and keep the money in Canada, and thus build up the poultry trade in Canada. Now it seems to me the mistake lies just here,—in confounding the office of the mere poultterer with that of the fancier. Is there a fancier in the Dominion who, if he raised one thousand scrubs and sold them at a good price would consider he was a success as a fancier. The primary object in holding poultry shows attests to the contrary. This very disposition to import specimens from the United States says emphatically that quality and not quantity is what our fanciers are after. And why, we may ask, are so many imported from there? Is it because, they are cheaper? I think not. It will be found that,