

well up to fifty or seventy-five miles, and just as your expectations and hopes are rising high in having some hundred mile flyers, your agent at your hundred mile station make a blunder and let your pigeons go when there is every prospect of bad weather, and the prospect is realized and the birds are caught in a storm and nearly all lost.

There are other annoyances and difficulties, a trainer has to contend with, but perhaps the worst of all is the loss of birds by shooting. This I look on as the most serious of all. While I always consider that birds lost flying ordinary stages are well lost, provided they fly in favorable weather, the same is entirely different in many cases where birds are shot on their way to their loft; for it must be remembered that a hundred or two hundred mile bird runs the same risk, and more in proportion to the distance he has to fly as the five or ten miler, of being brought down by being shot.

It is downright meanness for anyone to shoot a tame pigeon when homeward bound, still there are many who carry guns that only want the opportunity to do it every time. It is a pity it is so difficult to bring home to the right parties the perpetration of so mean a trick. A man loses his bird, or it arrives at its loft wounded, but the finding out who did it is all but a matter of impossibility.

I had much satisfaction in reading of a case recently tried at Birmingham, England. The owner of a homer sued a man for £5, the value of a bird he shot while passing over his land on its way to its loft. The defendant sat up as a plea that the bird was no longer the property of the plaintiff after it left his possession, but was then *feræ naturæ*; also that there was no property in pigeons, &c., &c. The learned judge failed to see it in that light, and said there were very many persons now in the country who kept homing pigeons, and that a great deal of capital was invested in them, and he thought had just as much right to protection as any other branch of industry or fancy, especially as there was a large trade now being carried on in these birds both at home and abroad. He failed to see that the defence was at all feasible or reasonable, and after considering the matter very carefully had concluded to give judgement in favor of plaintiff for £5, with costs. A few such healthy lessons as this would teach people who are so mean as to treat other's things in this way that property, if in birds, is not anybody's and everybody's, unless on their owners premises.

One out with a gun, be he man or boy, should always remember other people have their pleasures as well as he, and if it is only a common pigeon worth perhaps a few cents at most he shoots, how does he know but that bird belongs to some poor lad who has but a pair or two, and sets as much store by any one of them as the owner of a splen-

did horse does by his roadster. However, no matter who the bird belongs to or what their value is it is meanness in the extreme to shoot a pigeon that is another person's property, and could I have my wish, a penalty of £5 would not let a man off who was mean enough to do it.

× ROADS.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

FRIEND FILLERTON.—"P. Cock," in answering a question in my letter in January number of REVIEW, seems to have set aside the facts stated that prompted that question, and upon which it was based.

The sum of \$1.50 was paid first on a trio, then upon a single pullet, and since I have paid the same sum on a third coop. It seems altogether unreasonable to suppose that the same appraisal, \$7.50, could be made upon goods so evidently differing in value.

What kind of a duty do you call \$1.50 per coop large or small?

I must decline, Mr. "P. Cock," the honor of being your pupil in the future, please give me no further information; I have no doubt but you are qualified to do so, but you offer so much that is superfluous and so uncalled for that it is not pleasant to take.

I am glad to see that you have changed your mind upon one feature of this duty question, that is, its effect upon the poultry interest. I hope the "children" of Nova Scotia have also been put right upon this subject.

Now, Sir, your method of imparting knowledge may be original—I think it is—but I fear your style is a little too dictatorial and self sufficient to be successful.

STANLEY SPILLETT.

Lefroy, May 24th, 1881.

Editor Review,

I noticed in last issue of REVIEW a communication from a Mr. Brown, throwing a doubt on the honesty of advertisers of rose comb Leghorns, and doing it an underhand and not very gentlemanly way.

Who is this Mr. B. that he should dictate what a breeder must advertise to maintain his character for honesty. I am thinking that he must have but partly awakened from his Rip Van Winkle sleep when he penned his communication. I am a reader of nearly all the poultry journals published, and have never noticed rose comb Spanish, single comb Hamburgs, or rose comb Plymouth Rocks advertised. Surely he is recounting the dreams of his Rip Van Winkle sleep!