

He knew before he came that the awards would be made by the Poultry Committee, and he knew just as well as anybody else who were the gentlemen composing that committee their names appearing in full in the prize list. I presume if Mr. Meyer had been awarded the silver medal last September his letter in the June REVIEW would never have been written.

That the judges carefully considered their decision is proven, I think, by the fact that they refused to sustain a protest entered by a disappointed exhibitor, and still rather by the fact that nobody has ever advanced any good reason for questioning their judgment, and to insinuate that they were either unfair or incompetent after committing one's self to their decision is, to say the least, discourteous and unmanly.

Referring to Sec. 1, "In this section a first prize of \$10 and second prize diploma are offered for the incubator hatching the largest percentage of live chickens or ducks. No machine to contain less than 75 fertile eggs at the time same is brought to the exhibition. Any machine having less than this number of fertile eggs to be excluded from this particular competition."

Mr. Meyer says this would not be so bad if every machine were placed on an equal footing, but thinks that because he lives in Kossuth and the exhibition is to be held in Toronto that it would be unfair for his machine to compete in such a contest. I beg to suggest that Mr. Meyer has the privilege of running his machine in Toronto prior to the opening of the exhibition if he so desires, but if Mr. Meyer cannot arrange to do this I can only see one other way out of the difficulty and that would be to induce the Industrial Exhibition Association to hold the show in Kossuth instead of Toronto.

The statements made by Mr. Meyer are of a nature well calculated to have an injurious effect on the incubator trade by creating a wrong impression in the minds of the public and will be regarded by every business man as a most insane and suicidal course for one to take who pretends to be in the business, perhaps it is more malicious than suicidal, but in that case Mr. Meyer should hesitate to injure the trade of others even if he has none of his own to suffer. If all incubators were of the sort that Mr. Meyer writes about the public would never want any of them. He says: "We know very well Mr. Editor that these great incubator records of the show room are made by testing out first all clear (unfertilized) eggs on the fifth or sixth day, then again on the twelfth or thirteenth day testing out all weak doubtful, poorly fertilized eggs, and again a few days later a final test with a good tester will discard a few more dead or suspicious

eggs. The result of all this care together with the excellence of the machine, to say nothing of the man at the helm, will be a magnificent hatch of perhaps 73 chickens out of 75 fertile eggs, or to put it differently (the way that is never told to the public) 73 beautiful chickens out of from 200 to 300 eggs, or perchance 600 or 800 eggs were used and the result will be more chickens hatched than all other competitors combined. The public were never told that twice as many eggs were used and the result will be more chickens hatched than all competitors combined. Verily there are tricks in all trades but ours."

I regret exceedingly to learn that Mr. Meyer's machine is of this type, I had hoped better things of him and his machine, but after the astonishing statement which is all the more remarkable as it emanates from one who professes to be a manufacturer of incubators there is no longer room for hope, as Mr. Meyer doubtless speaks more particularly of the machine with which he is most familiar. On behalf of incubator makers generally I deny positively that Mr. Meyer knows that the show room records are made in the way he says they are, viz., by incubating from five to ten times as many eggs as the number of chicks hatched; years ago with "old time" machines it was necessary to do such things but with the best modern machines it is quite unnecessary.

I have personally operated the leading incubators of the United States, these are the machines that have made the greatest show room records, and I state positively that any and all of them will hatch every egg that could be hatched under a good sitting hen. It is quite true that the operator tests out from time to time unfertile eggs and eggs with weak germs, so does the man who sets many eggs under hens, but the machines that require from 300 to 800 eggs to produce 73 chickens seldom or never appear in the show room and when they do they usually suffer the fate they deserve.

Hitherto I supposed Mr. Meyer was possessed of better judgment and a deeper sense of justice to his compeers than to make statements that are utterly false and calculated to do injury to those engaged in an honorable business, it seems to me like a "dog in the manger" policy, if he cannot cut the hay himself he seems determined that nobody else shall. It has been asked in the REVIEW why it is required that the machines entered in Sec. 1 must contain not less than 75 fertile eggs. I believe the intention was to prevent parties showing a 200 egg machine with three or four dozen eggs in it, which is no test of what a machine can really do. I think the sub-committee showed wisdom in this, and investigation may prove that the committee