

of the standard works on poultry.

Experience has taught me that the *Royal* was wrong in the opinion of the Langshans. There is as much difference between the two varieties of fowls as there is between any other two of the Asiatic breeds, except in the plumage, the Black Cochins being of a rusty, reddish black plumage, and the Langshans a brilliant coal black, with a beautiful bottlegreen sheen. I do not deny that they may be akin, but the Langshans are just as distinct as from the Black Cochins as the Brahmas are from the Cochins, class 1. As far as the Langshan has failed to do anything for merit, popularity, I will only say, that but for the vitigating influences of the Langshan upon the Black Cochins, the latter would have been nearly extinct by this time, owing to the failure of breeders to produce specimens free from reddish or brassy feathers, which were rapidly disqualifying them for the show pens. Thus, far they have done much for the Black Cochins, and for themselves have made a record even in a name of that class in this country.

Experience teaches us that they are distinguished for size and weight, egg production, beauty of plumage and general formation of the fowl (being in that respect entirely different from the Black Cochins), and, lastly, for hardiness—they cannot be excelled by any breed or variety as they withstand the effects of hot and cold, wet or dry weather, without any perceptible change. My hens laid all through the Winter and Spring, and are now laying on an average of five eggs a week, to each hen. They are not persistent sitters, but are easily broken up, and between the periods of brooding they take an unusually short resting spell, before they begin to lay again.

The young grow up and mature rapidly, and with me excel in that respect either the Cochins or Brahma breeds; my four months old chicks are as large as the mongrel hens I keep for hatching purposes. I regard them, in all respects, as the most desirable fowl for either the farmer or villager, especially when profit is the object sought.

Yours, S. STONEBREAKER, M. D.
McLennan Co., Texas.

Our Lefroy Letter.

Since giving my views upon the subject of "Judging at Toronto" I have received letters from some of the leading fanciers of the Dominion, in which they express themselves strongly in favor of a foreign judge. As you, Mr. Editor, have already remarked, the feeling is such that there is very little chance of giving satisfaction, unless a foreign judge be employed. And I think it would

be well, also, to have the name of the judge given in the prize list, following the example of our brethren of the Province of Quebec and the United States. I cannot understand, if the judge be a competent one, and is known to have the confidence of the fancy, what is to be gained by keeping back his name, unless there is a danger that too many birds might be brought out. We find the officers of the large shows of the United States making it public months before the shows are to be held, that B. H. Pearce, or some other disinterested person, is to judge the show, as did those who had the management of the Sherbrooke show. Evidently there was no cause for secrecy, they had employed a competent man, and one in whom those interested had confidence, and they desired it to be known. There may be something to be gained by keeping back the name of the judge, but it is difficult to see how it is to be the success of the show.

Suppose that four or five of our own fanciers are selected to judge our show, are they to be allowed to exhibit in all the classes except the one which they are to judge? If so there is evidently a great weakness here. One can see at a glance the easy possibility of fraud or favor—"You do as well for me or my friend as you can, and I shall not forget you." I do not say that this has occurred or will occur but it can and that is sufficient reason for reform. What would be thought of a Government which would leave its official position so open to abuse? How soon would we hear of rings, frauds, &c., and what a time the *Mah* and *Globe* would have. But as it is we find every place hedged about with every protective condition which experience demands and wisdom suggests. What imagine interested parties forming a committee of investigation to examine and report upon the value of certain extras performed by said interested parties. Even suppose the thing to be done fairly and honestly, would it not give rise to suspicion and want of confidence, and such a government would soon have to give place to wiser if not honest men. In our case who will choose to pay a high entrance fee, to say nothing of other expenses, and then be left to the mercy of his competitors, judging between their own stock and his.

Let us consider some of the objections to having B. H. Pearce, or a foreign judge. Will it be a confession of weakness to go to the United States for a judge? Hardly. Will it not be rather an evidence of an honest desire to give justice and to profit by the experience of others, no matter who they are or to what country they belong. Surely this is more honorable than that narrow mindedness that prompts a man to remain in ignorance rather than change his mind, or to