

breeder finds a mongrel among his flock, and don't know what it is, he at once calls it a Wyandotte, and enters it for exhibition. It would not much matter if the judges withheld the prizes in such a case, but it is not so. And it made my heart sink for the future of this excellent breed, when I saw the first prizes, in most of the exhibitions, placed on such unworthy specimens of their kind. I do not mean to be personal, and will mention no names or places, as my object is not to wage war but to get breeders interested in this excellent variety of fowl.

In the interest of the Wyandottes, I beg respectfully to suggest, that it would be only right and just for the judges to exercise their right to rule out such birds, as they must know, are no good at all, and whose appearance would suggest that they are not even distantly related to these most beautiful birds. Although well acquainted with the breed, at one exhibition I could not find any, and happened to express my regret to another exhibitor. He told me there were a few pairs, and took me to see them. I had passed them several times, but they were so unlike Wyandottes, I did not even think to look at the name on the card, and certainly if the card had not said they were Wyandottes no one would have known it.

Now I do not say there are no good Wyandottes in Canada, but I think they are like angel's visits, few and far between. Let every breeder of this variety wake up to the fact that there is a lot of weeding to be done before the birds can take their proper place in the eyes of the public. Let them study their matings, and religiously select only those birds for the breeding pen that will give good results in chicks next year. It will certainly pay better in the end. So that, even from a business point of view, it recommends itself to every one interested in them. In the United States, this breed is fast becoming a great favorite, a place the birds have won simply by their merits, and even promising to rival the ever popular Plymouth Rock. I could say much more, but fear I have already trespassed too much on your limited space.

I think all your readers would rejoice to see your valuable paper double the size it is at present, even if it were double the price too. In common with many others, I read with great pleasure the articles from Mr. S. Spillet, in your September number. Hurrah! for the day when we, in Canada, have a man so devoted to the poultry interest, and such an indefatigable worker in the cause as the world renowned I. K. Felch. Hoping you can find room for this,

I am respectfully,  
W. C. G. PETER.  
Angus, Ont., Sept. 10th, 1885.

### Meat and Eggs vs. Feathers.

BY LEWIS WRIGHT.

Before discussing to what extent our poultry judging might be made more effective in the real "improvement" of domestic poultry for economical

purposes, it is desirable to make perfectly clear that I do not spare, in the least, certain ridiculous or exaggerated expectations. When Sir Henry Thompson or others complain that poultry are not so judged as to prefer the "best layers," a moment's reflection will show that this could not possibly be done in any way. No man has ever been able to suggest how it might be done. Take any fowl as she stands in her pen, and there is no conceivable test of outward appearance by which any judge can decide that she is a better layer than her neighbor. Evidence might be brought upon such a subject, but even if perfectly trustworthy, such would have nothing in common with a competitive show. Again, Sir Henry Thompson very plainly implies in his letter that some "French" system of judging is the cause of a great superiority in French fowls. As I have stated before, there is not very much real superiority in the French fowls, and supposing there were, "French judging" will not account for it. For years past the Paris shows of live poultry have been attended by skilled English reporters of various schools, and they are all unanimous that the one thing which really characterizes the judging is the neglect of all real standard at all, and the presence instead of the most gross and unblushing favoritism. French exhibitors have lamented to me only very lately the utter absence of a conscientious attempt, such as they see in England, to select the best fowls irrespective of their owners. So far as it is a question of standard at all, this has been mainly kept in view by breeders themselves; as to the shows, French awards in past years have been practically a distribution of favors.

On the other hand, the large French classes of *dead* poultry probably really have had, and at least it is reasonable to suppose they have had, a real influence in promoting table fowls of good quality. They attract large numbers both of exhibitors and of spectators, and probably help to train both. If we could have such, it probably would be good. But is Sir Henry Thompson justified in blaming the fanciers, and charging it upon *them* that we have no such exhibitors? Such a charge can only be made with an ignorance absolutely phenomenal. In the first place, those who exhibited the French dead poultry are market feeders—those country raisers so plentiful in France and so scarce in England, from causes alluded to in my last. Still, we have some in England, and it would be *their* business to get up such shows as this. But in the second place, these market feeders not having done so, the despised "fanciers," anxious enough to promote useful poultry for the table, have for years past established classes both for live table fowls and dead ones. At some of these attempts liberal prizes have been offered. And so far the result, broadly, has been a failure! The feeders *have not exhibited* in the classes meant to tempt them, and such entries as were made have chiefly been