

and did not do so. I may say that two of the other judges and three exhibitors of the five present thought my birds were the best they ever saw. I might also state that Knapp, the principal winner helped to score the birds. *Fanciers Journal*, Phil., March. 14.

The Black Minorcas were a very large class, but I think the judging in this was the worst I ever saw, the best cockerel on exhibition did not get a place, he was owned by Mr. George G. McCormick, of London, Ont.

I saw the same bird at the Ontario show held at St. Catharines the week before he went to Buffalo and there he scored 98 points, but when he got to Buffalo he was nowhere. Let me say just here that the Canadian exhibitors then and there said that they never would show again where the judge that scored the Black Minorcas was a judge on these varieties, a majority of the exhibitors in the Minorca class said the judgment was wrong, I then took the trouble to get the opinion of two other judges who were judging on other classes to pass their opinion and they said it was a shame. II. E. Russ, in March Review.

I do not believe in this kind of revenge. I don't believe the readers of any first-class journal, as a rule, enjoy it. I don't believe any journal has a right to publish such slander without investigation. If an investigation results in justification, then "let 'er go." I do not believe poultry breeders approve of this kind of free advertising, neither do I believe any one has a right to free space in a journal for such a purpose. I do believe in friendly criticism, but what earthly benefit to the readers of a worthy journal like the REVIEW, can be derived from such rot as the above. Waiving further preliminaries let us proceed to business. Mr. McCormick sends all the way to England and pays an outrageous price for a bird, when he could get better ones in Canada or the States at an ordinary figure. He shows him at the "Great Grimsby" show and wins. What was his competition? He shows him again and has him scored without a Standard. What! without a Standard? Yes, for when he was scored, no one in the crowd had a Minorca Standard. I

have my information straight, in *black and white*, gentlemen. With no Standard to indicate necessity for cuts, he scores 98½, I can see no objection to 98½ points for this bird under the circumstances. Without a Standard to guide me, I could easily run him up to 100, 500 or 1,000. Without a Standard there is no occasion to cut, and no limit to the number of points he can score. In such a case 100,000 or ten times that number would not be astray. Consider it candidly, reader. Mr. McCormick comes to Buffalo with his no Standard, 98½ point pet. Outside of this bird, the show has no attraction for him. Mr. McCormick takes the judge who is to score him, and all who will follow to the idol of his heart. All are told what a wonder has been secured at "21 guineas." Every judge and every exhibitor, as well as all who understand Minorcas know that the man from London has paid far too dear for his whistle. This history is too long, we must cut it short, and consider the judging. The "21 guinea" cockerel is disqualified, because he is judged by the same Standard which disqualified birds belonging to officers and everyone who showed Minorcas. Mr. McCormick denies that he had white in face, but he and one or two assistants are known to have used an external application and severe rubbing to remove "white in face" after he was thrown out. Even before this, at the St. Catharines show, a prominent Minorca breeder told Mr. McCormick that the bird could be disqualified for white in face if judged by a Standard. The reader, no doubt understands who is responsible for the black Minorca judging. It is with pride that I shoulder the responsibility. There is no variety that I understand better. I judged them in New York City 20 years ago and have been familiar with them ever since they became popular. I never did my work more carefully, understandingly, and conscientiously than when I judged

Minorcas in Buffalo last winter. No one can know how glad I would be, at that time, to give Mr. McCormick's bird a good score. I fully realized how sadly he would be disappointed. My heart was in full sympathy with him, and I, in a good degree shared his disappointment. Yes, reader, I felt it, and the social choros that bind fancier to fancier were severely strained when I disqualified, but I had a duty to perform and I performed it conscientiously and justly. I would do it again under like circumstances. Mr. McCormick says I admitted I was mistaken and wanted him to enter a protest. Mr. McCormick knows that there is not one word of truth in that sentence. He knows I stood firm and emphatically told him I could do no otherwise. The words "protest" or "mistaken" were not used or hinted at, and there is not the least shadow of reason for him to say so. The position taken by both Mr. Russ and Mr. McCormick and their statements are not true. Mr. McCormick says "I may say that two of the other judges and three out of the five exhibitors present thought my birds were the best they ever saw." They did not say so nor think so, Mr. McCormick, I have their testimony to the contrary on my desk in black and white, both judges and exhibitors. You say "Knapp, the principal exhibitor, helped score the birds." This is another untruth. No one helped score the birds. I had a man mark for me but he did not have a Minorca in the show or out of it.

Now Mr. Russ what shall I say to you? After Mr. McCormick's abuse in the show room you came to me like a gentleman and talked like one. I confess that I thought you were one. You excused Mr. McCormick when I told you how he insulted me by saying, "you must overlook it because he is an Irishman" I did not suppose it made any difference about nationality, whether Irish, English, Yankee, or what not.