

of his extra weight. I must say I am fully in accord with the new Standard in this respect, that nothing be allowed for over-weight. But if a late bird meet in competition with one fully-grown, the late bird has advantages over the early one—if weight is not taken into consideration—and these advantages are wholly the effect of age. For instance, a young bird may have a very small and straight comb, and every breeder and fancier of the Brahma knows what a desirable feature this is, second only to hackle, and in the estimation of not a few, the chief adornment of the variety. Now, if this bird were fully developed there is no doubt but that the comb would be very much larger, and is liable to develop some unfavorable feature, which while young was hardly discernable. Again, young birds are whiter in saddle and hackle than when more advanced in age. And if a bird has not yet grown a tail, can any judge conclude with certainty what will be, from what is; or is he justified in doing so? It is, What is he has to deal with, not what may be, or even what in his opinion will certainly be.

I think that fully furnished birds should be insisted on at our winter shows. The principal object of holding the shows at this season, when it is unpleasant and difficult to have birds comfortably shipped or housed, not to mention the greater expense—also more trying to the birds themselves—is that the birds may be shown in a fully developed and furnished condition. And a want in this respect should be a disqualification. The greater expense I refer to is that in connection with holding the shows, fuel, &c.

Now that the time of our winter shows approaches, I feel disposed to offer a few remarks and suggestions on the methods of judging. It may be a delicate task to interfere with old established customs, which have served their purpose for years, still we find every day changes of methods, which in the past were considered unimprovable, or rather, perfect; the imperfections of which were too obvious when compared with those which displaced them. If the proposed reform does not bear upon its face the proof of its utility or improvement over existing systems, then let it be passed by as visionary and chimerical; but if the proposed reform is supported by reasonable proofs of its necessity, accompanied with feasible and practicable plans of improvement, let us have them, nor rest till we do.

I am aware that there are a large number of fanciers in Canada who desire a change in the manner in which our shows are at present judged. I may say here that I have no doubts, nor never have had any, that we have men eminently qualified to do our judging, and just as honest and conscientious as can be found in any other country; but that is no reason why they shall not adopt the improved and

better method of judging by scoring the birds, which is nothing more than committing to writing what they are already supposed to hold in their memory. And I believe if our judges once adopted this method they would never be willing to return to the old wholesale one. I cannot see why it is not a help just as much as is a memorandum of goods purchased. There is not one merchant in Canada, I would suppose, that would sell a customer as many different articles as there are points in a fowl without making a note of each and its value, and why shall not a judge be aided in the same way. He takes each bird out of its coop, goes over it, from point to point, and why shall he not note down the value of each point as he goes along, and at the end run up the bill. He must come to some conclusion on each, and at last must recapitulate, and not unfrequently go over them several times. Now, why shall a judge not have a clerk, and as he goes over the points call out the value of each, and his clerk note it down. It seems to me the work can be done very expeditiously this way, and correctly too. If a judge is not capable of putting a comparative value upon each point severally, it is only too evident he is not capable of putting the same value on the whole collectively. But, if my memory serves me rightly, it was held at Toronto last winter by many, among the rest by yourself, sir, that only the winning birds should be scored. Well, sir, it may arise from my stupidity, but I cannot for the life of me understand what use there is in the thing if it be not as an aid in determining which are those lucky birds, and as an educating medium. The judge critically examines every specimen not evidently disqualified, and why shall he not note down his decisions? I cannot see why that every man who enters birds in any class shall not have the satisfaction of knowing where his specimens are weak. I think he is entitled to such information. Of course he can hunt up the judge and bore him a bit. And suppose the judge is disposed to give the desired information, can he be expected to remember the whole details during the whole time of the show? Why he would needs to be a walking encyclopedia.

Now, as to the way this thing is done elsewhere. Permit me to quote from I. K. Felch; he is describing his method of judging: "I have a separate room to myself, and the attendant carries the birds from the coops to me. By this way I know nothing as to the ownership of the birds, or anything else about the birds, but just pass judgement on each bird separately." I quote from memory, and cannot recollect the exact words used, but I am confident this is the spirit of it. Now, is it not evident that all the birds are scored here. And look over the advertisements of shows, and is the