

ent breeds; inappropriate coops, and not nearly enough even of them; the usual amount of ignorance, or even worse, on the part of the Judges in awarding prizes, are a few out of the long list now lying before us. And why should these things be? Because the management of this class of the exhibition is placed in the hands of incompetent and incapable men, utterly ignorant of the duties they undertake, and criminally careless of the interests committed to their charge; because the judges appointed by such persons are chosen—not with a view to their proficiency in poultry knowledge, nor for their adeptness in discriminating between two evenly matched pens of fowls, but because they are the representatives of certain favorite localities prominently represented at the Council Board, or the unflinching supporters of some well-known exhibitors, whose love of poultry consists in the amount of prizes they pocket annually, and the *eclat* attached to the receiving of such, together with the subsequent benefits derived as poultry breeders whose stock take first-class prizes at the first and principal exhibition of the Province. These are some of the reasons why this state of things exists.

But the time has arrived for an end to be put to such despicable proceedings. The poultry breeders of the Province of Ontario have a right to expect—nay, to demand—that their principal exhibition shall be fairly and properly conducted, that even-handed justice shall be meted out to all exhibitors alike, regardless of all other considerations than that of merit in the specimens shown; yet it is a notorious fact that the very contrary is the case. Unprincipled and incompetent men are almost invariably appointed as judges, prizes are awarded in many cases to specimens wholly unworthy of the least notice. Disreputable exhibitors, aware of this fact, take advantage of the ignorance or credulity or favoritism of

the judges, and, by the most direct means, seek to influence their judgments, even supposing them capable of giving a fair one. A most notable instance of this occurred at the last exhibition. Two persons, shall we say *gentlemen*?—one a judge, the other an exhibitor, both from the same locality—after the fowls were placed in their show pens and before the judges commenced their labors, made a careful survey of each coop; those of the exhibitor carefully examined, and their merits accurately pointed out, whilst the defects in others were as carefully noted. Is it necessary for us to add that this exhibitor had a lion's share of the prizes awarded him. Who will have the hardihood to assert that this model judge assumed his duties with an unbiassed mind? what language is too strong to be used in depicting the conduct of this model pair? and yet they are but fair specimens of the class of men who have acted as judges and exhibitors at our Provincial Exhibitions for the last twenty years. We beg to inform this pair of worthies—judge and exhibitor—that their names are now in our possession, to be published hereafter should occasion require it.

As already stated, we did not attend the exhibition in person, and cannot therefore undertake to point out separately wherein the judges acted wrong in awarding prizes, but we have undoubted authority for saying that in many instances their judgments were wholly erroneous and without the least shadow of justification in awarding prizes to some of the specimens which were honored with them. We cannot, however, pass over unnoticed a flagrant act of favoritism evinced by the judges toward one exhibitor. A prize was offered for "the best collection of fowls owned and exhibited by one person." Any ordinary individual would understand the word "collection" in this case to apply only to such coops of fowls as were placed