

expulsion to the members who exhibit them." This is the prescription from which the physic for this disease must be compounded. One dose will relieve, and two is sure to cure. It is not possible that at poultry shows more than at anything else can everything be perfection. Many little discrepancies and little abuses from time to time will creep in, and it always needs all the eyes of the honestly disposed to watch for these things and cut them down as they crop up. Even though this year one little crop of irregularities are exposed and put away, next year will probably produce some more, just like one season's crop follows another. But no one year's bad weeds should be allowed to seed and produce a double crop next season; no accumulating nuisance should be allowed to go on year after year as this dishonest system of bird borrowing has been allowed to do. Had it been hoed up or cut down the first time it showed its head above ground it would have been banished forever. But it was not so handled, and now requires more work and rigid measures to put it down. But it can and must be done.

Strathroy, Feb'y 2nd, 1885.

× ROADS.

The Situation.

Editor Review.

If there were not records of a later date than the catastrophe of the London resolutions of your being a probationer in time, I should conclude that you were annihilated, and instead of writing a letter for Review, should write one of condolence to your family.

But allow me just here to ask how those virtuously indignant resolutionists passed over in their righteous condemnation of personal attack the square assertion in the Canadian department of January *Monthly*. Allow me to quote:—

"Just here we would like to say a few words in reference to judging. As we all are aware two of the gentlemen who will judge at this show have been judging our shows for a great many years, and, we regret to say, do not give the same satisfaction now as they did when they started. We do not doubt for one moment but what our worthy friends are as capable of judging as any other gentlemen in the country, as they both know a bird when they see it; but we must say we do not like this way of *dividing the prizes up to keep on good terms with all fanciers.*"

Does not this prognosticate the Guelph calamity?

Now, Sir, permit me to say to the sympathisers and apologists of this Guelph failure, is it not plain that the judge either could not or wouldn't? And it has been demonstrated over and over again, that it can be done successfully. Now, which horn of the dilemma is most suitable

for your impalement. I have no ill will against the judge, nor do I set this down in malice, but in defence of the scoring system, which I claim to have the right to propagate and defend to the utmost of my power. Friend Butterfield was engaged to give the system its first trial at Guelph, and it was a failure in his hands. Now, how in the name of common sense is the system to be defended against this thrust at its practicability without criticising his acts? And why should his acts in this case not be discussed without its being made out a personal attack? He was a public servant in that case, and his acts in his official capacity are public property, and the public have the right of ownership to examine and judge those acts. If the judge did his best at that show, then his best, even his strongest supporters say, won't do. If he did not do his best, then why did he not do so? Let me answer, if the latter is true, Simply to destroy the scoring system. And in either case what is the duty of the Review, if it would be true to the fancy, true to its own best interests, true to the object of its existence, true to its past record of "hewing to line, let the chips hit whom they may?" Just simply to come, as it has, squarely down on the position, without any respect of persons.

"The English opinion" has been completely disposed of by Mr. Elliott, who may well say, "Come on MacDuff," for his authority is the very emperor of English fanciers.

At a meeting of the Toronto Poultry Association, as reported in the Canadian department of the *Poultry Monthly*, the following is given as the general tone of the speeches made at that meeting upon the subject of scoring: "Several of those present condemned very bitterly the scoring system. One member remarking that it was one of the worst drawbacks that had happened the poultry interest for many years." There is a large measure of truth in the words of Garrison: "To every reform the same objections, substantially, are urged till it triumphs. 1st, That the new idea disturbs the peace and endangers the safety of existing institutions. 2nd, That it is generally discarded by the old experienced ones." (So was the greatest truth which has ever been presented to the mind of man, the Gospel.) "3rd, That it is contrary to long established customs. 4th, That it lacks responsibility and character, and none of the rulers believe in it. 5th, It is sheer fanaticism and its triumph would overthrow all order. Lastly, its advocates are vulgar in speech, irreverent in spirit, personal in attack, seeking their own base ends by bad means, and presumptuously attempting to dictate to the wise, the learned and the powerful." This needs no further comment than