

is too mean to be allowed, and prohibit such from competing for five years if not forever.

Let us have our fowls scored and show to our brother fanciers, both in Canada and the United States; what class of birds we have that take premiums. If the name of the judge was also advertised in connection with the prize list, intending exhibitors would be in a better position to judge whether to send their stock or not. If the expense of importing a judge is greater than the committee think themselves warranted in incurring, let an increased entrance fee be charged to meet the expense, or a per centage of the premium be deducted.

We have some judges that would scorn to do anything but what, in their judgement, was fair to all exhibitors, but the number is so small that they feel thoroughly disgusted with the business, and would prefer being visitors rather than judges.

Yours truly,

W. R. CUNNINGHAM.

Little Britain, Dec. 4th, 1882.

#### Editor Review.

As editor of the *POULTRY REVIEW*, and interested in all that pertains to our fancy stock, I am led to jot you a few lines bearing on "our shows," and hope in the interest of British justice my ideas may commend themselves to your consideration, and be acceptable to your readers, and will meet with such united expression through your columns that ample justice be done exhibitors on merit, and merit pure and simple.

Complaint, grumbling and dissatisfaction has in the past been the rule, notably so at the last Toronto exhibition, and not, I think, without excellent cause and provocation. Our shows, as a rule, have not been encouraging as stimulating healthy, honorable competition. Our judges have not, in every instance, been properly qualified for their important positions, nor have they proved as impartial as could be expected in a position in which strict honor should be a first requisite. Ours is an honorable calling, and one in which almost every member becomes an enthusiast; therefore, in common interest, we demand fair, square, honest treatment, and in this I fearlessly speak for every member of our fraternity, that it is only such we want. I write without prejudice, as I, a junior, have no personal complaint, and I write feelingly as I am ambitious to keep good birds, and if I have not them now, wish to know when I get them. I have several coops which I consider equal to any that can be produced, and I am acquainted with numbers of dealers who think of their fowl as I do of mine. I respect these men, I respect their opinion, I appreciate their visits, enjoy their correspondence and their conversation, and I find,

without exception, they have not been satisfied; they are anxious that a change should be made, and I heartily endorse this common desire. We all wish to exhibit, raise first-class stock and sell to best advantage, but do not ask undue favor—we want fair, honest scoring and judging, so that we may know where to improve our stock, as we wish to improve others, and we wish to know by such scoring the reasons which awards the honor of pre-eminence by "prize" or "Honorable mention." We can no longer tolerate judges who are incompetent, or perhaps biased or ignorant, and who judge unjustly, and in doing so, perhaps unwittingly, do an injustice not alone limited to special exhibits but the country at large.

Mr. Editor, I appeal to you in all seriousness, cannot this crying evil be remedied? Cannot we secure impartial and qualified judges, whose opinions command respect, at all our shows, more especially at those known as poultry exhibitions, in which as fanciers we are particularly interested? And would it not be well to even call upon one or more of the principal judges from across the line, and allow a fair remuneration for their good services. Let us, at any rate, try by fair means to gain our laurels; let us as a fraternity, frown down and discountenance ignoble practices, and let us as honorable men in an honorable and commendable calling, demand that justice for ourselves and others which should alone be our ambition, as it is our Canadian birthright.

—Yours truly,

D. C. TREW.

Lindsay, Nov. 27th, 1882.

## PIGEON DEPARTMENT.

### Judges of show of P. A. of Ont.

#### Editor Review,

I was much pleased to see in your last issue of "Review" the letter from Mr. Stanley Spillett, of Lefroy, on the above subject and I am quite in accord with everything he says.

His letter however applies to *poultry* judges only, for being a poultry breeder himself that is what he is most interested in, at the same time his remarks apply equally to judges of all other exhibits, and as pigeon fanciers are very much interested I wish to say a few words in their behalf.

From what I hear from fanciers, especially in and about Toronto, the entries of Pigeons at the coming February show is likely to be very large, and they have frequently put the question to me "Who is going to judge the pigeons?" which, of course, I could not answer; but as Mr. Spillett has mentioned names as fit and proper persons for judging the poultry, I claim the same privilege