

say to Mr. H., is that we still claim to be the breeders of the Andalusian hen 1st Birmingham, but Mr. H. will not give honor to whom it is due. We well know that this Andalusian hen won for Mr. H. several prizes, and we think we are correct in saying 1st and cup, Watford. MR. HOPKINS generally gives you a list of what his other Andalusian hens have won, but he carefully avoids naming the 1st and special Bridgewater hen, (except that she was V. H. C. at Brighthouse.) Well, we have only Mr. H.'s own words for this. MR. HOPKINS' hen was nowhere at Birmingham in 1887. We had two hens which got the same honors.

Jenkinson's Revivers, are no doubt, very good, but they cannot always make a sure win. We notice one part of MR. HOPKINS' letter which is far from being correct. MR. HOPKINS says it is quite true that he claimed the 1st and special Andalusian hen at Bridgewater, just for the name, and not because he thought her the best; far from it, as they were badly judged.

Now Sir, In MR. HOPKINS' previous letter, he made the small excuse, that several could have beaten the hen in question had they only been in condition. Now, which of these statements are we to believe. They are both incorrect and false. All the English Poultry Journals spoke in the highest terms of the 1st and special hen, and said she was the best Andalusian hen yet seen. We can send you reports cut from two or three journals if you wish. Now, MR. EDITOR, MR. HOPKINS has made the offer for us to prove that the 1st and special Bridgewater hen is the same that won 1st at Birmingham. We are quite prepared, and we therefore ask MR. HOPKINS to forward to you his £200, and we will forward our £40.

Cable us MR. EDITOR as soon as

you receive the £200 and our £40 will be sent at once.

Yours faithfully,

ABBOT BROS.,

Hingham, Norfolk, Eng.

[We must decline to allow any more space to this subject. —ED.]

WHEN YOU FIND HIM PASS THAT GENIUS UP WEST, CAYFORD.

Editor Review:—

Allow me to offer a few remarks in regard to MR. ERMATINGER's letter in March REVIEW. And in the first place let me thank him for signing his name, so that we know who to reply to. It shows how little interest he takes in the Society that he did not know anything about the exhibition. Last year's show we advertised in the REVIEW, but this year's January number had gone to press before a hall had been secured for the exhibition, owing to the scarcity of suitable buildings for the purpose. So there is nothing "ridiculous" about it not being advertised in the REVIEW. And it was better to have the boards marked in this fashion, "go to the Poultry Show, etc." than in any other fashion that I know of, to fill the object for which they were intended.

There is a difference of opinion as to having *strange* judges, but for MR. E's information, I can tell him that the Montreal Society was the first to introduce American judges in this country and have their birds scored by the "Standard of Excellence;" and this was done year after year till the Executive thought that their own members had been sufficiently educated to do good work themselves. In our Society our largest exhibitors happen to be our best judges, and as it is a member's show, and they have sufficient faith in their honesty and uprightness, it is hardly the business of outsiders to take exception. We lost the valuable services of one of our best judges, MR. COSTEN, through severe illness, which prevented him from being present for

the first time in the history of the Society.

With reference to the "pit games" called "dung hills." Last year the Society added a class for pit games to the prize list at the solicitation of their admirers. This year, not one of these fanciers paid their subscription to the Society with the exception of one young fellow who entered three birds. The Game judge told me that he could not score that class, and as there was no competition, they were awarded the prizes. So much for the "dunghills," which relieves the judges from the odium of not knowing "a pit game from a barn door fowl," and also obviates the necessity of their "getting" as they did not pass judgment on them. Two out of our three judges at the late show certainly know more about Brahmas, Rocks, etc., than Games; but the third judge, J. C. NICHOL, knows as much about Games probably as any man in Canada, and scored every Game bird in the show; and I repeat the remarks in the March REVIEW. "His thorough business-like manner of procedure was most marked, and his awards met with general approval," and consequently all classes were judged to *advantage and none neglected.*

There was very little difference of opinion at the show with regard to the "rain bow colored prize cards," and instead of *less, more* were wanted. The general opinion was that they were the best given at any show in Canada as yet, and the society was congratulated on its enterprise in procuring them. MR. WIXSON, of Ingersoll, in his account of the Detroit show, at which I am glad to see he was a successful exhibitor, says: "The regular premiums were not cash, but silk badges, beautifully gotten up, and I value the collection I was fortunate to secure much higher than money prizes." So at least there is one successful exhibitor who does not need "a little more cash" to induce him to compete. The entry fee at