

that nothing should worry the hen during her long confinement, if any other hen should intrude in the setting hens coop it would then be more advisable to close the door of the coop altogether and feed inside. For where there is a fight for nests between hens the chances are that all eggs will get smashed.

Due care to the hens comfort during the 21 days will repay you amply in your expectations being realized in the shape of a good hatch. I generally take a look at the eggs about the 20th day, at night, by placing my hand under the hens breast and lifting her gently up, taking good care not to lift her so as to make her shuffle or stir her feet. If you see that any of the chicks have smashed their way out above all shells, as the chicks generally break the shells in such a fashion as to leave one part of the shell the shape of a cap and this portion often works its way on to the other eggs, and in many cases kills the chick in the eggs on which it settles by preventing the little fellow picking through two shells instead of one, and here he remains until the old shell is removed or he eventually dies.

With regard to the care of the chicks after birth I believe I gave you my experience in April number.

### REFORM WANTED.

BY PEA-COMB.

In looking over the March special of the REVIEW I was struck with the letter of MR. P. H. FANQUIER of Brampton, respecting the irregularities and shortcomings of the managing committees of Poultry Associations with respect to exhibitions.

There is undoubtedly too much truth in MR. FANQUIER'S remarks respecting favoritism in the show room, it is perfectly sickening to see the amount of deference and attention, heaped by the great moguls (who pull the Association

wires) on some much advertised breeder who lives a hundred or two hundred miles away, and who, in nine cases out of ten, is not half such a wonderful fellow at home as at the poultry show; and his only object in being there is to win all the prizes he can, and take every cent of his prize money even if he breaks the treasury in doing so, while the poor devils of local fanciers, who have worked hard and contributed their money to get up the show, must be content to go without any, and unless he belongs to the such (?) upper ten is voted a confounded nuisance by the said great moguls, whose knowledge of poultry is, in many cases, exceedingly limited. I have seen three or four of these fellows doing a show act in such a manner that conveyed the idea that they were the whole association and owned the whole outfit, birds, coops, hall, everything, the town included. We have had about enough of this kind of thing, what all sensible men want is fair, honorable and *respectful* treatment to everybody, let him be a hod-carrier or a cabinet minister, we want no distinctions of class in the poultry show-room, the labouring man who pays his one dollar membership fee and fifty cents to enter his pair of chickens is entitled to exactly the same treatment as the millionaire who sends his birds to the show in care of his man, indeed if any distinction is to be made, in nine cases out of ten it should be in favor of the working man, who is a much more useful member of the association than your millionaire.

In new associations that have had no experience in managing shows it is somewhat excusable if matters do not run smoothly the first time, but in the case of shows where there has been previous experience there is no excuse whatever.

Is it fair to the exhibitor who has gone to the trouble and expense of sending his birds to a show to put them in a coop, and never even put his name

on it during the entire show, the winning birds of course have their owners name on the prize-cards, but the birds that do not win, although scoring perhaps half a point less than the winners, are totally ignored; what justice is there in this? for what purpose does a man send his birds to a show, is it to win the paltry dollar or two that is offered in prizes?

Certainly not, he sends his birds there to advertise his stock, and if they win neither first, second, nor third prize, they may score very little less, and if the owners name and the score of the birds were on the coop, the public could readily see how these birds compared with the winners. Mind you I don't believe in putting names on coops before the judging is done, but afterwards the name should be on every coop in the room, also the address of owner, name of variety, for the guidance of the visiting public who are not fanciers, also the score; I would not attach the score-cards to the coop because they are too large and the birds tear them down, but the total score could be marked on the same card that bears the name and address of exhibitor.

If shows were managed differently it would be the means of greatly increasing the number of fanciers, but matters are usually managed so unsatisfactorily that many are deterred, like MR. FANQUIER from having anything to do with them. I am glad to see that some associations are showing promise of reformation, and trust that they will continue to improve until the complaints that are now so common shall have become a thing of the past.

Like MR. FANQUIER, the breeding of poultry is one of the greatest pleasures of my life, and it is a shame and a pity that there is not more good-fellowship, and less petty spite, and mean contemptible trickery among fanciers.