

next issue, I will deposit money with the President, Mr. Allan Bogue.

Now this will be a good opportunity for Mr. Peter to trot out some of those pullets which he considers far too valuable to trust in a show room while young.

Yours truly

T. H. SCOTT.

St. Thomas, Ont.

HOLD ON TO SYMMETRY.

BY W. C. G. PETER.

Kindly allow me to correct the remarks, *re* Plymouth Rocks, which appeared in November issue. The article was written hurriedly, and I was so busy that I did not read it over. *Re* primaries, I meant to suggest that the clause *re* white splashes should not be allowed to cover *entire white feathers* in cocks or cockerels in primaries; and though white in hens is not so objectionable, these faults will recur in progeny, and in most cases in an aggravated form—just as in other particular colored birds.

Will our REVIEW friends express some opinion on the symmetry question? I will state one of the reasons I have for retaining it. If a back is poor and gets a hard cut, how are we to know what the cut on back was for? How much for plumage and how much for shape? If we buy a bird by the score, and do not see it, and the cut on back is all for shape, and there is no symmetry clause to guide us, we do not know so well what we are buying. I cannot forget what lessons the score cards of Messrs. Felch and Bicknell were to me, on this very question. I sent a bird I thought extra good in shape, and when the cards were returned with no cuts for symmetry by either judge that fixed the shape in my mind. Another I thought too long in the back; it was cut two. I knew the plumage was cut, or only a trifle. Here

was another lesson. Of course, I was quite a novice in the scoring system, and I like to learn. I had thought I would not exhibit this year again, on account of press of business; but Felch at Owen Sound, Bicknell at Bowmanville, and our own Jarvis and Butterfield at London and St. Catharines will be too much to resist, I am thinking.

HIT 'EM AGAIN, FRANK!

TO CANADIAN FANCIERS GENERALLY,
AND REVIEW PARTICULARLY.

Editor Review:—

As I promised you when visiting "Homewood" in the summer, I now drop you a few lines. Regarding the fancy here, I am sorry to say our society has gone up, there not being enough fanciers in town to keep it alive, and the support we had from outside not being as great as we desired. We only have one or two live fanciers in town, so for the time being we must work away and try and get up enough interest to organize again. My own time is so much taken up away from home, as you know, I cannot devote much time to working up a society here. In fact I do not get time to look after my own interests, among my birds, as I only see them about once a week, and under such circumstances my surprise is that they look so well and are in such condition. But I must not run in this strain or you will think I want a cheap advertisement, so I will just refer to other columns for the advertisements, and ask the fancy a few plain questions on another matter.

For some time past I have carefully watched the improvement in our Canadian paper, the REVIEW. It has improved in size, in type, and the articles are much better written. I notice with pleasure the articles from the pens of our two northern fanciers, Messrs. Peter and Spillett, and often wonder

why we are not similarly favored from our veterans in other places. The question arises, is the REVIEW worthy of our confidence and support? If so, are we each doing our part to push it ahead? This can be done in several ways. Some can write for the benefit of others, and I am sure a word occasionally from such veterans as the following would be highly appreciated:—Costen, of Montreal; McClelland, of Peterboro'; Buck, of Brantford; Sanderson, of Stratford; Carson, of Orangeville; Scott, of St. Thomas; Ferguson, of Listowel; Main, of Boyne; Smith, of Fairfield Plains; Bogue and McNeill, of London; Sunley, of Guelph; McKay, of Hamilton; Hamill, of St. Catharines; Wilson, of Seaforth; while in your city of Toronto there are Messrs. Doel, Dilworth, Barber, Banks, and others. I tell you were these gentlemen to write occasionally I feel certain great good would result to the fraternity at large and the REVIEW would be benefitted. Even if you had to add a few pages of good reading matter I don't think subscribers would object. Since my entry to the ranks of the fraternity, with one or two exceptions, I don't remember of reading any article from the pens of the above, though all are known as great prize winners. There are also many others who could also interest us in this way, but I only single out a few, to start the ball rolling. I ask you, gentlemen, in all frankness, as Canadians, are we booming our own Canadian paper as we should?

Besides writing for the REVIEW we can assist materially in getting new subscribers. I acknowledge, Mr. Editor, my own shortcomings in this respect, while I have sent in an odd subscriber. I feel that with a little push more could have been done. If every subscriber would only send in one, the whole subscription list would be doubled, and I don't think you would object, even if they all came in a rush between this and Xmas. I feel that the fraternity should do this. There is scarcely one