

A SAD DAY FOR THE GLOSTERED FANCY GLOSTER FANCY



The meeting place: Butcher's Arms

Dear Readers, on the 22nd of March, some 30 members of the International Gloster Breeders Association gathered in Mickleton for the annual meeting of the (IGBA). Among those present were three officials from the Gloster Fancy Canary Council (GFCCI): the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, and the International Secretary and several other council members.

Going into the meeting, the Council representatives sincerely hoped that the motion proposed for discussion — that the IGBA should become another governing body for the Gloster Fancy — would not be approved. However, from the attendance and the way the meeting was planned, it quickly became apparent that the intentions of the IGBA leadership were quite the opposite.

Sadly, the events of that day may prove to be a turning point for the Gloster Fancy. The motion was ultimately passed, a decision that will divide our beautiful fancy into two separate factions. Some claimed that the split was already there while others showed disappointment seeing fallouts so intense over a canary in a cage. What is surley visible now is that the split is officially there.

Proceedings of the Meeting

Attendance

At the meeting there was a notable for the presence of several well-known and respected members of the Gloster Fancy, including: Alan Haywood, Dave Hobart, Dave Rands, Richard Lambert, Nick Barrett, Steve Chennells, Keith Baker John Herring and several other prominent breeders and fanciers.

For much of the day, the meeting followed normal procedure. Standard agenda items such as financial reports and other administrative matters were presented and voted upon.

Zoom Voting!!

One notable aspect of the meeting was the use of Zoom participation and voting for those who were not physically present. From the outset, however, there appeared to be technical issues affecting communication. Those attending in person were unable to hear the Zoom participants or even see them, and the Zoom participants themselves did not appear to voice their opinions at all on anything during the discussions. However they managed to vote everytime with a **100% "YES"** to all that was proposed during the meeting, this naturally raised questions among some attendees with one member asking how it was allowed to process such ruling with a selected number of Zoom viewers to vote, when the meeting was already ruled with no proxy voting.

The Motion

Once the meeting resumed, the Chairman opened the floor for discussion on what would become the most debated topic of the day: the motion proposing that the IGBA should establish itself as another governing body for the Gloster Fancy.

By this time the anonymous proposer of this motion had been revealed as it could not be kept secret anymore due to legality.

The Debate...

One of the most direct questions towards this proposal came from one of the most established senior IGBA members who also sits at the Council table:

“Why are we doing this when we already have a Council?” Isn’t it better to be in the GFCCI to change things rather than create a second governing body??

This question triggered a barrage of comments and responses from various attendees. A range of opinions were expressed, but one important claim made by staunch supporters of the IGBA motion was that the GFCCI is anti-democratic.

At this point, the debate became particularly intense. Several individuals claimed that they had previously attempted to join the Council but had been prevented from doing so. Others voiced concerns that the Council had dismissed the concept of “other coloured Glosters”, allegedly referring to them as “mongrels,” and had refused to consider recognising extra colour birds as a another class.

Response from the GFCCI

In defence of the GFCCI, the International Secretary addressed the meeting regarding the way the IGBA Secretary had responded to correspondence from the Arab Union of Ornithology, an organisation representing seven countries. The GFCCI deemed the answer as damaging and poisonous.

In that response, the IGBA Secretary had referred to the GFCCI as a “self-elected council”, a very unprofessional answer that revealed that the IGBA’s intentions. This description was strongly challenged, as it was felt that such wording was damaging not only to the Council but also to the wider reputation of the Gloster Fancy internationally.

What was surprising was that officials of the International Gloster Breeders Association (IGBA), who had themselves been nominated to represent a club at the council table, claimed that the GFCCI had no right to nominate an individual without first notifying the nominee. This misinformation comes from the lack of proper ruling and reference towards the Constitution. Since the

GFCCI’s constitution has been recently updated, there is no rule stating that a nominee must accept a position before a nomination is made, nor thus he needs to be notified. However, as the law states, that individual has the right to refuse the nomination and this was made clear during the GFCCI EGM.

Comments like “Self elected GFCCI Council” and irregular nominations have now raised serious questions about how the proposed 2nd governing body would be formed. Now that the existing Council was being criticised for alleged lack of democracy, clarity is now needed regarding how the IGBA intend to appoint members to this new supposedly governing body, without being part of the IGBA.

An Unclear Way Forward for the Proposed Structure

As discussion continued, the proposed structure of the new governing body became increasingly questionable following suggestions about forming a sub-committee that would report to another sub-committee, which would then report to the IGBA committee.

For some in attendance, this seemed unnecessarily complex. Rather than providing a straightforward governance model for the Gloster Fancy, the proposal appeared to introduce multiple layers of administration, which finally end up being 100% IGBA manipulated.

Some others commented that it began to feel more like running a miniature House of Commons

rather than establishing a simple and effective independent governing body for the breed.

A Sad Day for the Fancy

In the end, the motion passed. For many who attended — particularly those who believe strongly in the role of the GFCCI as the true governing body — the decision was deeply disappointing.

There is genuine concern that this development will create division within the Gloster Fancy even through IGBA members, a community that has historically thrived on cooperation, shared passion, and mutual respect among breeders and exhibitors.



Mario Zahra
GFCCI Int. Secretary

Serious questions towards the end were left unanswered, the most important being:

“How can a club form a technical, independent and democratic governing body without appointing its own people?”

Only time will tell what the long-term consequences of this decision will be. What is certain, however, is that the events of the 22nd of March 2026 will be remembered as a significant and controversial moment in the history of the Gloster Fancy.

Another notable observation was the ten people present that voted against the motion, all being valid and experienced people. In addition to these votes, several letters were submitted from individuals and societies who were unable to attend but wished to formally express their disapproval of the motion. These written statements made it clear that concern about the proposal extended beyond those physically present at the meeting.



• Keeping •
• Breeding •
• Showing & Loving •
our
Peigree Livestock
since 1987

this is our way of life