

to exhibit at any show at which he may be appointed judge.

By inserting the above you will much oblige

Yours truly,

E. C. COLEMAN,

Sec'y H. P. and P. S. A.

Seaforth, May 11th, 1885.

SOMETHING WRONG SOMEWHERE.

Editor Review :

In your April number you publish a report of the Eastern Ontario Poultry and Pet Stock Association, signed, C. W. Martin, Sec pro tem.

The communication states, I the late secretary was dismissed for alleged irregularities at the late exhibition; what a pity it is that the wise-acres who compose the executive committee, did not say what the alleged irregularities consisted of.

As they have failed to do so, I will do it for them. Several days after the close of the show, a protest was entered against me, signed by four residents of Ottawa, P. G. Keys, A. G. Gilbert, A. Fisher and John Clay; the protest charges me with altering the score cards in order that my own birds might win; I exhibited in the Light Brahma class, and Keyes, Gilbert and Fisher were exhibitors also; the fourth man, Clay, was not an exhibitor of Brahmas, but took a hand in all the same. A committee meeting was held to investigate, at which I produced a letter from the Judge, C. H. Crosby, which would have convinced any reasonable people that my birds won the prizes honestly, but as there were two rows of Light Brahmas, and he omitted in his letter to state which row he was speaking of, they pooh-poohed Mr. Crosby's letter, and moved a resolution withholding all prizes claimed by me.

The prizes claimed by me were as follows:—1st on Light Brahma pullet score, 97 points, same bird winning silver medal for highest scoring Light Brahma female. I also won third on Light Brahma pullet; and a local

special prize of \$2 for L. B. cockerel score 93.

I sent my score cards to the judge, Mr. C. H. Crosby, asking him to state whether they were correct or not, if he recollected.

Those of your readers who have been much about show rooms will know that the chances are ten to one that the judge would not recollect what any particular bird scored a week or two after the show. Of course, he may recollect the 1st, 2nd or 3rd prize birds in any particular class, but he cannot recollect the 4th, 5th or 6th.

Now, it happened when judging the L. B. pullets he scored two 96 and another 96½; these were the three highest; when he adjusted the tie they scored 97, 96½ and 96. 96½ winning second place. Was owned by Mr. T. Hall, of Montreal, and 97 and 96 winning 1st and 3rd were mine. On account of this tie Mr. Crosby recollected them very distinctly; he also indicated their exact position on a diagram of the exhibition room, and endorsed the score cards, stating in most positive language that he *knew* them to be the correct score.

All this relates to the pullets, the only prizes I attach any value to. The only other prize claimed by me was the local special for cockerel, open to Ottawa only, and this among the rest I was also charged with having altered; I was unable to appeal to the judge in this case as it was neither 1st, 2nd or 3rd, and it would be absurd to expect that any judge could recollect what birds scored that only took a 4th or 5th place. As I was unable to prove that I had not altered this score card, they withheld the prize, notwithstanding the fact that they could prove nothing; the parties entering the protest were totally unable to substantiate the charges, but the committee decided nevertheless to deprive me of the prizes.

I have always understood that the judge was the person to award prizes, but it would appear that such is not the

case, with the E. O. P. & P. S. A. at any rate.

I care nothing for the prizes as far as their intrinsic value is concerned, but it is exceedingly shabby of the committee to act as they have done on the unsupported charges of three disappointed exhibitors.

As to the last clause in the report sent to the REVIEW, stating that the Association *unanimously* decided to dispense with my services, I simply say it is untrue, and this can be proven by several gentlemen, members of the Association.

Yours very truly,

T. A. WILLITS.

Ottawa.

"JUDGING AT GUELPH, 1886."

Editor Review :

April number of your valuable journal came to hand on the 31st March (that's what I call doing things up brown) and as usual, is running over with good things, not the least of same being the controversy anent scoring and judging at Guelph and Stratford.

Now I propose to answer in as friendly and gentlemanly a manner as possible, some of the arguments and pertinent inquiries therein contained.

As you and your readers are doubtless aware I have been, and am still, one of the most persistent "kickers" for the scoring system, the only proper way of applying the American Standard of Excellence by which we breed. With all due respect to the fathers of the fancy in the west, I will just say, that in my poor way of thinking, our judges (doubtless good men and true) have yet to learn the art of scoring. The argument that any man can the first time trying, score birds as well as men who do very little else during the winter season, have been doing so for years, and whose characters are above impeachment, strikes me as being very lame, on the principle that we learn to creep before we walk in any business, and it is not to be expected that one can