

public not led to believe that such will be the case? I believe it is more important that the losing birds be scored than the winners. It is a generally recognized and oft repeated fact that our shows offer an opportunity to beginners and others to improve their knowledge by comparing their birds with others. But, sir, as the thing has been, and is, and will be if only the winning birds are scored, it affords a very imperfect source of education. Suppose an exhibitor does compare his bird with the winner as he walks backwards and forwards between the coops, if he succeeds in getting at the mind of the judge in the matter he will indeed be very fortunate; but on the other hand, suppose he hold the score-card of his bird in his hand, notes imperfect comb marked, he then compares with some chance of learning something.

Of course it may be objected, "It will cost more." I cannot see why, only the cost of the cards. I cannot see why birds cannot be judged more quickly by this means than by any other. And to make up for this extra expense, more birds will be shown. I, for one, will double the number of my exhibits if I can carry home with me this means of comparing my birds among themselves, and thus educating myself.

I can see that it leaves a judge more open to successful criticism. But why should he object to this if he has judged honestly, and not too wisely? Why should he not learn to do better; and how better than by having his attention directed right to the point of error?

Again, in support of the scoring system. It has been adopted by all our schools and colleges in their examination. So many marks are allowed for each question, and the examiner must use his judgement in determining how many of these have been earned in each case by the applicant or student. But it may be objected that this is comparatively an easy matter to decide. Not by any means. There may be a great deal of truth mixed with a certain amount of error in many of the answers, and the examiner must mark accordingly. In solving a question the student may reason absolutely correct, but may err in his application of these reasonings, or in the simple work of carrying them out. And this scoring or marking has been found the most complete and satisfactory means of getting at the truth. Of course we often hear of the examination from the same papers or questions being more severe in some places than others, simply because some examiners cut more severely than others. So with scoring birds; we hear of some judges being harder cutters than others.

And why should the exhibitors of disqualified birds not be informed upon what grounds their exhibit was thrown out? They help to pay the judges, and they should have the benefit of his

knowledge. And if the judge is not paid he ought to be; then he is a responsible party, and under obligations to his employers to do their work, and to do it well, and to give an account of it. What would be thought of a public officer who was not held responsible to public opinion, or an office in which there was no means of examining into the minutest details of the work connected with it?

In conclusion, I hold that systems, political or otherwise, cannot continue to exist as successful institutions without the means of minute, complete and full report of their proceedings. Examine the condition of Russia and other absolute systems. But, says one, the comparison is exaggerated. Not at all. The only difference is that in the case of Russia no explanation or report will be given, and in the case of our shows no provision is made whereby a report can be given—and the score-card supplies this need.

But do our judges need such checks? That is not the question. Every honest man who works for the public must hail with delight every means by which his honesty and integrity is made apparent to his employers.

I am, yours fraternally,

STANLEY SPILLETT.

Lefroy, Nov. 20th, 1893.

The New Standard on Plymouth Rocks.

BY W. F. JAMES.

(Continued)

The reduction in weight was perhaps one of the most beneficial changes made by the A. P. A. in the standard for this breed. Many protests had been made from time to time through the different poultry journals and by some of the most noted breeders, against the old *Standard* weight as excessive. It was claimed, and justly, too, that in order to raise birds to the standard weight for the winter shows chicks had to be hatched in March, and even in February, almost mid-winter in our climate, and those hatched latter had to undergo an amount of pampering and stuffing to bring them up to standard weight, which renders them useless for breeding purposes, and was the cause of much disease and of unfertility in eggs. A strong fight was made in the committee by some of the largest breeders from the Western and Southern states, who are favored with a more genial climate, but common sense carried the day, and the champion of the movement, (as also in the Light Brahma class) Mr. I. K. Felch, of Nantick, Mass., deserves the thanks of all breeders for his earnest advocacy of the cause. It was, I believe, his wish to reduce one pound all round; but finally a compromise was made, and weight was reduced $\frac{1}{2}$ pound all round. I write from memory, but