

my hen-house out for just six times every week. I don't find it half the job some might think it is. And as to my back yard, there is some dirt about it, it's true, but it is, nearly all found in a hole about three feet square and three feet deep. When that is nearly filled with refuse from the house, and occasionally a retired article of domestic use, such as I have enumerated, another hole is dug, the old one is leveled up, and everything is clean and sweet, but no more so than it ought to be.

× ROADS.

Strathroy, April 21st, 1884.

### I. K. Felch on Scoring.

Editor Review.

I take the liberty to send to you, for publication, a letter received from I. K. Felch, Esq., in answer to one written to him, in which he was requested to answer the following questions:—

(1.) Do you, as judge, score all the specimens in a class? (2.) Do you find scoring satisfactory to yourself, as judge, and to the public generally? (3.) Does it take more time to judge by scoring than by the old "look and say" method? And, I think, as 4th the question was asked: do you approve of owner's name being on coop at time of judging?

MR. SPILLET,

Your questions at hand. It is my custom to score the entire class; then each bird stands on its own merit, and shows its true comparative merit. It is a fact that in many cases the three first prizes go to birds that vary but a single fault. Open judgment often gives a bird first place that in scoring would not be placed at all, for the reason that it is perfect in surface merit, its outs being hidden. A real judge will resort to scoring when in doubt while judging in the old way. This being true, the very act stamps the open system as inferior to the system of judging by points. Stand and look at a lot of birds in a yard; one with an inferior comb may look, at a few feet off, the best specimen, when one more modest to the eye, by close inspection—by giving each section its credit for excellence—far surpasses the one pre-judged the best. Open judging is based on symmetry and personal appearance; Standard judging takes in the entire merit. Standard judging is safest and best, for the score-card protects the judge, and secures to the exhibitor full justice by a credit of each and every point of excellence his specimen possesses. I have seen two birds by score which showed five points difference go to a second show and the poorest one be placed first. By open judging the exhibitor is at the mercy of the personal prejudice of the judge, while with score judging all exhibitors are governed by the *Standard*. Therefore it is the fairest. It matters

not what I like or do as a breeder, by the *Standard* alone must I act as a judge. A breeder helped me at the Toledo exhibition, and on a breed of which at Worcester he was chairman of the committee that reported its standard. They asked him how I judged them. He said, "He did it to the letter of the law, but I would have let the *Standard* go to h—l!" Now, why did he say this? Simply because he had a few birds he liked very much that did not fit the *Standard*. This very incident shows just what open judging does; the judges do actually let the *Standard* go to h—l, and go it on their own prejudice or liking for a certain bird, and judges all birds to it—not all birds to a standard recognized by the majority of the breeders. In open judging, if the judge be a lover of Cochins, you will find him giving the preference to Cochin shape in all the breeds.

Yes, I find scoring satisfactory to myself, and to the public generally. If a man scores honestly he can safely trust the footing of his score-cards to designate the winners. In case of a tie, then give it to the bird that has the best personal appearance.

At Battleboro' the birds were brought into a room, scored, a record of the score taken, the score-card tacked upon the coop, and carried back in turn to the hall; the highest score received the prize, and I think general satisfaction given. It is the only impartial way, and there is no room for sensure.

Let the names be on the coops, for breeders show to advertise. By debarring them this privilege you rob them of half they exhibit for; those whose birds do not get judged to the last of the exhibition get no privilege compared to those whose birds are first judged. A judge whose honor is not above letting the name influence him has no business in a show room. As a judge I never take anything but the number. But when only the number is given a judge can easily know to whom they belong. If he is a good judge he can tell every strain the moment he sees them. With this knowledge you can see if he is inclined to be tricky. You only help him by *withholding* the name of the exhibitor. His score-card will show him honest or dishonest, for they must agree. If one comb be cut three, and one not as good cut only one, he has the alternative of pleading ignorance of his business, or rascality in his calling.

You cannot get along as fast as in the old way—and you make far less mistakes. This fact is the greatest argument in its favor. I could probably judge a show three times as quickly the old way, and to score them afterwards would result in many changes in the awards. To wit: I judged 1st to Plymouth Rock breeding pen at Montreal; the man winning demanded his score-card, so I scored the