

ist before the existence of the laws. But it may be asked, cannot any irregularities be practised under this system without the judges suffering exposure? Yes, they can. I cannot say just where and how, but I know no perfect system has originated in the mind of man, and I should be amazed to find that this was the first; but on the other hand a judge's uprightness and ability are made more apparent, to which no man can object.

I have heard it stated by several, who were eye-witnesses of what they stated, that some American judges in scoring birds first select the prize birds and afterwards score them, and when this score did not come high enough to confirm the first decision they changed the score card till it did. Now, sir, is it not evident that scoring was not used in this case as a means by which the true merits of the specimens was ascertained, but only a test of the old "collective" plan? But if this had been all the inconsistency it would not have been so glaring, but when the test did not bring the same result (and no doubt it brought the true one) as the jump-to-conclusion-plan, it must be re-tested or proved, and the true findings of the test wrested to level up the discrepancy. In the first place the method was not used in its legitimate way; in the second place, even when used in a wrong way it exposed fraud.

Again, suppose the bird is scored differently by different judges at different times, and they differ in their scorings, I cannot see how this proves the inefficiency of the system. The judge, let him use what method he may, has to be guided by what he has before him, and not by what he has known the bird to be, so that if the bird has fallen off in condition, &c., the exhibitor ought to be the loser, and the bird should be scored lower by just what he don't possess. Or if two judges score the same bird with different results at the same time, this is no argument against the system. It only shows that the best rules are not absolutely faultless in their results, because man who applies them is not perfect in knowledge.

But, sir, it seems to me we come to the most difficult part of the problem when we come to the question: Is it practicable? I argue that if it is not used in the legitimate way it is perfectly useless. We find our American friends using it subject to modification, and our own judges, who have seen it thus used pronounced it a failure, and I have no doubts but it was used that way. We can't have all the birds scored and pay prize money, and it is thought that score-cards and diplomas would not bring out our best birds. Well, I may say for one, it would bring out mine. It has been suggested that the prize birds be scored, and let all others pay, say 50c each, if they desire their specimens scored; but if the prize birds are

to be selected first and awarded their position and then scored, I can't see how this will amount to much. Of course a first may be made to take second, etc., but how about birds which may at first be thought worthy of a place of honor and afterwards get nothing? I can understand how a judge can, by looking over the collection select those which are plainly prize winners, and by scoring the lot select the very best and throw out the rest, but in this way, where there is strong competition, he must score a few which will not be prize winners. Of course these can be subjected to a fee of 50cts each.

Now, I have tried to lay the subject before the fancy as it appears to me, and I hope we shall have a full and thorough discussion of the subject. I may say I have nothing to say personally against our own local judges, nor their judging, but I should be glad to see them adopt what to me and to many others appears a better system of judging; one that would, I am confident, give better satisfaction to the public, and be more satisfactory to themselves, after they got used to it. I have never had a doubt but we have plenty of men who can apply the *Standard* in this systematic way, as well as by the old collective method. I may say I for one will gladly pay 50 cents each to have birds scored, especially when I cannot see where the difference is which puts my bird in the shade with nothing. I may be wrong in believing that my bird ought to have had a prize,—most likely would be—but it would be a great satisfaction to be shown just where the deficiency was, and I should be armed for next year's breeding. Of course if the majority think the old way the better I shall be satisfied to remain as we are, and shall continue to try to keep up our shows by putting my very best foot foremost.

Yours sincerely,

STANLEY SPILLET.

Lefroy, Feb. 5th, 1834.

### Scoring.

Editor Review.

Perhaps it would be out of place for me to say anything on the subject of scoring, after Mr. Spillet's very able letters advocating the adoption of this system of judging. It would simply be waste of time for me to recapitulate the many reasons advanced by Mr. S. in favor of its adoption; suffice it that I heartily endorse his views, and I know that many other fanciers do as well; in fact nearly all that I have conversed with on the subject are strongly in favor of scoring, and as strongly opposed to our present system of judging. In fact I know of some who are so dissatisfied with the present system that they say they will not exhibit another bird until scoring is adopted.