

ship don't demand a uniformity of feelings and sentiments. But after all, any man must see the necessity of criticising the actions of those who accept positions of responsibility. How are reforms to be secured if this is not tolerated and practised, and our judges, especially at this juncture, where the two systems are striving for the mastery, must expect it, and should accept it in the official capacity and not as individuals.

Can it be expected that the friends of the contemplated reform will be satisfied to accept the test at Guelph as final? Surely not, especially when it has been pronounced a success at nearly every other show in Canada. Well, what steps would any reader of the *Review* take if he had invested in a piece of machinery which did not seem to accomplish all that was claimed for it, though in the hands of his neighbors the same machine was giving unqualified satisfaction. Would he not proceed to examine his machine critically, and compare it with those of his neighbors, and if no difference could be detected, could he be blamed if he also examined a little carefully those who had the working of the machine? If he went so far as to enquire if all the manipulations necessary to the successful working of the machine had been attended to, or had there been carelessness, or could he be blamed if he made enquiries whether his agents could have any motive in making his machine a failure? And should that agent resent this close scrutiny? I think not.

Now there has been a failure at Guelph, while success has attended everywhere else. Now, what should be done? I say just what has been done. Examine the whole thing; and no judge should resent it, but rather court enquiry, and if all is right he will come out of the ordeal exalted. I offer these observations for what they are worth. This is just how the matter appears to me. If I am in error I shall be pleased to be put right.

But, before concluding, permit me to say, sir, as a constant and interested reader of a number of poultry magazines, I congratulate you on the success of your efforts in favor of the scoring system. I find that many in your position would have considered expedience before principles, and would have decided to be neutral, with the mistaken idea that it would be to their advantage from a dollar and cents point of view. Therefore, all credit is due to those who, notwithstanding the fact that they may for a time estrange some of their friends, take hold and work energetically on the side of right and progress. I feel that the fanciers of Canada are under deep obligations to the *Review* for the stand it has taken in this matter. Every man must feel, whether he is interested in this scoring question or not, that the *Review* can be de-

pended upon for a plain, honest, outspoken fairness in the interest of the fancy. Nothing has been hinted at by an indirect unuendo, but a spade has been called a spade, thus giving everyone a chance to reply if he had such knowledge as would controvert the charges made. Hoping that the *Review* may long live and flourish to encourage and probe the fancy,—the latter though a less pleasant task than the former, yet sometimes none the less salutary in its effect.

Yours sincerely,
STANLEY SPILLETT.

Nantye, Apr. 27th, 1885.

“Scoring” Again.

I have no desire to enter into a spirited discussion over the question. My disposition is to let all who are not in favor of scoring enjoy their opinions. They have just as much right to oppose it as I have to favor it. If the result obtained by the adoption of the *American Standard* and its application in the show room, as now almost universally established, does not present to them any progressive ideas, but appears to involve new difficulties, why should we ask them to think otherwise? Let them believe in judging by comparison if they like it better. Whenever it becomes necessary to present arguments in order to establish our premises, we should always have them seasoned with consistency, and keep in view the “golden rule.” Our opinions are based on circumstances. We either possess some element within that differs from that of our neighbors, or surrounding circumstances have exerted a different influence over us in all cases where our opinions are not concordant. We do not see alike. While we may be inclined to censure our neighbor for disagreement, each of us should remember that we, too, may be in error. I believe in scoring, but why should I complain of one who does not? “Let every man be fully persuaded in his own belief.” Discussing the subject in a friendly way is far better than (*dis*)cussing it in an unfriendly way. When we are a little warmed up by excitement we may make unguarded expressions, not fully in accord with our sober thoughts. In such a case we are more unfortunate than the object of our spite. If scoring is the text let us stick to it, waving all personal matters. If we attempt arguments let them aim squarely at the mark.

On page 94, April No. of *Review*, my old friend, Doel, says “Mr. Butterfield is not an avowed enemy of the *American Standard*, but he, with myself and many others, does not believe in scoring, as it is practically useless. You can take a first class bird and make him score twenty points less than a bird a fancier would not breed from, and no fault