

just on that one thing, and on that alone—integrity of the judges.

Perhaps it may be considered discourteous to speak of judges as dishonest, or as lacking that strict honor and integrity which is necessary, or a man to possess to constitute him a really good judge, but we must look a question like this square in the face, and call things by their proper names; and if even all those who ever judged at shows were the most capable and the most honorable of men, that even hardly fills the bill. What the advocates of scoring claim is that being obliged to put their judgement down in figures gives less chance for dishonorable judgement, and is more satisfying to exhibitors, as they see how and where their birds are up to or are lacking in the standard. To young exhibitors this is a great satisfaction. He thinks, perhaps, his bird should have been first, whereas the judge has placed it second or third; he looks over his score-card and sees there for himself in what points he is up to, and perhaps better, and where behind the winning bird, and consequently receives an education this way which he cannot receive by the other system of judging, as by that method all he knows is that his bird has been awarded second or 3rd prize, or none at all as the case may be; but he does not know why, and consequently he still remains of the opinion he was defrauded, and that his bird should have been first.

The great objection to judging by scoring—and it is a very forcible one too—is that it occupies much more time than the other way, but I think this can to a great extent be remedied in this way: do not oblige a judge to score such birds as have no possibility of winning. For instance, suppose fifty birds are entered in one class, a good judge can walk along in front of the coops once or twice and pick out perhaps half of the birds entered, or say as many as thirty out of the fifty that have not the ghost of a chance of being placed on the prize-list. To force a judge to score all such birds as these (many of them, perhaps, that never should have been sent to the show at all,) is simply absurd, but to oblige him to score a reasonable percentage of the entries I think would be only just and reasonable.

For a judge to say that a certain bird in one lot of entries is the best and not be obliged to show why he is so is, to say the least of it, giving him a good deal of latitude, and judging by such a system will take a long time to educate amateurs up to a knowledge of the standard. Judging by the "rule of thumb," or without scoring, has its advantages; it consumes much less time, and if a judge is careful, competent, and thoroughly honest, can be done just as fairly as scoring every bird in

the entry. Whilst putting down a bird's points in figures is in theory correct, it does not follow that a judge finds his figures always satisfactory to himself. For instance, say one bird scores 95, another scores 94; the judge looks at the 94 point bird and knows himself that it is the better bird. There is almost always an indescribable something about one bird of two which are so closely matched that shows one of those birds to be superior to the other; you may call it symmetry, quality, or what you like, but it is something and it is something that can't, when it comes so close as this, always be put down in figures. Well, when the judge finds he has scored the poorer bird the higher he must do one of two things, either revise his score to suit his judgement or let his score stand as it is and award the prize contrary to his judgement. Now, when a case like this crops up a good judge could have judged these two birds just as well, and I think better too, without scoring.

I do not in this letter pretend to give my undivided preference for either system. Both have their advantages and disadvantages, some of which I have here set forth, but I think if the time objection can be removed—and I can't see why it cannot, to scoring—that would be for all parties the better system.

I am almost afraid the new system was not given a fair trial at Guelph; if the judges there did not like scoring and were not prepared to give it a just and fair trial, they had no business to accept the position to judge under the new rules. I claim it is not a satisfactory solution to the question that scoring is a failure simply because the judges there were unfavorable to the change, and, as thought by many, acted accordingly. If the Poultry Association of Ontario is to continue to be a success, this feeling which has taken possession of many of the exhibitors, the amateurs especially, that judges will favor their friends, must be rooted out and no matter what is necessary to be done to do it, it must be done, if not it will soon come down to a society of a very few members, and those all prize gabbers. Judges have no business to know whose birds are whose, they do not judge the owners, it is the birds they judge, or rather should do, and no man who acts as a judge and has any respect for his character, should think to enter a show, to even look at the birds, until his score book is ready for and handed to him, and then he should go straight on with his work. I am sorry to say that I think a good deal of the judging is done before it has commenced at all,—the readers of the REVIEW can understand what I mean by this expression.

I know well, from experience, that a judge's position is not always a very enviable one, but men