

## Judging by Scoring.

### Editor Review.

That the beginner shall be able fully to understand what may be said for and against judging by scoring, and that he may form a just estimate of each system as presented by the friends of both, he must have a copy of the *American Standard of Excellence*. The distinctive feature, and I think the only one, in the new method is the recording of the decisions of the judge in detail, as head, comb, etc., thus determining the absolute merit of the bird as compared with what is necessarily agreed by all fanciers to be perfection—the Standard—instead of the comparative merits of the bird as compared with the other birds on exhibition. Now nothing is plainer than that both methods approach very nearly to meeting here. Under the old system the judge must come to some decision, if it be only that it is the best head in the exhibition; still he can just as well decide something definite: excellent, good, fair, bad, very bad, for instance, and I have no doubts but he does. Now then, here comes the only difference, the judge simply records his judgement by allowing as nearly—say five points—as the degree of perfection justifies.

Some of the advantages claimed for the new system, are: 1st, That by thus pointing out to each exhibitor just where his birds are wanting he is enabled to give more general satisfaction, and save himself from a great deal of annoyance afterwards in answering questions and pointing out imperfections.

2nd. The exhibition becomes what it should be, an educative medium. The score-card points out distinctly where the lesson has been badly prepared. What would be thought of a teacher who, at the end of a quarterly examination, was not in a position, or did not choose, to inform his pupil just in what subject he displayed the weakness which occasioned his failure?

3rd. To use the language of I. K. Felch: "It exposes either incompetency or fraud." I am aware that some regard this claim to be a direct impeachment of the honor or ability of our judges. As well might every public officer in Ontario or in the world be insulted at the reports and checks that hedges about his official responsibilities. Instead of this every public officer hails with pleasure every means by which his honor is established and maintained.

4th. It enormously increases the number of exhibits, and makes the exhibition a financial success.

5th. It greatly increases the attendance of non-exhibitors when the score-cards are tacked on the

coops during the show as all would-be breeders rush in to learn.

6th. It shows the true value of every bird in the show, not disqualified, and shows why those are disqualified—for I still maintain that unless all are scored the system fails; that when used merely as a test for the decisions of the old system it is a farce, and it has proved so again and again in the United States, and not unlikely in England.

Now, to the beginner I would say, I do not advance these opinions as dogmas or unfallable truths, but ask every candid man to compare them with the *Standard* and common sense, and if they won't stand the test, come squarely out and say so, and why they don't.

### THE "NEW DEPARTURE."

Now, Mr. Editor, I should like to say a few words respecting the "new departure," which Mr. Doel advises shall be introduced into our shows. The first obstacle which seems to present itself to my mind, is who will be the judges of the amateurs? Evidently those "very young" fanciers have no confidence in the ability of our present staff of judges, still I have no doubt that they will accept them if "judging by scoring" is practised.

I have looked in vain in the REVIEW for anything that will bear the interpretation which Mr. Doel seems to put on something which has appeared in its columns respecting judging and judges. That our judges are strongly conservative, that they cling tenaciously to the old system with which they are best acquainted, I believe has been said, and that they have defended their system is a truth, but that either their honesty or ability has been impugned I do not find.

A number of fanciers—the majority of the fanciers in Canada—believe there is a better way of doing the work of judging than by the old way, and they have fairly compared the two methods—have pointed out what they consider the weak points in the old, and wherein the new is better—and have asked a fair discussion on the subject through the REVIEW with the friends of the old.

Now, Sir, for an example. Suppose a mechanic has worked in a certain way for years, and another comes along and says, "I can give you a method far better than the one you are used to," and proceeds to explain his way, showing wherein the old is weak and the new superior; even if his method is no better, or even worse, has he attacked the mechanic personally? Surely not. And how in the name of common sense the judges of Canada have any further grounds for complaint than this is a mystery. As I have taken a prominent part in these discussions, I may say if I have accused any judge in Canada, directly or indirectly, of incompetency or dishonesty I will take it back, for