

competent noodle because he does not score them point for point the same, why the whole thing is absurd, and in airing their supposed grievances these gentlemen are only exposing their ignorance.

Having bred Plymouth Rocks especially for ten years past and attended the best exhibitions in the United States and Canada, and studied the scoring of the best American judges I think I ought to be pretty competent to score my own birds right by this time, and when a customer wants a very high-scoring bird I generally guarantee the score, for instance, I say, "Felch would score such and such a bird at 95 points." Now I will give a few instances where the scores so guaranteed by me were the actual scores of Messrs. Jarvis and Buck, and yet we are told these gentlemen were not capable of applying the Standard at Guelph 1885. I sold a cockerel to score 95 and he won first at score of 95. At several other shows same season, birds I sold won at precisely my guaranteed scores.

Again this season I sold a cockerel, I guaranteed a score of 97, and he won at Owen Sound at 97½, and again at Guelph at 96½, he was sick at latter show, which only goes to prove my argument.

Now these scores seem high, but this cockerel would have won with that score at Madison Square, N. Y., or any other American show, being as near perfection as any bird ever can hope to be as all can testify who saw him, and I would bet my pile on the 97 score by Felch or other American judges, as he left my hands or was shown at Owen Sound. I merely give these instances of the scoring of Messrs. Buck and Jarvis to prove that these gentlemen, who have been much abused, are quite capable of applying the Standard and scoring system.

I am, etc., etc.,

W. F. JAMES.

Sherbrooke, P.Q., April 12th, 1886.

Editor Review:

Allow me a few notes upon the subject of scoring as discussed at London.

First, the contest has not been and is not as these speeches would lead your readers to infer, American *versus* Canadian Judges, but is "scoring *versus* non scoring," and American judges have not generally been recommended because they were better than our own, but because our own refused to accept scoring, as Toronto show in '84 and Guelph in '85 testifies. Let me except Mr. Jarvis, who, I am glad to learn, is giving satisfaction as a scorer, a proof that he accepts the system.

The American judges were recommended to demonstrate that scoring was practicable because it had been apparently demonstrated at Guelph in 1885 that it was impracticable, and so what course was left to those who believed in scoring but to try to get some one to demonstrate that it was usable. I am glad to find friend Bogue speaking of scoring as an accomplished fact, for from his position in the fancy he can wield a strong influence in its favor, and from the strong stand he has heretofore taken against scoring, his acceptance of it is all the more satisfactory to the scorers. I repeat what I stated some time ago, with this improved method accepted all around us we might as well try to oppose our mortality as to oppose the acceptance of this improvement. But, sir, I must take issue with him upon one statement, that is, that every show judged in Canada by American judges were failures. Now, sir, I had extensive correspondence with exhibitors at Toronto, both before and after that show, and they all invariably pronounced it a success and declared themselves as delighted. I had also correspondence with some of the officials of that show and they have invariably spoken of it as an unqualified success. Again, not one exhibitor has come out in REVIEW with a complaint.

Again, of all comparisons given in REVIEWS between Mr. Felch's scoring and Mr. Jarvis', has it not been shown that Mr. J. sustained Mr. F.'s score? Yet with all deference to Mr. Jarvis if in a few cases he has differed a little from Mr. F. when the circumstances of the case did not justify it, I cannot see why we have the right to conclude that in every case Mr. J. was right and Mr. F. wrong. Should Americans be any less apt to become expert at any art than Canadians? They, the Americans, originated the art of scoring, and we must have accepted it from them in some shape, and Mr. Felch is one of these to whom is due the making of this art practicable.

The opposition which our judges, or rather the majority of our judges, have given to scoring don't seem to indicate the possession of such wonderful ability to detect the worth or value of the system, as they have apparently exhibited in its application. But, sir, it is not fair play to compare Toronto with Guelph. At Guelph only the winning birds were scored, (after being selected by the old system), for the purpose, I presume, of showing why they were selected as winners, but the unfortunate birds were not scored to show why they were not winners, and as the successful exhibitors are not likely to complain, surely the judge is assuming the minimum of responsibility by scoring only the winners.

STANLEY SPILLET.

Nantye, April 14th, 1886.

Editor Review:

I desire to place before your readers a few thoughts that have been suggested through recent articles in your pages, as well as observations at our winter shows. I do not wish to be understood as dictating to our veterans, I myself being only an amateur. However, any hints I may throw out, I trust will be received in the spirit in