

change from the old style of judging to the new at a jump.

Speaking of Mr. Jarvis; I have only heard him spoken of as one of the most upright straightforward poultrymen in Canada, and with regard to his judging and that of Mr. Stevens being so dissimilar I think it quite easy to understand, as the ideal type of bird is scarcely the same with any two men. Here comes in the proper application of the Standard, which experience alone teaches, and though the Standard lays down a given number of points for say symmetry and station, it does not put it in such a way that a man who knows nothing about judging can score properly. Hence the added necessity of experience. I have the written assurance of an officer of the S. & S. Association, that Mr. Stevens left behind him the impression of a good sound judge, painstaking to a degree seldom to be found, courteous and gentlemanly, but not approachable on the *silvery* side. (By the way, I wonder who it was of the exhibitors on whom he sat, metaphorically speaking, so heavily?) The very fact that (as asserted) he said the class of birds were better than expected, would tend to show that he used extra care in judging, and as a consequence would aim to leave himself and his judgment less open to criticism.

Again a friend of mine, an exhibitor there, writes me that he would prefer a score card on Games from S. Butterfield to that of Mr. Stevens, which simply proves my previous assertions that our breeders are running to too much *still*,—aiming at the English type of bird. Mr. B. being an Englishman, naturally has his ideal in that type of bird, while Mr. Stevens takes the American type as his ideal. (Memo.—We breed by *American Standard*, our prize lists, not excepting that of the O. P. A., I think, state that said Standard shall be the guide of judges). Methinks I hear a bird repeat, "why in thunder don't you take your birds to the other side if you want them judged by Yankee's?"

My answer is that "we don't have to" while we have associations with sufficient enterprise to bring imported judges here, who know none of the exhibitors, such as Toronto, Bowmanville, Stratford and Ottawa, where the breeder who has the birds can win without being in the light so to speak. I know for a fact that some of the men who are howling now, have expressed very different opinions not long since.

Now I have not the slightest doubt that there are many exhibitors who have suffered as much as Mr. J. C. McKay, but have taken it in silence, for fear of being crushed; and I think Mr. McKay is entitled to credit for being, to say the least of it, outspoken and manly in his way of doing.

R. H. TRIMBLE.

Napanee, April, 25th, '86.

Editor Review:

I have been much surprised to notice the controversy going on in the columns of your esteemed journal regarding the scoring by Mr. Jarvis and other Canadian judges at the recent Canadian shows.

In most of these communications the disappointed exhibitor plainly crops up, and in such cases the vials of their wrath are poured out on the devoted heads of the judges, who have been doing their best in an honest and straightforward way to perform their duties in an impartial manner.

Comparisons have been made between the judging and scoring of Mr. Jarvis and that of Mr. I. K. Felch: comparisons by no means complimentary to the former gentleman. Now I have been acquainted with Mr. Felch for many years past, and he has no doubt judged more of my birds than any other judge on this continent, both at American and Canadian shows, and my opinion of Mr. Felch is that he has no living equal as a judge, and if he does not know how to apply the American Standard of Excellence and the scoring system, why it is useless to

go any further to find any one who can. Now, so far, Mr. Felch has acted as judge at one show in Canada this season; and I must say in justice to Mr. Jarvis, that it was a pretty severe test of his capabilities as a judge, to apply the Standard and scoring system after such a master hand as Felch. Yet, to my mind, the result has proved Mr. Jarvis to be a thoroughly competent judge, and one who has thoroughly mastered the scoring system and knows how to apply it. It is true I think, that our Canadian judges have one fault; they err perhaps a little on the righteous side, and score too high, in fact, generously give the exhibit "the benefit of the doubt," but this is a righteous fault and will disappear with experience.

As I understand the controversy, the malcontents find fault with Mr. Jarvis because he did not score birds the *exact figure* scored by Mr. Felch at Toronto. I fancy I can see "Uncle Ike" smile when he reads their complaints on this score. Why what will they say when I tell them that I have had Felch score my exhibit of Rocks for me at one show, and at another show score same birds entirely different, some higher and some lower, and yet he knew all the time they were the same birds, in fact told me so, noting such and such a bird is in better condition than he was at the last show, or such and such a one has lost three or four points since I last scored him, etc., etc.

Now, sir, the whole matter is in a nut shell, hardly any two birds are in same show condition at any two shows. As an example, a bird in prime condition and perfect health at his first show would not be cut for either symmetry or condition, while at his second, being dumpish, sick or out of condition would lose points and be cut on both; or might have lost sickle feathers or wing flights, comb gone over, or pale and flabby, and a hundred and one other things. But because Felch scored mine at 95 for sooth, the next judge is an in-