

plate (and the same description will also apply to the Aylesburys), coming straight down from the skull like that of a woodcock, and being both long and broad. The head is rich green, glossed with purple, which extends down the neck, round which is a collar, ring, or necklace of pure white; this must not *quite* encircle the neck, not quite meeting at the back, but must be clear and distinct so far as it goes. The breast is a rich deep claret brown, extending down well below the water line, and as free as possible from rings, or what is called by breeders 'chain armour.' There it passes into the delicate French grey of the under parts, which should extend to under the tail, any pure white under the tail being a great objection. The back is a rich-greenish black, the curls in the tail being a dark green. The wings are a greyish brown, with a 'ribbon-mark' across them, which must be a very bright and distinct blue, edged on both sides with white. The flights are grey and brown, white in a slight feather being highly objectionable. The legs are a rich orange. The whole appearance of the drake should be noble and commanding, and nothing can exceed the beauty of a moderately perfect bird.

"The bill of the duck is not quite so long as in the drake, and is of an orange color, with a splash of dark color, nearly black, upon it, say two-thirds down from the head, but not reaching the tip or sides; this color changes, however, during the laying season to a dirty brown, and sometimes they become almost black all over. The head is brown, with two distinct shaded lines on each side, running from the eye down to the darker part of the neck—this is very essential to perfection. The breast is brown, pencilled over with dark brown; the back pencilled with very dark brown, almost black, upon a brown ground. This pencilling must be very distinct. Judges differ sometimes as to the shade of brown which should form the groundwork, some preferring a light clay brown; but the most 'fashionable' tint is a dark brown, almost chocolate, provided the markings are distinct. The wing has a ribbon-mark, as in the drake, and the legs are like his, orange, but generally of a duller tinge."

Birds have wonderful appetites. It has been calculated that a redbreast requires daily an amount of food equal to an earthworm fourteen feet long. Assuming a sausage nine inches long to be a fair equivalent for man of the earthworm for the bird, Prof. Wood finds that a man would have to consume sixty-seven feet of such sausage in every twenty-four hours in order to eat as much in proportion to his bulk as the redbreast. Prof. Wood offers this as an illustration of the amount of work which is done by insect-eating birds.

### Judging by Scoring.

Editor Review,

With your permission I will return to this subject again, under the above heading. I think a general expression of opinion upon this subject is, at least, very desirable at this time. I do not mean an arbitrary cry for its adoption, but a calm, unbiased consideration of its merits and demerits.

It seems to me there are two heads under which this can advantageously be considered, viz: How is this system applied, and how is it practicable? In answer to the first I have no doubt but its true function is to assist in determining the true merits of the competing specimens, or a means by which the true merits of a bird are determined. That is, it is a means to an end, not a test of other means.

In support of this definition, I quote from *American Standard of Excellence*, new edition, page VI: "The American Poultry Association recommends that in the application of the *Standard* judges shall determine the merits of competing specimens by a careful examination of all the points named, commencing with 'symmetry,' and following the schedule in the order named in the table of values, and deducting such a per centum for defects as may be apparent from the full value of a perfect bird." Now, is this not judging by scoring, and not judging first and scoring afterwards, taking care that the scoring shall be made to agree with the less perfect system. This would reform with a vengeance.

Following the example of politicians I shall cite from any of the public statements made by those not in harmony with the scoring system of judging. I am sorry these are so few and fragmentary, for I cannot imagine any thing more really serviceable to a contemplated reform than to have met with all its apparent weaknesses and insufficiencies early in its existence, for if they don't kill it they must necessarily strengthen it. The friends and admirers of a new system are slow to notice its weak points, while those opposed see nothing else, hence better laws are made in the presence of a strong opposition than with even a weak one, especially if weak in ability. But to return to the matter in hand. It has been objected "that this system will not make judges honest." I do not think it will, if they are naturally dishonest. But I do think that being a succinct yet complete report it will make dishonesty and incapability more apparent—exposes the pair. An example to the point is, "vote by ballot, and the stringent election laws in connection with it." Nothing is plainer than that election trials, exposing frauds and corrupt practices, have increased apace; and yet have these laws created lawlessness? Hardly. They have simply exposed what did ex-