

many illustrations of this in the experience of other breeders as well as in the case of old "Pilgrim," from which I have marked my own strain of Plymouth Rocks.

So long as you can keep on your side three-fourths of the blood, or a like proportion, you are sure to perpetuate points and qualities, as in the working out of any other problem. For my part I go farther; I mate several yards, all of my own strain; next season I select a male from one of these yards and mate to females from the others, and *vice versa*. So I never go outside of my strain, but my matings are not related, and I am thus sure of the blood and of the points. No matter which strain you have, *stick to it*, or change it for a better; but as sure as you mix the blood and the strains—in other words make too violent a cross—just so sure you will court disaster and disappointment. I do not advocate too much in-breeding, although for one or even two seasons there is no harm in it—and I will illustrate this point further on and have the best and highest authority to back me up—but keeping to the same strain is not in-breeding. You might as well say that a Frenchman marrying a Frenchwoman was in-breeding or incest, supposing them to be both of the same race, Normans—or Bretons. Now as to the breeding once or even twice, I have a friend to whom I gave a pair of birds, brother and sister, and from this pair, both chicks, he bred some of the finest birds I ever saw, and even mated the progeny together again with like results.

Now, what does a practical experience like this teach us? (Mind I do not advocate in-breeding as violent as this; once may do no harm, but don't repeat it.) But this experience goes to show what may be done by keeping the strain together. I could quote many other experiences such as the above.

In my next article I will give some points on scoring and judging, and in next number will finish with some directions as to care and rearing of chicks, showing, &c. Before closing this article, however, I would like to say a few words as to the controversy which has been going on in the poultry press regarding the true meaning of the *Standard* term as applied to color barring of feathers. *Standard* reads, "Color: Body-color *greyish-white*, each feather regularly crossed with bars of blue-black, giving the effect of a *bluish-tinged* plumage, and this color should be the same shade all through the plumage." Now, it has been generally admitted that the expression, *blue-black* for bars was a mistake. Many assume that the metallic lustre seen on the black bar was what was intended by blue-black but the framers of the *Standard* say not. I have asked them to define blue-black as a color, but

they have failed to do so, so far, and it is generally admitted that greyish white crossed with bars of *slatey* blue would have been a better expression for the color of dark bars, and this is the interpretation of the *Standard* worked upon by the best judges of the day.

W. F. JAMES.

Sherbrooke, P. Q., Jan'y 4th, 1884.

Scoring.

There is nothing connected with showing and exhibiting our domestic animals that has given societies and committees of shows so much trouble as the judging. No one ever saw, and I suppose never will, all the competitors at a show perfectly satisfied with the judging. Sometimes, and very frequently too, exhibitors find fault without cause, but sometimes there is no doubt their complaints are justifiable. To get the judging at shows done honestly and correctly is not at all an easy matter. The members of a poultry society may agree to a man on their standard of excellence, but the appointment of judges to judge honestly and correctly according to that standard is something else.

There are two systems by which poultry may be judged. One is by the way this paper is headed—scoring by points,—and the other is by what is sometimes called the "rule of thumb." By the first method a bird receives so many figures for comb, so many for hackle, so many for color of feather, etc., etc., according to the standard established for the breed which the bird belongs to, and that bird which scores the highest number nearest perfection is the winning bird. The other system,—"rule of thumb," or judging without scoring of points by figures is simply done by the judge looking the birds over carefully and thoroughly, and handling them if necessary, selects which he considers is the best bird. There is much to be said both for and against both methods, and since the Guelph show it seems to me this is a very opportune time to discuss the question. I understand that this was the first show in Ontario which has been judged by scoring, which seems to have given general dissatisfaction—at least I should presume so from the fact that at the meeting of the society held there the system of judging by scoring was abolished by a large majority of those present.

I am not altogether an unqualified believer in judging by scoring. Were I an exhibitor at a show, and was asked how I preferred my birds judged, I think I should qualify my answer; it would be, "If you appoint an honest and competent judge, the 'rule of thumb' will suit me"; but if I have not implicit confidence in the judge, I want my birds scored. I think the whole question rests