

were not they could have tried the very simple experiment. As a boy I used to try this method, believing in it with unquestioning boyish faith, and used to set rounded eggs almost altogether. Yet in the fall, much to my astonishment, the usual 50 per cent. of male birds would appear, to shock my faith and strain my credulity; but when Spring came again the same experiment would be tried, and with about the same results, until it dawned upon my young mind that perhaps the method was not a valid one. I have no doubt that success has occasionally attended the selection of such eggs, that the rounded ones have produced pullets and the pointed ones cockerels, for there are many strange coincidences in this world; and I have as little doubt that success would attend sometimes, the rule reversed, the pointed eggs hatching pullets and the rounded ones cockerels. Coincidences are not proofs, and one experiment does not establish a rule, no more than one swallow makes a summer.

Another method, as groundless as the shape of the egg, which at one time was "banked upon" with confidence, was the position of the air chamber. If at the end of the egg one sex would be produced, if at the side the other sex would hatch, and if just a little out of true it was doubtful what the sex would be. But, like the old lady's infallible rule for telling indigo—"Put it into water and it will sink or swim, I've forgotten which,"—I do not recollect whether eggs with the air chamber at the end hatched pullets and those with it at one side cockerels, or the reverse. But it really does not matter, for just as good results can be obtained from the method stated one way as can from it stated the other way. The chances of success are the same whichever way the method is stated. There is nothing in favor of the method save the doctrine of chances, and it may now and then happen to come as the method states it, with very many more chances of failing to do so. No intelligent poultryman now selects his eggs according to the position of the air chamber in the egg.

About four years ago a certain manufacturer of caponizing instruments and author of one or more treatises relating to caponizing, claimed to have discovered a method by which the sex of eggs could be controlled. Indeed, he cited, in corroboration of his theory, the case of a St. Louis party, who had succeeded in rearing one lot of 300 pullets without a male and another lot of 40 cockerels without a female among them. Such perfect control of the sexes as that is what the world of poultry-keepers has been waiting for through all the centuries since the wild gallus was first brought under domestication. And the method was simple enough. Buy a set of caponizing instruments and remove

the right testicle and all the eggs will hatch pullets, or remove the left testicle and only cockerels can be hatched. Could there be anything neater than that. But what a strange doctrine of the seminal fluid that introduces. If one adopts Wrissonn's theory of a germ plasm, which is transmitted from the earlier to the latest generations, it is difficult to see how the removal of one testicle can effect the character of the whole germ plasm, and thus undo the work of previous generations and upset the hopes of subsequent ones. Or if one adopts the Darwinian theory that the germs are secreted from the whole body by means of hypothetical gemmules, it is really difficult to understand why the removal of one male gland should change the sex of the fluid secreted from the whole body—at best it could do no more than to deprive it of the element that would make the removed organ, so that males might be produced with a single testicle. This theory also assumes that the female is absolutely impotent in controlling sex, that sex is determined by the male alone, and the female simply nourishes the future creature without having power to influence it sexually. These objections will very naturally occur to any thinking person, but the most suspicious circumstance in the whole matter is that, desirable as the controlling of sex is, since the announcement of this method we have heard nothing more about it. If it were true there would doubtless be hundreds performing the operation and thus regulating at will the sex of their chickens. If it really were true, it would make a boom in caponizing instruments and books such as never before was known. I do not even suggest that there is any connection between such a boom and the announcement of the theory by a manufacturer of caponizing instruments and maker of books on the operation. I give the discoverer of the method full credit for his alleged discovery, and only wish that reason and fact would permit it to be true. I think it absolutely valueless, but my thinking will not demonstrate its value or the lack of any value. It is a method that any person can try, and if success results he has reason to be thankful and ought to publish the results.

#### THE NEWLY-HATCHED CHICKEN.

BY W. HAY, CORRIE, ARRAN, SCOTLAND.

**R**EMOVAL TO COOPS—When the hatch is completed the hen should be dusted with insect-destroying powder, and then removed with the chickens to a coop, which should be placed in a sunny spot sheltered from the cold winds.

**COOP**—The coops we use are roomy, with a sliding win-