

have to be eliminated from the food consumed; and when in confinement they do not get an occasional bit that is often obtained without your knowing it when at liberty. The materials are present only in very small quantities in grain, etc. Hence the necessity of supplying it more freely in a form easily assimilated, and in quantities governed by the extra need of the stock under winter quarters.

This business of eggs and chickens that so many croakers say is "no good" will not be over done this season, Mr. Editor. If my business would allow me I could raise twice as many birds and sell them all, and I am only one in the great progressive army. And as for eggs for market, I cannot begin to supply all I am asked for. There is room yet, brethren, all: fanciers, market poulterers, egg merchants, all, all, there is a vacancy for you. Come and help the industry on by united action and steady work.

A merry, happy, Christmas, to you and yours, Mr. Editor, and to the many readers of our jolly little REVIEW.

ABSURDITIES.

BY GRUMBLER.

Is it not absurd to fill the pages of a poultry journal with letters from Mr. A. or Mr. B. in which all there is of any interest to the reader is the statement that Mr. A. has hatched and raised three or four hundred chicks, without saying how many eggs were used? Mr. A. does not tell us that in order to get so many chicks he had used anywhere from six hundred to a thousand eggs, but he does not forget to tell us that on account of his well known (?) ability as a breeder the natural consequence of all exhibition chicks is the result; no culls, no poor birds, all good shape, good color, good combs. In fact all perfect birds that will score 100 points; and then it is signed with the name and address (in small caps),

so that all may know just where to get eggs that will hatch such chicks, or where to buy birds whose ancestors for several generations having been so fine must produce progeny equally good or superior.

Another writer, who also signs his name and gives his address, tells us how he feeds, gives us a lesson in cleanliness, tells us if we want our poultry to thrive and be superior birds that their quarters must be clean; that no half-way measures will do; that to clean up once a week is not sufficient; that the quarters must be swept and dusted every day; that each pen must be opened to the pure (frozen) air daily; that the attendant—who must be the proprietor—must be up in the morning early enough to have breakfast of boiled potatoes or meat scraps thickened with shorts, bran, or ground grain of some kind, piping hot, ready for the chicks as soon as they can see to eat. Of this they must be furnished, not enough to satisfy their hunger, but sufficient to partly fill their crops. The attendant is then allowed to feed himself, taking barely time to eat his breakfast. Then he must prepare chaff, with a little grain scattered through it, to make them scratch to give them exercise. A short rest for the attendant is now in order; then another feeding, with another rest for the attendant, in which he may run to the post-office, look at the paper for a few minutes, cut a little wood or make preparations for the chickens' breakfast, until nearly night, when another feeding of good sound grain, and as much as they will eat is in order. It is almost as much of a wonder when Mr. B. got time to write as for whose benefit he is writing.

Would not the above programme be a great inducement for the man who was not in the poultry business to engage in it at once? Would it not be the means of encouraging men to buy fancy fowls or eggs in order to become a fancier? According to Mr. B., there

is so little of confinement, so little time taken from business that the satisfaction of having beautiful fowls would not pay for the time and trouble required to care for them, to say nothing of first cost of birds, houses, etc.

It has been said that "any fool can find fault, but it requires a wise man to suggest cures." Now, as a paying subscriber to the REVIEW, I claim the right to point out wherein the paper is not satisfactory, and in the event of the objection not being removed, to then refuse longer to remain a paying subscriber.

It is, I think, an acknowledged fact that to be a good advertising medium a paper must have a good circulation among the class who would likely be customers of the advertisers; and in order to get this large circulation the paper must please the subscribers.

Now, by refusing to publish letters in which the writer puffs his stock, the Editor will not allow that portion of the paper for which the subscriber pays to be used for advertising. If a writer, in giving the result of hatching, will tell us the dates on which each nest was set or incubator filled, the number of eggs used, the number of chicks hatched, the number of infertile eggs, number of chicks dead in the shell, giving his opinion of the probable cause without telling anything of the value of stock raised and giving his report for the full season, he would give others information with which they could compare the results of their own season's work, and which would be of interest to all.

It is hardly fair to subscribers and advertisers who pay for their advertisement in the advertising columns, but who may fancy themselves not competent to "write for the papers," or have not sufficient "cheek" to prepare an advertisement for the reading columns, to allow others to use gratis space worth five or six times as much as the same space would be in the advertising pages. I have not seen a poultry journal that is not guilty. Why