

In the early part of the season I made up my mind that my best male bird must be impotent. I knew he was not a caçon, he was too amorous for that, and I also knew whence it came; but every attempt seemed to be a failure, and these attempts were made frequently enough—or I may say very frequently. Other persons, frequent visitors to my yards, noticed this and prophesied failure, but the eggs did better than was expected, from 80 to 40 per cent. proved fertile. As the season advanced improvement was apparent, till today (25th of May) 60 per cent. of good strong chicks is the result.

I have fed barley for years as well as this winter, but not exclusively, still from my own experience, and those of others, I have come to the conclusion that barley is not a good egg producer. In conversation with Mr. Hill, of Lefroy, upon this subject, he remarked that in the early part of the winter he had fed wheat, and his Leghorns did amazingly well, afterward he fed barley on account of its greater cheapness, when not an egg was forthcoming; wheat was again fed with the former satisfactory result. At the time of the above conversation, I was feeding a large per cent. of barley, both whole and chopped, and although my hens were doing very nicely, upon increasing the amount of wheat fed the yield of eggs was nearly double. For nearly three months I have fed 60 per cent. wheat, and I have never got so many eggs from the same number of hens; never but once in three months has my flock of nine hens gone lower than four eggs, and that after three of them was sitting. Eight, and even more, eggs per day for months is not bad for Light Brahmas, which will do nothing else but sit! For laying hens, wheat whole and chopped, and pease chopped with bran and shorts, or a part chopped barley cannot be improved upon, or wheat alone. I have also seen the very best results from pease alone, fed whole through the entire winter.

But if this failure to hatch arises from the eggs not being fertilized by the male is not attributable to the food, where are we to look for the cause?

In the first place we are to look for a cause co-extensive with this failure. In my opinion, not a little of this is due to an unfavorable condition of the system, consequent upon high feeding and want of exercise; the latter being the most prolific cause of trouble in this respect. The great length and severity of the winter, the depth of the snow, and the very liberal number of stormy days, all made it impossible for poultry to take much exercise. They were necessarily cooped up in a limited space during the whole winter. So we find just as soon as the snow disappeared, though the weather was not much milder, an im-

provement was apparent immediately, which continued as the health and strength of the birds improved.

On the other hand, I have noticed that winters in which there was not much snow, and most clear, sunny days, though cold, eggs have hatched most satisfactorily in the spring.

I simply give these ideas as the fruit of my experience and observation, and look for the ideas of others with the expectation of having to modify my own. I say modify, for I do not think it possible for a man to have so much error, either in his system of working or in his ideas, as to render it prudent for him to throw aside all his own and adopt that of another.

I am, yours fraternally,

STANLEY SPILLET.

Lefroy, May 25th, 1883.

Technical Terms Explained.

There are numbers of persons among fanciers of poultry who are ignorant of the terms which are applied to the different parts of the body of the fowl, and to such people a few words may be in season. I have seen cases over and over again in which a beginner has been puzzled by the descriptions in books and in newspapers, simply because he was not *au fait* with respectable technicalities; and it often happens that in corresponding with each other persons are misguided on account of the ignorance of one or both in such matters. Unless one is quite perfect, and can talk of the points of a fowl as easily as one would repeat the alphabet, it is useless to expect anybody to be possessed of a knowledge sufficient to enable him to compete with any success, much less distinction; and although words and descriptions do not make a bird, ignorance upon such matters illustrates a corresponding deficiency in more solid and enduring information.

To commence with the head points: The comb of a fowl is known to everyone, but how many are there that can describe with accuracy the difference between a rose comb, a pea comb, and a single comb. The latter is the common upright comb with a number of indentations or serrations, as the Spanish, the Dorking, the Leghorn, the Game, the Cochin, and others. The rose or double comb has a flat surface except for the numerous little sprigs of coral like points which cover it. It is square over the beak but narrows towards the back, where it runs into a fine long point, which is generally called the spike. The pea comb which is found in the Brahma and the Indian game, is a small tripple ridged comb resembling the flower of the pea in a certain stage of development. Personally, I think this term is unfortunate, as the resemblance is not very close; and the