

SCRAPS,

FROM REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE.

Editor Review:—

NOW that we are sending eggs to a new market, where they are sold more by weight than by count, let us then look around and secure those breeds that will meet this demand when they are properly cared for. This will lead to a raid on those breeds that many are so well pleased with, because they are good on the count. Now, let me say that I have watched this count business for many years, and what have I found? that the hen with a record of of 6½ or 7 to the lb. will beat the greatest number of Red Caps or saw combs at the end of the year, on the scales. Then, again, when you seek their eggs it is not on the top of the house or in fence corners, but in the coop you find them; and if you want a fowl for the table, you have one, and not a sparrow. Though out of place now, let me tell you that our old Brahma hen died on the 17th, aged 13 years and 8 months; she never wanted to sit but once, and her record went over 2,200.

T. HOOD.

(There is most emphatically no best breed. Each and every breed has its own particular sphere, eggs, flesh or beauty, or a combination of either one of the first two and the latter.

Nearly 14 years is a great age for a fowl to live to. How was she treated, housed, fed, etc.?—ED.]

Editor Review:—

The majority seem to say that advertising pays. Last year I did not sell enough to cover mine, and this year have sold only one cockerel at \$2.00, representing my total sales. I raised 104 chickens, hoping to get some results from 'printers' ink.' This

number, with my old hens, made a large flock to feed. I got discouraged when a dealer offered me 20c. each, and killed down to fifty, giving them all away. Poultry pays, there is no doubt of it. I would like something like this to appear in a paper to offset some of the items we see on the other side, of great gains.

I love hens or I would give the whole thing up in disgust. My wife advised me several times this fall to do so; but "with all their faults I love them still."

You see I contradict all this when I still send an "ad" showing how consistent I am.

Hoping I will be in good time for next issue, and wishing you the compliments of the season.

I am &c.,

W. S. ODELL.

Ottawa.

(Certainly we will be happy to show both sides of the question. Where does the fault lay? Is the variety offered for sale a popular one? Is the advertiser in a section of the country where sales can readily be made? Is the REVIEW at fault?—ED.)

Editor Review:—

My fowls have got a disease, they swell under the eyes and when you squeeze their nostrils a discharge comes like dirty water, it has a little smell but not so bad as roup. Only two old birds have got it, but the whole of my young ones, about 100 birds have had it all winter. I lost three. I have got about twenty cured. I put in their nostrils and around their eyes 1 oz. acetic acid; 3 drs. carbolic acid; 1 oz. sugar of lead; 1 oz. alum; 5 drs. glycerine mixed together, and tincture of iron and quinine. Since I commenced with this mixture I have lost none.

ROBT. YATES.

Wardsville, Ont.

Editor Review:—

Enclosed please find \$5 for one year's subscription for the following names I have sent, \$1 to renew my subscription which does not fall due until Feb., however I want you to send me I. K. Felch's book, and oblige.

Yours truly,

C. S. JACKSON.

International Bridge, Ont.

[From all points they come].

Editor Review:—

The REVIEW for this month came to hand to-day and I must say that like good wine it continues to improve with age. I am sure your readers are in for a treat in Mr. Babcock's papers judging by the enviable notoriety he holds as a poultry writer. Mr. Mortimer's writings also are always interesting and at the same time very practical.

"Black Wyandot's" notes on Leghorns suggest to me the thought that if fanciers would only stick to the varieties we have already got and not be everlastingly seeking after something new, it would be a good thing for the trade both financially and otherwise. Of course man will ever seek to improve but why not improve what we have already got and not boom a variety for a couple of years and then when it is really getting to be of some value drop it for some new fangled variety or other. I believe that this booming of new varieties does more injury to the fancy than is generally thought. As an example take the case of a beginner who reads some puff concerning a new variety and purchases a few of them. Now ten chances to one they will not breed true, then he becomes disgusted and gives up the fancy, and as new breeds are continually being made we must, as a consequence be continually losing fanciers.

Do you not think it would be well for poultry journals to discourage booming of new varieties? I suppose it is