

out. Buyers cannot be too careful whom they deal with to avoid disappointment and delay, for a bad setting of eggs means the best of the season lost, while a pair of scrub or cull fowls are a disgrace to any poultry yard that is claimed to be run on first-class principles. As a general rule those breeding but few varieties, or even one, are more likely to have high-class birds of that kind than those breeding from fifteen to sixty kinds of land and water fowl, rabbits, dogs, ferrets, and every other kind of live stock they can raise or buy from different farm-yards all over the country.

WHITE LEGHORN.

Bowmanville, March 4th, 1884.

More About the Composition of an Egg Shell.

Editor Review,

Please give me room for a few words in support of my arguments in last issue of your journal on the composition of an egg shell. A correspondent, signing himself "Incognitus," who seems to fear to let his name be known, in the February number of your journal attempts to hold my article up to ridicule, and uses language that, I think, should not be used by one writer to another—unless, at any rate, the attacking party follows the example of the party he attacks, and gives his proper signature.

Let the readers of the Review read over the article I penned, and judge who is in fault. I did not say that egg shells were composed of phosphate of lime, but sure it is that both Mr. Spillett and "Incognitus" inferred that I did so.

Now, Mr. Spillett says that all the carbon is destroyed from the stone by action of the fire, and is no more carbonate of lime, but "lime." Well, this being so, why is it dosed out to fowls, if, as "Incognitus" says, the shells of eggs are ninety-five per cent. of carbonate of lime? "Incognitus" goes on to say that he was pleased with the way that Mr. Spillett refuted my article in December. Now, in the name of common sense, where did Mr. Spillett refute my article? Why nowhere; but verified my meaning. So has "Incognitus," but he has refuted Mr. Spillett point blank.

The authority I have on the subject is from Bousingault, from Miché, Liebig, and from Johnston, whose works I happen to have before me.

Now, by feeding carbonate of lime in the shape of crushed limestone (not burned) to fowl (that by consequence of enclosure and not having a chance to run about at large where they may select such bits as their taste and nature may desire) will very much aid the disposal of eggs. I have been keeping fowls for thirty years, and though having a lime-kiln on my place, I never yet saw

a fowl eat or peck at *raw lime*, neither have I seen the man who ever did so. Hens will peck at plaster, when they are confined to close quarters, for the sake of the sand (or silicate) that is in the mortar—not for the mortar. Just place each separate before the fowls and you have not long to wait for an evidence that I am right; especially give river sand, which is composed so much of small crushed shells. Had I not said *vice versa* "Incognitus" might have had room for his attack.

How many fanciers crush bones to give hens? I do myself, but not for the purpose of making egg-shells, but because there is always some flesh and fat about them, and the substance is hard and sharp, and affords the gizzard assistance in grinding the food, and there may be some composition in the phosphate that may be required for the sustenance of the fowls. Does not the male bird partake of the same rations as the hens, and who will say that they require lime to make shells?

I see you have made a typographical error: *transmitted* should have read *transmuted*. However it is quite evident that "Incognitus" does not see the difference.

I should like to say something in regard to scoring, but as your several correspondents have, to my view, pretty well covered the ground, it would be useless for me to repeat. I should like to see all birds that are entered duly scored, and such birds that attained say a score of 85 or 90 points be recognized as standard birds, and the date of the score, and the age of the bird be duly recorded by someone, say yourself, Mr. Editor, and receive a suitable fee for so doing. Then those wishing to buy or sell or advertise standard fowls could deal in such a manner that each would know exactly what was meant.

Yours truly,

R. A. BROWN.

Cherry Grove, March 10th, 1884.

Poultry on the Farm.

We have watched and read your articles with great interests, and while we can appreciate how to make large crops pay, it has been our lot for the last few years to content ourselves cultivating a few square rods devoted to small vegetables and rearing a small stock of poultry. The latter subject seems to have been ignored in your department, and through the apprehension that a series of articles on this branch would be profitable as well as interesting, I have brought the question before the readers:

The scarcity of eggs and poultry, and the consequent high prices the past season, suggest a screw loose somewhere, and it only remains for some of our "go ahead" farmers, their wives and