

For the Poultry Weekly.

He Kept a Record.

AND FINDS IT FALL SHORT OF HIS ESTIMATE.

HAVING kept a daily record for the last six months of the eggs laid by my hens, I send you a statement of the gross number, as perhaps you may think it worth while taking notice of it in your Poultry Weekly and passing your opinion thereon.

Well then, I started, Dec. 15., 1888, with 36 hens, and with the exception of two or three, about the half of them were that year's pullets and the other half the previous year's. They were nearly all Plymouth Rocks, or an approach thereto. Three or four died during the year and seldom were there more than three or four clucking at the same time. During winter or I may say for six months of the year, there was always feed before them, such as wheat screenings, oats, etc., the rest of the year they got as much as they could eat once a day with plenty of outside range. They laid then for the year 259 dozen eggs. This falls far short of the lowest estimate a hen ought to lay, viz: 175 eggs for each hen, according to an estimate in your WEEKLY of May 22nd, under the heading of "What it costs to keep a hen"

I kept a similar record with 60 hens a number of years ago, and if I remember well, the result was about the same in proportion to the number of fowls. Yours truly,
Mountsberg, Ont. JOHN MACPHERSON.

We are glad to notice that you have kept account of the laying, but your record is hardly conclusive as to what the hens would do for a year. Half of them you say were pullets of the year you began your record so that all the time they (the pullets) lay idle the account tells against your hens. Say six of the hens died, to bring it to even numbers, that only gives you 103½ eggs each for the 30 hens. But (to be a little Irish) half of those hens were pullets and not in the flush of egg-production, and as they were sitters there was time lost over the hatching period, or, till "broken up" if not allowed to sit. So maybe, as they were not of any pure race, they did well considering all things.

We would like you to keep a record this next year, of the same flock which is now mature and in the best period for egg-production viz: yearlings and two-year hens. We think that you will find in this low record room for hope.

Putting the proceeds at only 15c. per

dozen for the 259 doz eggs you get \$38.85 independent of the chick raised—the eggs for the production of the latter would of course be deducted from the above amount and the value of the product of the eggs estimated in their place.

Our own record for last year for all breeds combined, mostly yearling hens and early pullets of Leghorns and Wyandottes was 206½, exceeding my neighbor's, Thos. Barrétt's, about four and a fraction. I have many Leghorns and Wyandottes, and his breeds are heavy ones, except a pen of Wyandottes, so he may be proud of his record. This year he has kept the account as usual and I will ask him for it for the WEEKLY when the year has expired. We feel sure as you are so much interested that it would pay you to procure thoroughbred birds of noted egg-producing breeds, i. e., if eggs are your prime object. The Rose or Single-comb Leghorns would be perhaps the best because they are non-sitting varieties. The pullets lay early and with good care they are capable of attaining a respectable size for the table, and as your range is good they would be under the very best conditions for the variety. But let us draw your attention to a frequent loss that attends large range, viz: the disposition of every hen to make a sly nest, and consequent loss of the eggs if not found soon enough.

For the Poultry Weekly.

Large and Small Breeds.

AND A BATCH OF INTERESTING QUERIES.

SINCE reading your article on the eating capacity of the large and small breeds, I have taken a good deal of notice on the subject, and I am going to differ with you.

I will grant that the Leghorn is quicker, and that out of a given quantity of grain (less than they require) a Leghorn would come out ahead. But give them all they will pick up, and though the Leghorn would be ahead at first, the Brahma would still be there when the Leghorn was taking his after dinner drink. Of course this is only natural if the Leghorn picks up two grains to the Brahma's one and though the assertion does not prove anything, I would back my Brahma in a pea-eating competition against your Leghorn, even though he didn't feel vey hungry. In support of my opinion I quote from a table before me, of an experiment on the subject tried in England. The daily