

rule, and that the inferior article is absolutely driven out of the market by American factory cheese. Mr. Etches, the oldest Derbyshire factor, states, "for inferior cheese he really could not find a market with such competition from America." On this point Mr. Jackson observed, "Well might the late cheese-factor, Williams, exclaim of those that made bad cheese, 'what a pity they did not give the milk to the pigs! they would then have had sweet pork.' It would have been wise if we had done so last year with the milk from our seven cows; for although made by an experienced, anxious, careful, old servant, the cheese came back from Chester fair, no offer having been made for them. Some of the best I picked out and sent to Manchester, some our servants and workmen ate, some I gave them to take home for their wives and children; the rest the pigs would not eat, but the poultry amused me by being less dainty."

Great complaints are made of the difficulty of obtaining good dairymaids, of the toilsome, continuous drudgery, and the impossibility of getting as faithful, diligent service now out of work-people as formerly, when wages were lower. Dr. Voelcker advocated dispensing with dairymaids and substituting dairymen in their place, but another speaker had tried this with but poor success. Efficient men do not like to be so employed. There is a dislike to do woman's work; it puts a kind of stigma on those who are set at it. These and other difficulties point to the factory system for solution, and seem to indicate that something will ere long be done toward its adoption in England. But it is astonishing how slowly innovations make their way in the father-land.

The chairman of the club above referred to, in closing the discussion, remarked: "Gentlemen, we have been told this evening that we owe to the Americans the introduction of cheese factories. But we have also been told that the Americans have learnt from us the art of making good cheese. Well, they are cute fellows. We invented the reaping-machine, and they brought it out. With them, I suppose, 'necessity is the mother of invention.'" Endorsing what had been said about the desirableness of improvement in the quality of cheese, he said, "We in Norfolk have never attempted to make anything but skim milk cheese; and you all know that whenever you get any of that in your mouth, supposing, that is, that you are such fools as to put it there, you find the bit too big to swallow and too hard to bite."

### The Use of Whey.

To the Editor of THE CANADA FARMER:

SIR,—I see a communication in a recent number of the CANADA FARMER respecting the use of whey. Now, in my opinion, there are objections to the feeding of whey to cows. That the feed which the cow consumes will affect the flavour of milk, I think no one will doubt; as in the case of turnips and many other things. Will not the feeding of sour whey, in like manner, affect the flavour of the milk? I must admit I have never tried it, but I very much doubt its utility. The next objection is the difficulty of getting the whey back from the factory to the patrons to feed it to the cows. And in case the whey is carted back, can it not be made more profitable in feeding something else, say pigs, or calves? Pork we must have, and while I agree with you that they are a nuisance around a factory, still there can be a few kept on each farm without much trouble. But, I believe, whey can be the most profitably used in feeding calves; and I would suggest that the proprietors and patrons of some factory try the experiment; get a nice pasture lot close to the factory, and let the patrons send their calves there to be fed on whey. I think a pig will consume as much whey as a calf, and I think the calf worth most in the fall. We often hear the farmers complain they cannot raise calves when sending their milk to the factory. The above plan would remove that objection. I know some doubt about the use of whey for raising calves, but after five years of experience in raising calves on whey, I do not hesitate to say they can be success-

fully raised on it; and my plan is this: I select my cows from which I intend to raise the calves, put them to the bull so that they will come in in the month of March, and as cheese-making does not commence till the 1st May, my calves get a good start by the time I commence to feed whey. I might say I never allow the calf to suck the cow if I can help it. I milk the cow and feed it to the calf, as I think there is less trouble in teaching a calf to drink that never sucks the cow. I feed it with new milk until the milk is good for home use, and then put it on skim milk until I commence cheese-making, and then feed whey with a little corn meal, always feeding the whey before it gets very sour. By following the above plan I have succeeded in raising very good calves, and I do not see why they could not be as successfully raised at the factories as at a private dairy.

PRIVATE DAIRY.

Dorchester, April 2nd, 1868.

### Poultry Yard.

#### English and French Fowls.

To the Editor of THE CANADA FARMER:

SIR,—Having seen in your journal an extract from the *Times*, relating to French and English poultry, we beg to forward you a copy of an article which that paper called forth, and which appeared in the *Exeter Flying Post*, and was copied into many influential journals here. The writer of this reply is far more conversant with the subject than the writer in the *Times*, and to your own climate the remarks he makes are even more applicable than to ours, so that we think its insertion may possibly prevent some disappointing mistakes.

CASSELL, PETTER & GALPIN.

London, Eng., Jan. 1868.

Our readers will find in our issue of Feb. 15th, a notice of Mr. Wright's valuable work. The following is the extract above referred to, from the *Exeter Flying Post*:

In an article upon the poultry at the Paris Exhibition, the *Times* made some remarks in reference to the comparative merits of French and English poultry, to which we have thought it our duty to draw attention, as calculated to do considerable harm, if passed unnoticed, and none the less because to a certain extent the remarks are just. The *Times* expressed a most sweeping condemnation of English poultry breeders and exhibitors, because by them "the animals are prized in proportion to their approach to certain standards of form and coloration; whilst in France," it is said, "they were esteemed solely in reference to their economic value as table birds, and as abundant layers of eggs of large size." In speaking more particularly of the French breeds, it again remarked that "the smallness of the bone is a point on which the French rearers justly pride themselves, whilst, 'by some strange infatuation,' we do just the reverse;" and, finally, it affirms "that as table fowls, the only English breed that can compete with these (La Flèche, Houdan, and Crevecoeur) is the colored Dorking, and this has the disadvantage of being rather delicate in constitution—an evil which is common to it and La Flèche, and, though to a smaller degree, the Crevecoeur, but from which the Houdan is exempt." Now, as we have not the slightest doubt that the high price of butchers' meat will induce many of our readers to attempt redressing the domestic balance-sheet by keeping poultry, and as the tendency of such remarks is to make the inexperienced suppose that keeping the French breeds and discarding all English notions of pure breeds is the sure high way to success—a supposition which will lead to certain loss—some caution will not be out of place. That we may not be accused of speaking from prejudice, we will fall back upon "The Practical Poultry Keeper" of Mr. L. Wright—confessedly the highest and most practical authority on poultry which has ever yet appeared—not copied more or less from other works as is usually the case, but full throughout of instruction the fruit of experience. It is not, however, on these accounts solely we should choose it for reference, but because Mr. Wright himself has laid far more stress than any previous writer upon those very practical points which the *Times* professes to advocate, and has given the best practical estimate ever published of the French breeds, as was noted the other day by the *Saturday Review*, in a carefully written article on the same subject. Thus, we find Mr. Wright remarking, with the *Times*, that "our poultry shows have to

some extent, by the character of the judging, hindered the improvement of many breeds," and, again, that the French have taught us a lesson of some value in this respect," having "within a comparatively recent period produced by crossing and selection four new varieties, which, though inferior in some points, are all eminently valuable as table fowls." This, he remarks, "is really useful and scientific breeding brought to bear upon one definite object, and we do trust," he adds, "the result will prove suggestive with regard to others," proceeding himself to point out, in his able and scientific essay upon poultry breeding, the means by which he considers first-class fowls might in a few years be produced, "of which the cock should weigh 20lbs. and the hens 15lbs. each. But when we come to the French breeds in detail, we find that the much-vaunted Crevecoeur "is very delicate in this country," and not to be recommended for general purposes, whilst the eggs though large are not numerous, and often barren. The same may be said of La Flèche; and the Houdan alone Mr. Wright considers well adapted to the English climate. Of the merits of this breed he speaks most emphatically, but they are already well appreciated, and the breed is being multiplied as fast as stock can be obtained; though even they cannot be kept everywhere, as the hen refuses to incubate. But it will at once be obvious that first-class quality on the table is not the only thing to be considered in determining the value of a race of fowls. It is indeed the only thing to the opulent or the epicure; but in a country like England there are thousands to whom it is of far more importance to ascertain the comparative amount of meat a fowl will yield—not meat of the very choicest quality, perhaps, but good, palatable, useful meat nevertheless. From this point of view we have breeds with which the French bear no comparison. There is the Brahma, for instance, which Mr. Wright considers the most useful fowl "all round" of any, being a first-class layer, only a moderate eater, of the very largest size, and the hardest of all races known, whilst it is well adapted to confinement. The cockerels of this breed will weigh 40lbs. at three months old, costing thus about four-pence per pound, and the meat is good and juicy. Then there is the Hamburg, which though small for the table, yields, in a good run, more weight of eggs for the same amount of food than any fowl in the world. So, again, Mr. Wright most justly enforces the necessity of long-continued careful breeding before any strain of fowls can be depended on to maintain its qualities. We would impress upon all our readers that the much-vaunted French breeds have been mainly brought to perfection by good feeding through many generations, a process which would make English barn-door fowls similarly valuable, with the additional advantage of the fine French climate. But they have little intrinsic merit as breeds, and hence it follows, as has been proved again and again by the disgraced proprietors, that under a somewhat poorer regimen and our colder and more variable climate, all but the Houdan degenerate, dwindle away, and eventually perish; whilst the hardy Brahma or Cochin will thrive and grow fat. The Houdan Mr. Wright strongly recommends, when other hens can be kept to hatch the eggs. In fine, we would remark that a race of fowls well adapted for a uniformly dry and warm climate, like that of France, may be utterly wanting in that stamina required for such an atmosphere as we have in England. We need not only a fowl whose flesh is white and delicate, but which can stand our wet and cold, which can be reared in spite of them without loss, whose large growth will make meat at a cheap rate, and which will return an ample supply of eggs. For these objects we need a good proportion of that very "bone" which the *Times* so despises, just as the Scotchman in his Northern home has more bone than his Southern neighbor. In all these respects scarcely any fowl will equal the Brahma, whilst if finer quality of flesh be desired, a cross with a large Houdan or Dorking cock, as Mr. Wright recommends, will produce immense fowls for the table of quite unexceptional quality. It will be seen that we do not object to the *Times'* opinions in themselves, but to the unqualified manner in which they are expressed. We have referred to Mr. Wright's work as far the best with which we are acquainted; and we would recommend its perusal to all who may be contemplating the keeping of poultry for the first time. It is published by Messrs. Cassell & Co. at five shillings. With this in their hands, and either Brahma, Houdans, or good common fowls to stock their yards, they will go on and prosper; but let them eschew Crevecoeurs and La Flèche until they have more experience and a first-rate dry run for them. And though our breeders and shows have their faults and mistakes, which no one has so ably opposed as Mr. Wright himself, it is still no slight service to have maintained in their purity the different races to which our "tight little island" owes its possession—despite bad climate—of the finest fowls in the world.