

wonderful breast of white and excellent flesh. The chickens are hardy too, and the hens lay in winter, though the eggs are not very large. The race thrives well in pens, and M. Leroy recommends it for amateurs, of whose gains, by the way, he has but a low opinion—for the year is long, and laying is short; putting these gains chiefly in the occupation and amusement, and saying that an amateur can buy eggs and fowls in the market as cheap as he can produce them, and with more certainty. To be sure, if you turn your chickens to as good profit as the augurs did—if you can get long prices for prize fowls and their eggs—it is another matter. But how many are there who can do that? asks this practical man, who comes back again to his business hen as being the bird that all day ranges the fields and copes of the farm, that gains most of its own livelihood with its own beak and claws, that defends itself and its brood against all enemies, that lays good-sized eggs and many of them, and gives palatable chickens for the table.

What, then, is the best hen for the farm? M. Leroy passes in review a choice of notable breeds, which he pits against his elect. First in order he puts the black Spanish, for their excellence in laying immense eggs (which, in fairness, should sell by weight and not by number), their hardness, and their cleverness. But they do not hatch (though that is an extra good point if you work a hatching-machine), they eat much, and, as table-fowl, they rank among the inferior breeds. But there is a splendid variety of the Spanish which M. Leroy passes over, which possesses all its practical qualities, and beats it by far in size and flesh—a common hen, too, in south-western France, at Barbezieux in Angoumois. For centuries this variety has given some of the best capons to the Parisian gourmet. But, as the Spanish that he knows is inferior in meat, M. Leroy rejects it.

Next he places the pencilled Hamburgs, golden and silver, which the French call Campines. They are small, and two of them will not eat more than a single Houdan. They are wonderful layers, but the eggs are so little as to be tire some to eat from the shell. The race is hardly, the flesh is good, and this is a recommendable breed. But why go so far afield when you have what is wanted at your own door? M. Leroy, in speaking of his common hens, means mainly these of Central and Northern France; but his remarks apply elsewhere, and especially in England.

In the first place you must begin by selecting, and continue by weeding; constantly rejecting the bad specimens, which are common enough everywhere, and retaining only those that exhibit the best qualities, whether for laying or putting on flesh. And at the very start you will find yourself in considerable difficulties: for the old barn-door is now getting so mixed by the thoughtless introduction of unsuitable new-fangled fowls of all sorts into the farm-yard, that it takes a good eye to pick and choose. If Darwin was right, that "not one man in a thousand has accuracy of eye and judgment sufficient to become an eminent breeder," it is not every one that can hope for success even with barn-door fowl. The next thing to be done with your well-chosen hens is to renovate the breeds by an occasional cross. M. Leroy's ideal cross is with the wild *Bankiva* cock, and here—surely without knowing it—he is at one with Darwin, who wrote: "Having kept nearly all the English breeds of fowl alive, having bred and crossed them and examined their skeletons, it appears to me most certain that all are the descendants of the wild Indian fowl *gallus Bankiva*." In default of the *Bankiva*—which, unknown to M. Leroy, is, we believe, to be found commonly enough and in good fettle in Devonshire and the West, under the name of the "Indian Game"—this successful French breeder recommends the big English Game fowl; and were it not for the special difficulties of

keeping and rearing it, this—"le grand Combattant Anglais"—is clearly M. Leroy's private weakness: a foible which he shares with not a few of our own "knowing ones." He cannot say too much for the size and number of its eggs, the deliciousness of its meat, its hardness, and its hardihood. "Go to the other side of the Channel for them," he writes, "where purity of breed is a religion with the fanciers;" and thus must the common hen be renovated from time to time. And M. Leroy winds up by saying; "Breeders, my colleagues; amateurs; farmers: For the pen and the farm, for the omelette and the spit, there is but one hen—and that is the barn-door."

CARE OF HONEY FOR MARKET.

R. F. Holterman, Ontario, argued that our extracted honey is exposed to the air too much after it is extracted, and thereby loses its fine aromatic flavor. Comb honey should be kept in a dry, warm atmosphere.

D. A. Jones, Ontario, did not think the capping to cells was impervious to moisture; if the honey was stored in a damp atmosphere, it would absorb the moisture, and burst from the cells.

H. R. Boardman thought comb honey thickened by age; it even becomes so thick as to crystallize.

Prof. Cook explained the difference between evaporation and crystallization. Honey can easily thicken by evaporation, and to evaporate, it must have air; therefore the sealing is not air-tight. Crystallization is a different affair, and is akin to the formation of ice, resulting from the cooling process.

H. R. Boardman kept his honey room at a high temperature, with plenty of ventilation. On wet days he kept the room closed, and sometimes even built fire. He had even put lime upon the floor to absorb the moisture.

E. W. Thompson, New-York, had trouble with the bee moth larvæ in his comb honey. One trouble in fumigating with brimstone is getting enough to kill the larvæ, and yet not discolor the honey.

C. F. Muth said the fumes of burning sulphur will settle. The honey should be at the bottom of the room.

H. R. Boardman said that in fumigating, we should use nothing to ignite the sulphur that will cause smoke.

S. F. Newman thought many of these troubles came from removing the honey from the hives too soon. In the hives the honey is safe from the moths and from dampness.

J. B. Hall said the reason Mr Thompson has trouble from moths, is because of pollen in his sections. To fumigate honey, put some ashes in an iron kettle, then the sulphur; hang the kettle near the top of the room, then drop in a piece of iron heated to a white heat, and close the door. The temperature of a honey-room should be kept at 90°.

Dr. S. C. Whiting, Michigan, said that when he had some old honey that he wished to put upon the market, he placed it upon a hive containing a strong colony of bees, and it was soon so changed that it could not be distinguished from new honey.

G. M. Doolittle, New-York, mentioned the case of a bee-keeper who kept his honey all winter in his sitting room near the coal stove, and it kept well, and sold for as much the next season as did new honey.

James Heddon, Michigan, said that if we wished to keep honey from candying, it must be kept where it is warm; "we have no trouble with moths, and I do not believe they can be reared on wax alone. The cappings may contain some pollen."

C. P. Dadant: "Moths will starve in wax."

D. A. Jones: "Have not Messrs. Dadant and Heddon seen moths in cakes of wax?"