

FOR FARMERS AND GARDENERS.

Rhubarb Wine is attaching some notice among the people of the East. We extract the following relative to it, from the N. Y. Tribune:

Some time since we published a notice for wine made from pie-plant or rhubarb. It had been tasted by a number of good judges, who did not know its source, and pronounced a very fair sample of pale sherry. It certainly did resemble that wine both in appearance and taste. It not only deceived wine-drinkers here, but a sample sent to Cincinnati, was tasted by men skilled in the art of tasting wines and detecting adulterations, and called a good sample of American sherry, only wanting age to be excellent. Basing an opinion upon our own judgment, we have and do pronounce it as much superior, as a beverage, to half the costly wines sold in this city, as pure otard brandy is superior to 'fighting rum,' such as is manufactured in New York, and which in its turn manufactures demons out of human beings. Now since mankind will have something stimulating, and since it is fashionable for all who can afford it, to drink wine, and since a very abundant quantity of something that, at least will serve as a good substitute, can be made from rhubarb stalks, we repeated our recommendation of that kind of juice.

How RHUBARB WINE IS MADE.—Since our first notice, our letters of inquiry, 'How is it made?' have been too numerous to answer, if we had known how, but as we did not, we wrote to B. P. Cahoon of Kenosha, Wis., who, so far as we are informed, originated the rhubarb wine manufacture, from his remarkable seedling pie-plant, which grows larger than any other known variety.

The following is Mr. Cahoon's reply:

"Herewith I send you a sample of 'pie-plant wine,' made last September, by mixing equal quantities of water with the juice of the stalks, and to each gallon, 3 1/2 lbs. fair quality of New Orleans sugar, put in barrels, filled full, and lined with isinglass, and allowed to remain in the barrels till Spring, and then bottled. By adding or diminishing the quantity of sugar it will vary the strength of the wine in the same proportion. The pure juice without water makes a very strong wine, by using 4 lbs. of sugar to each gallon."

It appears that the process is exactly that with currant-juice, blackberry-juice, elderberry-juice, gooseberry-juice, or any other juice, such as has long been used in families all over the country, for the manufacture of beverages called wines.

The advantage of the rhubarb, particularly such a rank growth as Cahoon's seedling gives, is that it affords a greater quantity of juice than any other plant; and so far as it appears to us, it is a better quality than any but grape-juice for the manufacture of domestic wine. Of course it will afford, also, an abundance of cheap and good vinegar. The acid of the plant, as all pie-makers are aware, is decidedly sharp.

THE QUANTITY OF RHUBARB WINE PER ACRE.—

In our former notice, we gave the product of rhubarb wine, per acre, as 800 gallons. Mr. Cahoon says:

"This estimate is very much below the matter of fact, as tested here. Mr. G. Lewis, the purchaser of my plantation of pie-plant made last season, from one-tenth of an acre, 400 gallons like the sample I send you. It is a fair estimate that 2,500 gallons can be made from an acre of well-cultivated roots of my seedling. The wine costs here about 40 cents per gallon to the manufacturer."

According to this statement, instead of 800 gallons per acre, the product is over 800 barrels, and almost the entire cost of the article would be the price paid for the sugar. Probably, upon a large scale, five cents a gallon would pay all the expenses of labor of cutting the plants, grinding, pressing and bottling. With sorghum sugar for sweetening, we don't see anything to prevent the country from having wine cheap enough, if that will make men more temperate than cheap whisky.

Rhubarb or pie-plant can be grown in Utah, by proper appliances, probably in as great perfection as elsewhere. With an abundance of sorghum syrup for sweetening, why can not the people of this Territory have a healthy supply of this excellent wine?

Strawberries may be preserved by all who wish, in the following simple manner, given by the American Agriculturist:

The can or bottle is to be filled with the fresh fruit—first picked over, and all bruised and green berries removed. A syrup is made by boiling (and skimming) one pound of good sugar with one pint of water; this is poured over the fruit until the cans or bottles are full. They are then partially closed, set into hot water, (cold if bottles are used) heated to boiling, and a few minutes more. The vessels are then closed, and sealed with wax. They have opened very finely the present month. The berries may be added in layers with a little sugar between each layer, using no syrup. Treat the vessels the same as if filled with syrup, except that they should be refilled after shrinking in heating—say put the contents of six cans into five.

Corn may yet be planted for fodder, upon old ground not yet planted or where the seed has failed to come up. Having made the ground mellow, make shallow drills about two feet apart, run a small stream of water through each drill, turn off the water and plant the corn, each kernel some six inches apart in the drill and cover lightly—always taking care, in covering, to use the moist soil on the side of the drill—not that which is so wet that it will bake. We have planted corn in this manner and seen it come up in about three days.

Young Lambs die in various parts of Western New York from sudden attacks of pain in the bowels, a viscid mucous flowing copiously from the mouth. They lie on the side with the head stretched back, bleating with each paroxysm of pain, and die in six or eight hours.

The American Agriculturist for June arrived June 20, per eastern mail, freighted, as usual, with systematic and practical instructions on Farm, Orchard, Nursery, Kitchen, Fruit and Flower Gardens, Green and Hot Houses, &c., &c., affording a rich treat to all who take delight in aiding to develop the excellencies of the vegetable kingdom.

From the following article we are happy to be informed that it is the design of Prof. Judd to print an especial edition of the *Agriculturist* for the benefit of subscribers who live in remote sections:

On looking over and counting our subscribers upon the Pacific coast, during the past month, we were both surprised and gratified at the unexpectedly large number of them. In return for the generous patronage and the kindly appreciation thus received from our far off 'brethren of the plow,' we have determined to henceforth issue an extra early edition of the American Agriculturist, especially for California, Oregon, Washington Territory, Utah, and New-Mexico, and other distant points, including our subscribers in Mexico, Central and South America, and the West Indies.

The edition will not differ materially from the later edition for home circulation; the chief variation will be the omission of a part of the advertisements last coming in, and perhaps a trifling change in the market reports, which may require a slight alteration by transactions between the earlier and later editions.

The earlier edition will go to press on the evening of 19th, so as to be ready for the mail steamers which leave New York on the 20th of each month. This will be a gain of two weeks in the time of receiving the paper by subscribers on the Pacific.

Turnips for a main crop may be sown from this date till the latter part of July or first of August, though the period first named is generally preferable. New soil is the best for turnips, but they may be raised wherever the soil is rich and mellow. Plant in drills eighteen inches or two feet apart. Turnips have been transplanted, in smaller patches, with good results.

The Long White French Turnip is said to be the best grown in this country, either for table use or for feeding.

The Cut Worm is warded off from cabbage plants—saw a correspondent of the American Agriculturist—by sprinkling a circle of lime round each plant. He says, this plan "has succeeded where other means have failed."

King Philip Corn, planted June 2, and harvested the first week in September, by George Haigh, Orange county, N. Y., yielded over ninety seven bushels shelled corn to the acre.

Flour is made from either common or Bermuda pumpkins, cooked and evaporated till dry, and then ground.

[From the American Agriculturist.]

Breeding-In-and-In—A "Cattle Breeder's" Reply.

No. III.

As I did not fully answer all Mr. Clay's strictures on this subject in the March number of the Agriculturist, I now submit some further remarks. The subject is too important to the great mass of American stock breeders to be passed over with a few sweeping or positive flourishes of the pen, on either side; and having taken my position I propose to carry it out, in now noticing the remaining points in that gentleman's March article.

5th FALSE PROOF.—Mr. Clay denies that Bakewell bred in-and-in with his improved stock—particularly his sheep. Let us see. Bakewell finding the animal which he wanted not made ready to his hand, yet the material out of which to breed it abounding in several sub-varieties of the long-wooled breed, had to begin somewhere; and like a sensible man made his selections to commence with from the best he could find, irrespective of what particular name, or locality, so that they were of the breed he wanted, viz.—a long-wooled sheep that would take on high flesh at an early age. Of the best specimens that he could get, both rams and ewes, he formed his flock; and then he bred intensely in-and-in until he got what he intended to get when he started. He did refine the long-wooled sheep, and got it up to perfect carcase, in size, form and weight, unequalled by any other breeder of his day. And so he left his sheep at his death, which had acquired such celebrity that to this day they hold the names Bakewell, Dishley, and new Leicester (the names of himself, his farm, and county), synonymous terms—as a distinct breed.

That Bakewell's successors did not maintain the standard of his flocks in all their high qualities, proves nothing further than that they did not inherit or purchase Bakewell's skill and brains, as well as his sheep. Bakewell also may have bred for some other quality in his sheep, which his successors either did not want, or comprehend, and they may have failed in getting their own demand out of them. But that is of no consequence to the principle. Bakewell did succeed in his object—getting a finely developed race of sheep out of coarse and common, material by a persistent course of in-and-in breeding.

With the 'Long-horned' cattle which Mr. Bakewell found in an advanced state of perfection, so far as symmetry of form, and a capacity to take on flesh was concerned, he adopted in-and-in breeding to an extreme degree—maintaining, after several years' practice, that he had much improved them. See description of the 'Long-horns' in 'Youatt's British Cattle,' London edition.

6th. COLEMAN ON THE DISHLEYS.—Mr. Clay will excuse me for declining to receive the authority of Mr. Coleman in the stock line—an estimable gentleman in all the moral and social relations in life, but a theorist only, in his knowledge of farm stock, and not likely to draw his conclusions from the best authorities.

7th. As to the authority of R. L. Allen, which Mr. C. quotes, I coincide entirely with Mr. A.'s remarks coupled with the conditions which he attaches to them.

8th. JONAS WEBB.—Unfortunate here, again. Mr. Webb, does breed closely in-and-in. He so says, himself, and it is a fact of universal notoriety all over England where his sheep are known, that it is so. I do not assert that he never goes out of his own flock for a cross. He may do so, now and then; but where can he better himself! He has different families in his own flocks from one to the other of which he crosses, but they are essentially of the same origin, and blood. Webb's system is that of in-and-in breeding, to all intents and purposes, although, perhaps, not so closely as some others.

In reply to my remark of Price's Herefords being in-and-in bred for forty years, it is not argumentative in Mr. Clay, to say, "I know nothing of the Hereford herd alluded to, but venture that if the truth were all known 'A Cattle Breeder' would be as wide of the mark there, as in the Bakewell case, and the Stud-Book." If Mr. Clay can show me wrong, by authority, good; but simple assertion will not do. Mr. Price was a man of character, well known in England. He made that statement many years ago, over his own name, in the British Farmer's Magazine, a work of acknowledged authority in England, in an elaborate article on Hereford Cattle, prepared for that publication, which none who knew him disputed.

We will see about 'the Stud-Book,' before we get through.

As to the Collings—Charles, in particular—the next subject of Mr. Clay's criticism: We will not talk about his Galloway cross which I think as little of as Mr. Clay does, but of the Colling cattle, proper, I concede that he obtained his original breeding stock of other and older breeders, and the very best he could get in all the Short Horn region, consisting of a rare lot of cows, and the bull Hubback—which bull by the way, he only used and bred from two years. But the descendants of that bull, both in bulls [Foljambe (263) a grandson of Hubback, Mr. C. asserted; did his subsequent stock the most service] and heifers, he kept and bred together—in-and-in, to the very closest affinities, and in all possible ways in some instances, to the third and fourth direct generations—that is, a bull to his own daughters, grand-daughters, etc., as in the case of Favorite. He had different families, or tribes of cattle, I admit, taking their names and genealogies on the dam's side from the original cows from which they sprung, but they were mainly from the same bulls, as were Robert Colling's, his brother, with whom he interchanged bulls on frequent occasions. I do not see how much the Collings improved their herds beyond the originals from which they descended, or whether they improved them at all, but we have never heard that the Short Horns deteriorated in their hands; and it is quite certain that when they sold their herds and retired from breeding, no cattle in England stood higher than theirs, or brought greater prices; and if any instances of closer breeding can be found than they practiced throughout their whole career as breeders, I should like to know it. The pages of Coate's Herd Book, Vol. I, will corroborate my assertion.

Since the days of the Collings, although many years cotemporary with them, the late Thomas Bates, of Kirk-leavington, stood at the head and front of English Short Horn breeders, until his death. He had some of his best stock, male and female, from both the Collings, and the blood of their herds in others. He bred in-and-in, intensely, never going out of his own herd for a bull with any success, except in one instance, that of Belvedere (1706), and he a descendant of R. Colling's herd, closely bred in-and-in, through his ancestors for many generations back in other hands. A second cross direct from Belvedere, on his own daughter (Dutchess 34th), produced the best bull—so publicly acknowledged—in all England—Duke of Northumberland (1940). That Dutchess blood, (with the Oxford, descendants of the Matchem cow which he introduced to his herd in the year 1831, by persistent in-and-in breeding, the latter and her stock to his Dutchess bulls of the Belvedere cross, and afterwards by their own crosses,) raised his herd to the highest point of reputation, which their descendants still maintain both in England and the United States.

Next to Mr. Bates, stood, and now stand the Booths, always prize winners on their cows wherever, and whenever, they have showed. They are, and always have been in-and-in breeders—deeply so. So was Mason, of Chilton, and Maynard, and Wetherill. Sir Charles Knightly, another celebrated name in the annals of Short Horns, has long been an in-and-in breeder; and so, in fact, were a majority if not all of the English Short Horn breeders who acquired any high reputation in their herds. Indeed it is useless to multiply instances of the kind, not in cattle alone, but in every kind of domestic stock down to dogs—of every different breed, as well as chickens and pigeons—the two latter 'bred to a feather' in style and uniformity. Multitudes of cases could be named relating to 'fancy' animals, particularly where striking pints, characteristics, and properties were required, and only to be obtained by a concentration of blood, and with that blood a combination of the qualities connected with it. The inevitable tendency of descent in animal life is to partake of the strong characteristics of the immediate parents in the offspring, more or less, and the form, appearance, and organization which predominate in them, but which, if not strongly concentrated in such parents, strikes off to their parents' ancestry, or collaterally, as the case may be. How many instances do we constantly witness in the human family, as well as in animals, where the children much more resemble a grandparent, or collateral relation than either of the immediate parents! This arises from the aggregation of different strains of blood, and different characteristics in the parents, perhaps for generations back. So diverse, frequently, that scarcely a resemblance will occur between a large family of children. We have seen a pair of black or brown haired parents having red, light, and sandy haired children, with widely different complexions and forms, and not a doubt of their legitimacy—and all those marks of feature, complexion and form, could be easily recognized in their collateral relatives of the previous generation. Mankind, in personal and physical appearances, breed like the whole animal world, under the same natural laws, and conditions, and I mention such instances here, as being so familiar to almost every day observation that no one will deny it. I will next talk of other matters including horses, and the Stud-Book.

REPLY TO MR. CLAY'S MAY ARTICLE.

In reply to Mr. Clay's No. II, in the May Agriculturist, I shall not be led off on an issue which he himself has made, and aside from the original proposition with which I first commenced, viz.: that in-and-in breeding of brute animals, UNDER PROPER SELECTION, is frequently beneficial in promoting the highest development of physical perfection, and not adverse to the ordinary course of nature.

Instead of confining his remarks to my examples of the brute creation, he adverts to mankind to sustain his hypothesis; and as I am free to admit, with much ingenuity maintains, by various authorities, a plausible case—but mark me, by entirely changing the ground of my argument, to wit: the bodily or physical development only, as I insist upon, under certain conditions, while he couples with it the mental and nervous temperaments and faculties. On this branch Mr. Clay makes his strong argument. I am not going to argue this subject with him for the reasons, that it is not my proposition, and that to elucidate the whole thing it would require more of research than I have now the time to give it, and take up more of the space of an agricultural paper than you would be willing to allow. Yet I will briefly advert to one or two of Mr. C.'s propositions on page 132 (May Agriculturist).

'I deny the statement as regards the Greeks and Romans, and call for the data, etc.' For indisputable, current testimony of the domestic, social and moral habits of the Romans, in their highest state of civilization, power and renown, just look into those parts of the cities Pompeii, and Herculaneum which have recently been unearthed from their volcanic covering of two thousand years—their pictures, statuary, and every day familiar sights on which the most noble and exalted of their people indulged. For recorded evidence—a synopsis of many volumes of the chronicles of the obscenity, incest, and depravity of even the proudest historical names in both Greece and Rome, consult Greek and Roman History. See also the 'History of Prostitution,' lately published by Dr. Sanger, of New York—a sanitary work of high value; and not immoral tendency. In addition to the many translated works which are there enumerated, will be found names of books written by cotemporary authors, the depravity of whose language is untranslatable into the English tongue, all descriptive of the domestic habits and practices of the highest, as well as the middle, and lowest classes of the Greek and Roman people. If close-breeding was not practised in those nations in their palmy state, without public scandal, or the decline of the physical faculties, for that reason alone of the most powerful people of those periods, then history is a falsehood.

As to the mental and moral deterioration of mankind from a persistent course of in-and-in breeding, as Mr. Clay has begged that branch of the question, he may have it his own way, as I have not from the first disputed him. I named the Guelph family of England to illustrate the physical, not the mental, side of the argument, which he, in fact, admits. And that we may end this issue at once, I concede that in communities of people in a close neighborhood, on the same soils, eating the same foods, associating within the same range of objects, and intelligence, with like hereditary, or local diseases, disorders, and sympathies, both of mind and body, close, and continued in-breeding may, after a while, tell both on the mental, and physical organization. And it would also equally tell on those organizations if people ever so far estranged in blood and locality—but equally afflicted with scrofulous consumption, or other hereditary, or chronic, or nervous, or mental diseases—were to intermarry and produce children. It is a law of our physical nature that 'the iniquities of the fathers (parents) are visited (upon, and even) unto the third and fourth generation.' And so it is with everything, brute as well as human; and probably from cases under such circumstances as Mr. Clay's illustrations quoted. To close, on this branch of the subject, I quote from the Southern Cultivator, an extract advertising to the proposed Georgia law named by Mr. Clay:

'What is the blood of any person or animal, but a part of the food eaten within the previous 48, or perchance, 60 hours? The blood of no father or mother was ever the same for six months in succession; and, therefore, no two children born at different times, and the offspring of the same parents, were ever so much alike as some twins have been. CAIN and ABEL differed widely in their dispositions; although neither could have had either the vices or virtues of a long line of progenitors. The different members of many a family in our own time evince as wide a discrepancy of character, whose parental blood came from the same living hearts. One child is very conscientious through life; while a brother or sister displays a lamentable want of moral rectitude. If the same blood in the popular, not scientific, use of language, produces such variant results, why talk about the blood of cousins necessarily leading to bad consequences, if mingled by intermarriage? The notion is but little short of a downright absurdity. How can the marriage of a sound man and sound woman impair the blood of either, whether they are brother and sister, first cousins, or fourth cousins? The thing is impossible, unless one gratuitously assumes vices which it were just as logical to assume in the married life of any other parties. And if the marriage of near kindred can not impair the blood of parents, how is it possible for healthy parental blood to weaken the constitutional powers of its offspring? This, too, is equally impossible. Parents communicate deformity and imbecility to their children, not because they may happen to be cousins, or their grandmothers were such, but from errors, defects and maladies which have an entirely different origin. If it were proper to use the argumentum ad hominem, and were the writer addressing a legislative body, it would be easy to name some of the blood-corrupting poisons which eat like a cancer into the constitutions of more than one generation. It is not necessary to our argument that we point out any of the pregnant follies, vices and crimes which civilization breeds with extreme fecundity, to show that the occasional marriage of first cousins is not one of the number. Pure blood is never contaminated by what it parts with; but by what it receives that is impure.'

Mr. Clay's remarks on, 3—EXPERIENCE; and, 4—SPECIAL PROOF, require no further remark from me, as no point of argument is particularly concerned. But, in regard to the 'Stud-Book' and horses, I have somewhat to say, and will ask the privilege to do so in your next paper, as I have already trespassed too much in the present number.