

AGRICULTURAL.

CO-OPERATIVE BUTTER MAKING.—Co-operative or Factory cheese making has long been a success. At first the result of accident, the principle has been so successful, and so great an improvement over the old system of "farm dairies," that our production has more than trebled. The quality is greatly superior, and we are fast becoming the cheese makers of the world. While this system has been developing so rapidly and with such great results, the manufacture of butter has been but little improved, and the old system of farm dairies remains the same as it was fifty years ago. True, there have been a few "creameries" established on the co-operative plan near our large cities, for the manufacture of butter suitable for immediate use, but in our great dairying districts, where the bulk of our butter is made, the old methods are almost universally in use, and as a consequence, the quality of the greater part of the butter sent to this market exhibits the same variety of good, bad and indifferent as the cheese market did under the old style of cheesemaking. Ask any wholesale butter merchant what proportion of the butter he receives is of really fine quality, and he will tell you about five per cent. Ask any grocer what article in his stock is hardest to find of fine quality, and he will unhesitatingly tell you butter. Now this arises from a variety of causes, but the principal cause is that there is a lack of general system in the manufacture. Farmers will tell you that it depends on skill, or the feed, or the water, or the salt, or a dozen other things, all of which doubtless have a minor effect. But we claim that a proper system would go far towards equalizing and removing these defects, and place the manufacture of butter on much the same footing as that of cheese. An association of farmers conveying their milk to a manufactory owned in common, could afford to employ the best talent to superintend it; could afford to have the best utensils, the best water; could afford to have a better and more perfect equipment in every respect, than any ordinary individual possibly could. This would inevitably bring greater perfection and uniformity of product, and as surely bring much greater prices in the market than the majority of farm dairies. The butter milk could be used for feeding hogs and calves the same as now, subscribers being allowed for this in proportion to the number of cows they milked, or the quantity of milk delivered.—*The South.*

TEN RULES FOR MILKING.—Women make the best milkers. Stephens, in his Book of the Farm, says he never sees a man milking without thinking that he is usurping a place that does not belong to him. It would seem as though farmers had combined together to banish women from the barn-yard and cow-house. We can think of no other reason for allowing the yard to remain so dirty.

Milking requires a little skill, gentleness and patience. And we insist that if men will milk, they should do the work properly.

1st. The cows should be milked at the same hours every day, Sunday and week days.

2nd. If you milk "Daisy" first to-day and "Brindle" second, do not milk Brindle first to-morrow and Daisy second, but always milk them in the established order. Few pay any attention to this point, but it is an important matter, especially in a large dairy, as any irregularity makes the cows uneasy.

3rd. The same man should milk the same cows.

4th. No talking should be permitted during milking unless for the purpose of soothing the cow. The man who uses harsh words, to say nothing of blows, deserves to be kicked out of the stable.

5th. A kicking cow should be treated kindly and have her legs tied. It is the only sure preventive and is little trouble.

6th. Have a three-legged milking stool. A one-legged stool is a nuisance.

7th. Wash your hands before going to milk, and if the cows teats are dirty wash them also with water. It is very common to milk some milk into the hand and then moisten the teats with it. We have often done it ourselves, but cannot recommend the practice. Water is better.

8th. Sit close to the cow. Do not stick your head in her flank, but sit upright; you will milk easier, and have more control over the cow. Hold the pail firmly between your knees and do not let it touch the ground. We need

hardly say that you should sit on the right hand side of the cow, or what teamsters call the "off side." Of course it makes no difference which side if she is only used to it. And it may be that as there are left hand plows, there may be in our widely extended parish left hand cows also. In this case you will have to sit with your right hand toward the cow's hind leg, instead of the left hand, as is the usual custom.

9th. Do not milk too fast at first. Rub the teats or bag a little, and soothe the cow. Then as the milk begins to come down freely, strike a steady regular motion, and continue it without stopping, until all the milk is drawn from the udder. Rapid milking is desirable, but steady milking is still more important. Some people milk with a stripping motion of the hands. They pull down on the teats. This is a bad practice. A good milker may bear down a little, but if he does he is hardly conscious of it. Nearly all the milking is done by the three lower fingers. The forefinger and thumb are first pressed tightly round the teat so as to prevent the milk from going back, and then the three lower fingers are contracted until the milk is forced out. There is no pulling or stripping—the milk is simply forced out by the contraction of the fingers. The forefinger and thumb are first closed, and then the next finger, and then the next, and finally the little finger, and as one finger closes, the second finger begins to relax so as to allow the milk to come into the teat. In this way there is a steady, uninterrupted stream of milk forced out. This cannot be done with a stripping motion.

10th. *Milk clean.* Not a drop of milk should be left in the udder. The last drawn milk is not only by far the richest, but if the cows are not milked clean they soon fall off in their milk. Our own practice is to insist on the men going over the cows again as soon as they are through milking, and "strip the cows." If a man is really a clean milker, this is not necessary, but it is ordinarily necessary to adopt the rule.—*Hearth and Home.*

HOLDING UP MILK.—A writer in the *American Agriculturist* says he has found his cows will always let down their milk when inclined to hold it up if he gives them some salt to lick.

Correspondence.

SALT LAKE CITY, July 21, 1872.

Editor Deseret News.

An accidental number of a local contemporary is before me, with an article dubbed "The Indian Crisis." Like most of this journalist's emanations when dilating *anent* Utah matters, it is exceedingly Munchausenish, and those unacquainted with the paper might be misled by its sensational and unreliable statements, to the prejudice and injury of the "Mormons," whom it thus unwarrantably assails.

Some 2,000 Indians—men, women and children, are visiting and roaming through Sanpete, Juab, Sevier, and Utah Counties. Of this number Kanosh and his band are *en route* to their homes in Millard Co. The remainder are fishing, hunting rabbits, begging, and possibly some of the renegades steal more or less. (Pertinent to the thieving question, who will bear the closest watching, the renegade whites or reds? Which class gives our justices and sheriffs trouble and directly costs the Territory and counties the most to prosecute?) As a body the Indians now in Sanpete are not hostile nor do I believe for a moment, that there is an "Indian crisis approaching" unless they should be driven back to their reservation *volens volens*. It is true, they are a very heavy tax upon the people, and some of the citizens are becoming impatient to have them return to the reservation, on account of the burdens they impose on their larders, and the consequent anxiety about what may happen if Dr. Dodge should insist upon their return at the point of the bayonet. The Dr. says he has been a "soldier—of the cross"—for some 30 years. Inferentially we may safely conclude that he will be the last man to provoke unnecessary hostility, which would result in bloodshed and for months paralyze the industries of the outlying settlements and consequently cost thousands of dollars, in an enterprise so unchristian and inhuman. But, say some of the officials, "The dignity of the government must be maintained!" From this I suppose we are to conclude that if a few wild and delirious Indians (very probably made so by the

non-fulfillment of sacred promises, and stimulated by Christian (?) whisky,) "talk turkey" to some agent or other officer, the government he represents is assailed and must, forsooth, be re-dignified by the killing of *any and all* Indians that might be found lying around loose. For one I am about tired of hearing so much nonsense respecting the embodiment of the great United States Government in the persons of a few officers who, judging from the actions of some of them in the past, may be acting inimically to the Government they bluster so much about representing. Now if the Indians do become hostile, whom will they assail—the "Mormons" or the "outsiders?" Is the scribbler of the "Indian Crisis" article in danger of losing his scalp? Talk about the government sustaining loss in dignity or dollars by the unlicensed presence of a few Indians in one of the frontier counties of Utah! It is all bosh.

The Indians' idea about the land they always have lived upon, roamed over, etc., belonging to them, is just as consistent as thousands of notions entertained by the whites. The Indians see with positive alarm the encroachments of the enlightened and civilized white man; and when they are driven from their time-honored hunting grounds, on which their progenitors sleep and which are endeared to them by so many pleasing recollections, they go away hesitatingly, and what true Christian is surprised?

The insinuation that the "Mormons" are provoking Indian hostilities is a base libel. Last Sunday, at Spring City, Sanpete county, where a great many whites and a number of Indians assembled to hear preaching from the missionaries, President Orson Hyde told the Indians, in the most emphatic terms, that they should and must return to the reservation without delay, according to the injunctions of Dr. Dodge, and I know the Bishops have many times urged them to go. The author of this writing, seeing Kanosh at Fountain Green, asked him to use his utmost influence to induce Tabby to return to the reservation. After Dr. Dodge started for home, word reached Mount Pleasant, through two Indians, that Tabby had concluded to return at once to the reservation. This news was telegraphed to the Dr., but subsequently it was ascertained that the Indians intended moving only to Thistle valley for the present. Dr. Dodge officially instructed the Bishops of Sanpete Co. not to give the Indians any more provisions, and if in consequence of this withholding the Indians depredated or assailed them, he would protect them. Whether this is a good policy or not will be determined soon, as the bishops present agreed to carry out his views to the extent of their influence. I feel doubly assured that the Dr. has it in his power to effect the removal of the Indians without parade and without even his visiting them again. Suggestions were made to him by persons entirely familiar with the Indian character and feelings, that, if carried out, will consummate his utmost wish in this regard.

A HUMANITARIAN.

Hints for Wine-Drinkers.

The London *Saturday Review* recently contained an article upon artificial wine manufacture, which is almost enough to make the most ardent lover of wine determine to forego the pleasure of ever tasting another drop of it. Not that it advances anything against the judicious use of this beverage, coeval almost with the existence of man, but that it proves to us the almost impossible task of being able to obtain a really genuine glass of wine—i. e., the honest product of the grape. Dr. Thudicum and Dr. Dupre, who have just produced two elaborate works upon the chemical analysis of French wines—being an addition to some six hundred works already existing upon the subject of oenology—give some details that are really startling in their application. The leading feature in their works, and indeed that of any others on the production of wines, is the universal conspiracy against the pure, natural juice of the grape into which wine-growers and manufacturers seem to have entered. Port and sherry, for instance, are universally known to be more or less artificial concoctions, and there are large quantities of liquor sold under these names which have not one single drop of the genuine wine in their composition. The chief business of the Roussillon vineyards is to supply a wine which is exported into Por-

tugal for the purpose of being doctored; but not unfrequently the trip to Portugal is dispensed with altogether. Then there are French wines which are similarly used to a great extent in the manufacture of sherry. As to champagne, such a thing may be here and there met, but the ordinary champagne of commerce is notoriously an artificial production. In the champagne region for instance, the manufacture has increased from five millions of bottles in 1834 to between twenty-five and thirty millions to-day; but although real champagne is grown only in the prefectures of Rheims and Epernay—a very limited area—and although it is known that the late war must have seriously interfered with the cultivation of the vineyards, there does not appear to be any falling off in the yield of this wine. Burgundy and Bordeaux have in like manner been transformed into nothing but artificial imitations. The doctoring of common wines is openly practiced on the quays of Bordeaux, sugar and brandy being the chief ingredients of Burgundy. Dr. Thudicum and Dr. Dupre say that they have seen as much as twenty pounds of sugar to the "piece" added to Bordeaux, and they attribute to this much of the injurious effects of this manufactured wine to those who drink it. A remarkable instance of the growth of adulteration is seen in the almost total supplanting of the Muscat wines by the use of a tincture of elder-flower, which resembles the muscated closely in flavor. Many a connoisseur who smacks his lips over the rich musk flavor of his glass of sparkling Moselle is only paying homage to the elder-flower; for nowhere on the Moselle, or in that region, is any muscated grape grown fit for wine-making. Fortunately for those thus cheated, the elder-flower is not known to be prejudicial to health, as are many other substitutes used in the adulteration of wines and liquors. One of the most surprising passages in Dr. Thudicum's and Dr. Dupre's treatise is that in which they give an account of what is called "sugar infusion wines." By this showing the manufacture of wine is now conducted on such highly scientific principles that grapes are being gradually dispensed with altogether. According to Petiot's process, sixty hectolitres of juice can be converted into two hundred and eighty-five hectolitres of so called wine, by simply adding a sufficient quantity of water and sugar to make up the difference, and squeezing the husks of the grapes five times over.—*Ex.*

New England Farmers

In many places in New England alders are springing up in the pastures, young pines appear in the ancient mowing fields, and the feathered birches wave where once the farmers turned their rich furrow. In New Hampshire nearly 9,000 people left during the last decade, and as many more left the agricultural towns for the cities and villages. Maine barely held its own during the last decade. There was a loss in the agricultural towns and a gain in the manufacturing. Throughout New England general agriculture is becoming of less account relatively each year, while special farming and manufacturing is steadily on the increase. Of the six States east of the Hudson River, Vermont is the nearest to raising its own bread—producing 454,000 bushels of wheat in 1869, or a bushel and a peck to each inhabitant. Taking the army rations of fifty-two ounces of flour per day as a basis for computing the consumption of bread, it follows, Vermont raises bread enough to supply the people of that State thirty-seven days. To make up the deficiency they are obliged to purchase 3,836,000 bushels per annum. Maine produces 278,000 bushels, sufficient to last eleven days, and purchases 8,500,000 bushels. New Hampshire produces 193,000 bushels—little more than a half bushel to each inhabitant, or ten days' supply, and purchases 4,260,000 bushels. Connecticut makes a poorer show, producing 38,000 bushels—a supply of bread for two days—and purchasing 7,518,000 bushels. Massachusetts raised only 34,000 bushels, or just bread enough for breakfast and dinner, but not for supper! The purchase was 20,300,000 bushels of wheat. Rhode Island raised 784 bushels of wheat in 1869, and purchased 3,000,000. The six New England States together purchase from forty to fifty million bushels of wheat, and quite as much of other grains, or in round numbers, 100,000,000 bushels of grain.—*Cleveland Plain Dealer.*