

The Dairy.

Mistakes of Our Dairymen.

We have a standing invitation to all government organizations, viz: *Come let us reason together.* No matter how honorable, truthful, or independent our course may be, we have no hopes of our invitation being accepted. The motley crowds which control these associations forbid such prospects.

Last summer, after investigating the condition of the milk delivered at the cheese-factories, finding that we could not get time to accept all the invitations we received for making further tests, we expressed the opinion editorially that the cheese-makers should organize an association of their own where they could discuss matters pertaining to the manufacture of cheese and the handling and testing of milk, as the existing dairymen's associations were controlled by cheese-buyers, and neither cheese-makers nor farmers had an opportunity of deriving material benefit. We pointed out the iniquity of the existing law, and drew the attention of our leading dairymen to the necessity of changing the law in such a manner that inspection could be placed on a more rational and modern footing. Instead of heeding our advice, a committee, without authority from the association, engaged a lawyer to draft a bill to be passed at the coming session of the Ontario Legislature. This bill was read before the dairymen's convention recently held in Listowel, and in absurdity and iniquity it far outwits the old law. It passed the convention without a dissenting voice. No law should receive the assent of the Legislature which does not fix a standard, not only with reference to the quality of the milk, but also with reference to the methods for testing the quality. The standard in present use, and which is to be continued, is the cream gauge, and the convention did not even halt to ascertain that no country, either civilized or barbarous, adopts such an irrational standard. It may suit the cheese speculators all right, but it may be industrial death to the innocent farmer, and no upright judge can be found who will convict a farmer under such a system of testing. Even if the milk occasionally casts no cream, there is no evidence of adulteration, no matter how strong the suspicion may be. The lactometer, either by itself or in connection with the cream gauge, is also unreliable, and may be the means of bringing many an innocent farmer into poverty and disgrace.

It is a very significant fact that, despite the acceptance of the above mentioned bill by the convention, a resolution was also passed accepting Prof. Robertson's scheme. That is to say, the convention adopted both the right and the wrong method of procedure, and which is to prevail we shall not undertake to predict. We accept Prof. Robertson's scheme; in fact it was our own proposition several months ago. Under this plan, when the cheese-makers begin to understand the correct methods of testing milk, they will see the absurdity of the draft bill read before and passed by the convention, and our farmers will see the extravagance uselessly incurred in lawyers' fees and worse than useless legislation.

We hope our dairy authorities will recover their senses before the Legislature meets, and assume the authority to rescind the action they have taken. There is no need for hasty legislation, and next season should be spent in investigating details for the purpose of establishing standards.

Ontario Creamery Association.

The annual meeting of the above association was held in Guelph, on the 17th and 18th ult. There was a fairly good attendance—a considerable increase compared with previous meetings.

Prof. Robertson delivered an address on "The Outlook for Creameries." One of the failures, he stated, was the lack of enthusiasm. The cause was worthy of more enthusiasm. Farmers should not be satisfied with less than 125 lbs. of butter per cow per season. Creamery butter brought an average of 6c. per pound more than dairy butter, which made a great difference in the income for each farmer, each creamery, and for the whole Province. In Ontario there were 900 million pounds of milk made into butter, of which only 50 million pounds were manufactured at the creameries. Another failure was when only half of the farmers in a given locality sent their cream to the creamery; twice as much butter should be made from the same number of cows, and twice as many cows should be raised per acre. The value of land would then be rapidly enhanced. Good breeding could be put into cows by good feed, and good blood could be taken out by bad feeding. The feed made the blood. Better prices could be obtained by developing our home market. Amongst the dangers in obstructing the progress of the creameries, was the lack of care by the patrons, the quality as well as the quantity of butter thus being reduced. These dangers could be avoided by agitation and education. Too much butter was made just to pass inspection by the buyer, not to tickle the palate of the consumer. Another danger was the lack of preparation against drought. Amongst the difficulties to contend with was the difficulty in getting farmers to take an interest in themselves, the raising of beef stock from dairy animals, a fear that profits would not be permanent, and a suspicion that some had axes to grind to the injury of the farmers. The creamery, he maintained, was here to stay. Amongst the remedies, he mentioned rigid inspection and ample instruction. Meetings of makers and patrons should be held, at which authoritative information should be disseminated, and the meetings should be reported. Home markets should be opened out, and winter dairying should be more extensively engaged in. The milk should be produced in such seasons as will give the greatest profit to the farmer.

A paper on the "Proper time to Sell Butter," was read by Mr. Thos. Johnson, a butter dealer in Toronto. The best time to sell, he said, was as soon as the butter was ready for the market and still retained its pure, rosy flavor, which quality was so much in demand, and the customers should be supplied with what they want. It should be sold from the factory at the best obtainable price as soon as a sufficient quantity was made to put on the market. These remarks applied specially to June, July and August makes, when the quality was so liable to deteriorate. There was less risk in butter made at other seasons. There was too much risk in holding back in order to speculate for higher prices, as no ordinary rise in price compensated for the deterioration in quality. His early purchases gave splendid satisfaction, after being shipped straight through to the British markets.

Prof. Robertson remarked that there were great losses entailed by all parties concerned when butter was held back from consumption. Farmer, maker, dealer, and consumer all suffered in many

ways. If there was absolutely no market, the next best thing was a cool place for storing the butter. Immediate consumption or cold storage were necessary to maintain our reputation, for the best article was in demand and we must be able to supply it. Our summer butter was not consumed in England until after November, so that we should cultivate a home market for our earliest outputs. Keeping butter at 55° Fahr. did not give satisfactory results; the temperature should be as low as 45°. He was not afraid that the temperature would be reduced too low, and the butter would afterwards keep well when exposed to higher temperatures in a warm climate.

Mr. Geo. Browning, butter instructor appointed by the Association, gave accounts of his doings, which were very meagre. His conduct as instructor was severely criticised by some of the butter-makers, and the flying visits which he paid to many of the factories were said to be productive of no results. Some makers boldly criticised his ability as an instructor, and he had few defenders. Out of the 40 factories in the Province, only three, he said, used the oil-test. This remark gave rise to a lively discussion on the systems of testing the cream, some contending that the oil-test was absolutely accurate and just to all the patrons—also that it could accomplish more work in a shorter time than the Cherry Churn, while others denounced the oil-test as inaccurate, although in other respects proving satisfactory.

Mr. R. J. Graham read an instructive paper on "The centrifugal system compared with setting milk for cream." He said he used the centrifugal separator, and operated it with a two horse power instead of an engine. He mentioned the following advantages compared with the ordinary system of raising the cream: There was a saving of time, labor, ice, building, utensils, etc.; there was more cream, nearly all the fat being extracted from the milk, and the quality was better, being free from foul odors; the cream was sooner fit for the churn, and the skim-milk was sweet, fresh, and in splendid condition for feeding calves or for making skim-cheese. The disadvantages were: extra capital required at the start, and the system was not adapted to dairies keeping less than 20 cows. Milk, however, could be gathered from surrounding farms to the same extent as gathering for cheese-making. The milk was drawn once a day; it was not tested, but he had cream gauges which guided him as to adulterations. He manufactured the skim-milk into cheese, which he shipped to the old country, and it netted him 5c. per lb. It required 16 lbs. of milk to make a pound of skim-cheese. It did not pay at this price, the cost of furnishings being 40c. per 100 lbs.; although the labor was not much, it would pay better to feed the skim-milk to calves. He obtained 4 lbs. of butter per 100 lbs. of milk.

Mr. Derbyshire stated that more skim-cheese sold in England for 2c. than for 5c.

Mr. Graham answered that he had netted as much as 9c. per lb. in the English market for his skim-cheese.

Mr. John Sprague, who also runs a centrifugal separator, highly praised the centrifugal system of butter-making, and contended that the machine would last 100 years with slight repairs; in fact there was hardly any wear-out to the machinery. He preferred butter made from sweet cream, it being of better quality, and