

Model Dairy
Exp. Farm

WE LEAVE IT TO THE READERS TO SAY

"Who Juggles Figures and Facts"

AND WHO, BY THE TRUTHFULNESS (?) OF THEIR STATEMENTS, SHOULD BE ENTITLED TO THE HONOR (?) OF BEING CONSIDERED A DIRECT DESCENDANT OF ANANIAS.

The DeLaval Company advertise a "voluntary" (?) statement purporting to be from the engineer of the Model Dairy, in which he says "it took but one-fourth as much steam to do our work with it (DeLaval) as the 'United States' used." Such a statement is so ridiculous on its face that no experienced dairymen would doubt that it was **voluntary** on the part of the DeLaval Company.

We have hundreds of statements from dairymen who have used both separators, that the U.S. runs easier than the DeLaval and wears much better.

The truth is that Engineer Downey was never present when the U.S. was running, with one or two exceptions, when his department was unable to get sufficient steam to run so much as a Babcock Tester until very late in the forenoon. The work in the Model Dairy was done before he got around in the morning.

Now read what Mr. Van Alstyne, Supt. of the Model Dairy, over his own signature, says in reference to power in September, when the DeLaval was running.

"We found the power insufficient, and were obliged to put a cut-off in the pipe leading up-stairs to prevent the herdsmen drawing on our steam at times when we needed it for the dairy work, and as the weather became colder the latter part of September, this trouble increased to such an extent, that, one day with both burners lighted, we found our steam entirely out, so that we intended making a change before your machine was put in, and we were delayed a week in order to get the consent of the proper authorities, we then used soft coal, which did not give satisfaction, because it filled the flues of the boiler, and we changed to coke, which was eminently satisfactory."

Remember this was when the DeLaval Separator was running, and before the U.S. was put in. They could not get steam enough to run the DeLaval.

This "voluntary" (?) statement says further, "that the 'U.S.' had an expert to run it." He was in no sense an expert, had never worked in a creamery or dairy, or attended a dairy school or experiment station. The DeLaval did have experts to run theirs. Both operators were graduates and rank partizans of the DeLaval, and were angry because we objected to having unfair and prejudiced operators run the U.S.

A Few Facts Regarding the Machines Used in the Model Dairy.

The DeLaval Separator was one made specially for that work, but after the first period was sent back to their factory to be fixed over and improved, if possible, for a second trial.

The U.S. Separator was one taken from regular stock and used in our exhibit. After the first period it was returned to its booth, and remained there until we were requested by telegraph from the Superintendent of the Model Dairy to put in the U.S. to make a second run. We wondered why the necessity for tele-

graphing such a request, but telegraphed back we would comply with the request. [We learned later that the DeLaval was shaking so badly that it was not deemed safe to run it longer, therefore the necessity for arranging by telegraph to replace the DeLaval with the U.S.]

The DeLaval Separator is a top heavy machine, filled with 40 to 50 discs, and when they get out of balance cause trouble, if continued in use, therefore the necessity for immediate change when it begins to shake. They claim to run at low speed, but always, when in competition with the U.S., attempt to run at very high speed—sometimes more than 50 per cent. higher than they advertise to run. They know that their separator cannot run at high speed long, so run it at high speed only in tests with the U.S.

The U.S. is more substantially made, and does stand high speed, and runs longer and easier at its speed than the DeLaval does at its claimed lower speed.

As to the truthfulness of their other statements, we leave it to the readers to decide from the following:—

The DeLaval Co. state:—"The letter from the Model Dairy management and employees was written Oct. 21st."

Mr. Van Alstyne, Supt., states:—"The date on my carbon copy, as I gave it to their (DeLaval) representative, is Oct. 1st, and not Oct. 21st."

The DeLaval Co. state:—"The official skimming record of the DeLaval machine during its allotted run is .0161."

Mr. Van Alstyne states:—"The reading should be .0172, instead of .0161."

The DeLaval Co. state:—"The official skimming record of the U.S. machine during the allotted run is .0543."

Mr. Van Alstyne states:—"The average per cent. of fat left in the skimmilk (U.S.) was .0138."

Remember that Mr. Van Alstyne was the Superintendent of the Model Dairy, and that the above statements of his are exact quotations from letters in our possession signed by him.

Then, consider whose statements are to be depended on, his, or our "would-be competitors," the DeLaval Co., who are in an awful condition of mind, and squirming terribly because the U.S. did beat them in the Model Dairy, and are resorting to all sorts of schemes to break the force of the victory of the U.S. over the DeLaval Separator.

We will also call attention to one or two other of our "would-be competitors," the DeLaval Co., truthful (?) statements.

They say they received a Gold Medal at the World's Fair, Chicago, while in reality they received only a Bronze Medal.

They have advertised for over a year that the DeLaval Separator was awarded a Grand Prize at Paris, 1900, but now admit in their advertisements that this award was to the "Societe Anonyme Separator," which company exhibited at Paris a butter extractor, called a Radiator, and did not exhibit a cream separator.

For proof of our statements we refer to the official records.

VERMONT FARM MACHINE COMPANY

Bellows Falls, Vt., U.S.A.