

## In the Dairy

### For Aerating Milk

A most serviceable and convenient dipper for aerating and dipping milk may be made as follows: Procure an ordinary four-quart pail (with flaring sides) at the tinsmith's or hardware, remove the small handle and in its place put a handle made from four feet of stout fence wire; with a tin punch (or a penny nail, if this is not convenient) punch a number of holes about one-eighth of an inch in diameter in the bottom. File the bottom smooth on the outside for convenience in cleaning.

We have used a number of aerators and dippers, but this cheap one has given the greatest satisfaction of any. The pail is simply filled by dipping and raised above the can until it empties itself. C. M. M.

### Sampling and Testing Cream

Too great care cannot be exercised in the sampling of cream, and the testing of it. It is much more difficult to obtain a representative sample of cream than of milk, and it is equally so to prepare and test the composite samples. We do not favor the idea of sending the composite sample bottles around with the cream collector. There is danger of the bottles getting broken, the samples may become partially churned, and through frequent heating in summer weather they are likely to get into a very bad condition, a condition unfit for insuring a thoroughly reliable test. It is much better to keep the composite samples in a suitable place in the creamery and supply separate bottles for the cream-collector to bring samples of cream to the creamery in. This plan possesses the double advantage of affording the butter maker an opportunity of examining each sample of cream and of enabling him to keep his composite samples in good condition.

Some makers meet with considerable difficulty in testing their composite samples, on account of the mould that forms on and in them. A few drops of formalin—say 4 to 5 drops—put into the composite sample bottle at the beginning of the test period will prevent this trouble. We had this tried as an experiment last summer, in a creamery where they were troubled with mould in the samples, and the trouble disappeared.

The composite samples should be kept in as cool a place as possible, in order that they may be in good condition for testing.—J. W. Mitchell, Kingston Dairy School.

### Paying for Milk by the Babcock Test

The following are some further replies to our questions about paying for milk by the Babcock test. We shall be glad to have replies from any others of our readers who may be interested. Some of our correspondents have replied to the questions direct, others have given their views on the subject in a general way. All the information, however, is valuable, and will bear careful reading. The answers to the questions which follow are published under the name of the instructor sending them:

(1) How many factories are you in charge of?

(2) How many of these factories pay by test?

(3) Are the patrons and makers

satisfied where milk is paid for by the Babcock system?

(4) Where the "pooling" system is still in use, what objections, if any, are made toward paying by test?

(5) Would you advise factories to pay by the Babcock test?

Any information not covered by these questions that you may care to give will be gladly received.

D. M. NELSON, Kemptville, Ont.:

(1) Twenty-seven.

(2) Three.

(3) The patrons whose milk tests low always complain.

(4) At a number of factories patrons have voted out the Babcock test.

(5) Yes.

I am much pleased to say that the custom of tampering milk by skimming or watering seems to have become a thing of the past. The first year I had charge of this syndicate I had a number fined, and made the punishment so strong that I have not had one case in the past three years, i.e., (sufficient to have a fine imposed).

The farmers are taking better care of and delivering the milk in much better condition. The makers are taking a deeper interest, hence a great improvement in the quality of the cheese is the result.

R. W. WARD, Peterboro, Ont.:

(1) Twenty-six.

(2) Ten.

(3) Generally, I believe, they are satisfied.

(4) The principal objections by patrons are extra cost, and by makers extra trouble and work. A great many makers talk strongly against it for this reason. I believe if makers were honest and intelligent in this respect it would be only a short time until all milk would be paid for by the test, as it should be. To give you an idea, I had a maker come into my section from another and buy a factory. The factory had been paying by test with good results. The farmers wanted to sell. He talked the test down because he did not know enough to use it and said he would not buy unless they threw it but. Result—it went out. Until I got this

factory on the test, I had quite a lot of trouble with deteriorated milk.

(5) I would most certainly advise all factories to pay for milk by butterfat, as determined by the Babcock test.

L. A. ZUFELT:

(1) Twenty-four.

(2) Three.

(3) Fairly so, although other factories which formerly paid by test have gone back to the "pooling" system.

(4) The chief objection or opposition comes from patrons who send milk testing below the average, as they have to take less for their milk than when "pooling."

Another objection is the want of confidence the patrons have in the ability and impartiality of the maker in making the test properly.

(5) Yes, decidedly.

FRANK HEENS, Strathroy, Ont.:

(1) Twenty-two.

(2) One.

(3) Yes.

(4) Incompetent testing and the fact that high-testing milk pays more in proportion than low-testing milk. The makers object on account of the extra work and the constant "kicking" by some patrons when their milk tests low.

(5) Yes; I think it would improve the milk very much.

A number of important factories in Western Ontario that formerly paid for milk according to its fat content have thrown out the Babcock test and gone back to the pooling system. This, to my mind, is a step backward, and we should endeavor to ascertain the cause, and, if possible, prevent it, for I think we must all admit that paying for milk according to fat has a tendency to raise the quality and standard of that furnished by the patrons to any factory.

The trouble appears to be this: Some makers, I am sorry to say, are not careful enough in sampling, and keeping these samples, and properly testing and reading the per cent. of fat. Lack of knowledge also produces a lot of trouble here. Others do not wish to be bothered with the extra labor, and so discourage the test system as much as possible. Then

THE BIG TRUTH STICK

FACTS COMMON SENSE

SMASHES WORTHLESS SEPARATORS



**EASY OR HARD WHICH FOR YOU**

Put *Facts* and *Common Sense* to work on a Tubular Cream Separator and you know it must be easy to operate. Put *Facts* and *Common Sense* up against a back breaking, hard to wash, high can "bucket bowl" machine and you can't make yourself believe it is easy to operate. In the light of truth, the out-of-date, "bucket bowl" separators go to smash.

Which kind for you, the

Tubular	or	"Bucket Bowl"
Low Can	or	High Can
Simple Bowl	or	Bowl Full of Parts
Bandaged Gears	or	Exposed Gears
Self Oiling	or	Oil Tearing

Catalog O-292 tells all about Tubulars. Write for it.

**The Sharples Separator Co.**  
Toronto, Can. WEST CHESTER, PA. Chicago.



EASY TO OIL