whether I should but I like to brag about Minnesota. Mr. Lee
read a paper with which I agree heartily and I am glad I didn’t
spend a great deal of time in preparing a paper because if I had
I would have said very much the same as Mr. Lee did. When
you were singing here I made a remark to a man that I believe it
would be much better to continue the singing. He said, you
are not getting cold feet, are you and I said, no, when I get cold
feet a lot of you fellows would be freezing to death. It was
mentioned here today that Minnesota furnished nearly half of
the Navy butter, I am proud of Minnesota. Sweet-cream butter,
the kind of butter that you could walk up to the old cow and
look her square in the eye and not be ashamed of. I didn’t
intend to come and speak or start any revival meeting over here
because it is no use trying to revive heathens anyway. I made
my paper short boys, I think the chairman will like that, and
there are many reasons why I made it short. Any of you who have
had a chance to be Dairy and Food Commissioner in this state
will know the Dairy Food Commissioner is a pretty busy man
and I have at the present time a lot of commissioners over in the
State Capitol that I have got to keep on good terms with, other-
wise they won’t raise my salary and of course I have got to keep
on good terms with the Governor or he will turn me out of office.
Also I have got to keep on good terms with my wife and come
home often enough so that my children will know I am their
father.

THE NEUTRALIZATION OF CREAM AT
CREAMERIES

Address by JAMES SORENSON

When I received an invitation from your secretary to address
this convention on the subject of the Neutralization of Cream
at Creameries, my first thought was to decline, as I felt that my
opinion in this respect was already known to the men who make
up these meetings; again, I felt that a discussion of the subject
might prove of interest to some who have given the matter but
little thought in the past.

In discussing the neutralization of cream for butter making, it
may be of interest to briefly review the reasons why this method
was introduced and why some people attempt to justify its con-
tinuance on the present basis.
There was a time in the history of dairying in Minnesota, and I believe this is also true in Wisconsin, when there was no need of neutralizing cream before using it for butter making, but the hand separator came into use and, as a result, the centralizing creamery and cream buyer came into existence. No effort was made by these agencies to keep the quality of the cream up to a high standard, but the farmer was encouraged to ship his cream in any condition he saw fit, and the natural consequence was that the quality of the cream received by centralizers deteriorated to a point where something had to be done to save the business. The system of neutralizing cream then came into use, and has been continued up to the present time.

I expect many of you know when they first started to neutralize it was done kind of on the quiet. Of course finally it leaked out, they were kind of ashamed of it, well they are yet. That reminds me of a story of a young man, some eastern man, I don’t know whether he was from New York or where, but he made a trip up in Montana and ran across a young man he had known in earlier years, and he was asked, what are you doing out here. He says, “I am selling oleomargarine but don’t tell my mother, she thinks I am tending bar.”
There is no doubt that it would have been for the best interests of the whole dairy industry if the demand for good cream had continued, but the long distance buyer of cream would have found it most difficult to compete with the local creameries and the best argument used to induce farmers to ship their cream would have been removed.

It soon became evident, at least in the State of Minnesota, that neutralization of cream was directly responsible for the tremendous deterioration in the quality of creamery butter. The unwholesome competition of centralizers, in buying cream regardless of quality, forced many local creameries to take cream of poor quality, and the result was that dairymen, and others who believed in high quality dairy products, were instrumental in having a law passed which forbade the use of neutralizers. While this law is still on our statute books, it has been of little value in putting a stop to the use of neutralizers because, in order to convict anyone under this law, it has been necessary to station inspectors in the creameries to prove that the law was violated. Such procedure is entirely impractical when hundreds of creameries are operated within a state, and the creameries receiving low grade cream have continued to violate the law.

The State Dairy & Food Department recently secured a conviction in District Court against a creamery that had violated the neutralizer law, which at least indicates that the law has merit and that the Legislature was perfectly within its rights in passing such legislation. If it were possible to prohibit the use of neutralizers in Minnesota, it would result in a much better average quality of butter, because the centralizing creameries would be compelled to demand better cream, which would result in the delivery of higher grade cream at all the creameries in the state.

The real reason why so much poor cream is produced is that somebody stands ready to buy it, while if the market for poor cream was removed the production of this class of cream would immediately cease. Poor cream is generally the result of neglect and carelessness on the part of the producer, and if he found no market for his poor cream he would at once produce the kind of cream the market demands. The argument sometimes advanced that demanding a higher grade cream would discourage the farmer and force him out of the dairy business is not worthy of much consideration. If such an argument would ap-
ply to cream, why would it not also apply to other farm products?

It is generally agreed that it is quite possible to make a salable quality of butter from very poor raw material, if the cream is treated with some kind of neutralizer, and there has been no argument on the question of the healthfulness of the small amount of additional lime remaining in butter made from neutralized cream.

The greatest objection to neutralization is that a neutralizer deodorizes and removes undesirable odors which are often found in old and stale cream, and this is what makes the practice a most dangerous one unless the finished product is plainly labeled to indicate to the consumer the true nature of the raw material used in the manufacture of the product.

The practice of neutralizing and renovating cream used in butter making, without so stating on the label of the finished product, is extremely unfair to the producer of good cream and the manufacturer of high grade butter, and continued unfair competition of this kind can result only in still further damage to the whole dairy industry.

I realize that it is of little use to argue this matter with the man who is in the business of buying old, stale cream and who, by the use of neutralizers, manufactures such cream into a salable product, because he cannot refrain from viewing the subject from his own personal standpoint, and beyond this he is not vitally interested. It is simply another ease of the almighty dollar obscuring the view and destroying the good judgment and fairness of the man. However, I am of the opinion that some one else beside those who are reaping the benefits of the present unfair practices will decide whether or not the neutralization of cream shall continue and, if continued, what conditions are to be observed in the labeling of the finished product.

While I believe it would be for the best interest of the dairy industry to absolutely prohibit the use of any and all kinds of neutralizers, I am not spending any time convincing the Joint Committee on Definitions and Standards that neutralization should be prohibited at this time. But I have made an effort to show this committee that, in justice to all concerned, some provision must be made for labeling butter made from neutralized and renovated cream. If the man who manufactures butter from neutralized cream was inclined to be fair, he would never object to such a labeling provision. He insists that neutralization is merely a step in the legitimate process of butter manufacture, so
why should he object to the consumer being fully informed regarding this legitimate process. The manufacturer of high grade butter, who employs such methods as pasteurization and starters, would have no objection to so stating on the label of the finished product; in fact, many makers of butter are making a practice of advertising that they employ these methods. If neutralization of cream is in the same class as pasteurization, for instance, why should the manufacturer object to making a true statement on the label of his product for the benefit of the consumer?

It is interesting to note that the same men who advocate neutralization as an economical necessity are in the main responsible for the condition which brought about the economical necessity they so often refer to. Those who have bought cream of all ages and quality, and urged the farmers to send more of it, are responsible for the kind of cream that cannot be made into a marketable product without first being neutralized.

In conclusion, let me suggest that efficient federal inspection of cream is necessary to prevent the manufacture of unwholesome cream into butter, and if neutralization of old, stale cream is continued, the federal government should enforce a labeling provision for butter which will give due encouragement to the production of a fancy article.

It is my opinion that buying old, stale cream and neutralizing and renovating it, as many are now doing, and then palming the finished product off on the unsuspecting public as fancy creamery butter, is the basest kind of fraud, and it is high time that some kind of laws or rules should be put into effect which will place the renovating cream business in the same category as the renovated butter business, where it belongs, and thus give the producer and manufacturer of pure butter the square deal to which they are justly entitled.

**President Morrison:** "The Economic End of the Neutralization of Cream, by H. J. Credicott, Freeport, Ill."

**Mr. H. J. Credicott:** There was just one line of evidence I wanted to present on this and I have reduced this to writing in very brief form so I could present it just as I wanted to and wouldn't tire you with a lot of useless talk. This is the first time in twelve years I have read a paper.

One of my friends down in Illinois noticed the program and he says, well, I rather admire your nerve to talk neutralizer. I want to tell you gentlemen, it is not taking as much nerve to
come up and talk neutralizer as it did for me to come down thirteen years ago in the state of Wisconsin at your annual convention and advocate the churning of sweet cream. I had some high scores in Minnesota on butter made from sweet cream. I had sent sweet cream into the Chicago market and for nearly a year previous to that time I hadn’t turned out a churning of cream in the creamery which I operated which was not made from sweet cream. Mr. Moore was secretary of that association at that time and he invited me down to tell the butter makers about sweet cream churning and I got a red hot reception. I believe every creamery inspector and instructor in the state of Wisconsin was opposed to me. I am simply bringing this up to show you how times have changed. In this paper I have tried to bring one point out, the farmers’ end of it, and we have got to consider his part of it.

THE ECONOMIC END OF THE NEUTRALIZATION OF CREAM

H. J. CRECICOTT, Freeport, Ill.

The word "economic" is generally used in reference to the principles of successful business.

The three eminent gentlemen preceding me on this program have discussed the question of neutralizer, from the standpoint of the idealist with his rosy dreams, and of the scientist with his cold logic.

I will try to discuss it from the standpoint of successful prosecution of the dairy business. I count a business successful which proves profitable to those engaged in it and which is of benefit and renders a service to the State and Nation.

That the dairy business is rendering a distinct service to the State and Nation through soil conservation and the production of the most important of all foods is too well known and recognized to need any discussion.

That the dairy business is always profitable to those engaged in it is a mooted question.

The profit of a business depend to a great extent on the amount of labor involved.

It is this question of labor which has caused the use of neutralizers in cream.