laws of the State in which the cheese is offered for sale. As well as being in violation of Federal Foods & Drug labeling and branding laws.

Right in this connection it is my opinion, it is extremely advisable to keep those who handle your cheese advised at all times regarding you manufacturing processes so that they will not make claims for your product or offer it for sale in states where the product might be in violation of that state's food laws, or that matter Federal laws.

Those are the two problems I want to bring to your attention today, because we consider them important for you in the industry, as well as for us in the department. Now the other two men have other problems they want to present to you.

NOTICE TO READERS

Mr. Weavers then received and answered questions from the floor; but since this session, known as the Council Meeting, is open only to cheesemaker members of the Association, we do not publish the discussion.

This is in keeping with our policy of the past several years and it results in a full, free and frank discussion. Members know they are not being quoted and are therefore free to bring any question to the floor and their own case problems if they have any.

This means that a member must attend this session in person if he desires the information and benefit furnished by this procedure.

PRES. KOPITZKE: At this time I am very happy to present Mr. Madler, the attorney for the Department of Agriculture. It has been a pleasure to work with him and I know he will have a message for us.

MR. MADLER: I have attended all of your sectional conferences telling you what I thought about the proposed legislation which may be submitted in the next session of the legislature. This afternoon I would prefer to discuss some other problems with you.

First, I would like to bring you the greetings of Mr. Button, the director of the department. He regrets that he can't be here. He just returned from a trip in the west and found it impossible to leave his office at the present time because of the work which piled up during his absence.
I thought I might tell your group this afternoon that we have every reason to suspect that the new federal standards for cheese will be out before the first of the year. Now I have no advance information relative to the federal standards, but I do expect that we are going to be faced with some problems because of them. One of these problems was mentioned by Mr. Weavers, that of branding and labeling cheese as made from pasteurized milk or as a pasteurized product.

Now in addition, you have the problem of cheese made from standardized milk. That is not the result alone of the new federal standards, but it is going to be a problem that must be discussed with the next legislature. The subcommittee of the legislative council has had a series of hearings and one was devoted to the matter of standardization of milk for cheese through the taking away of some of the fat so you arrive at a finished product of a desired fat content. The manufacturers of Italian cheese have had that privilege historically, the Swiss by statute, and it is contemplated that a bill will be before the legislature to authorize the American and brick cheese industry to have a similar privilege. I think it would be well for your group today to advise your officers of your individual feelings in the matter so that your association officers can appear at the next session of the legislature and speak for you intelligently, to say whether you want standardization of milk for your industry. I say that with misgiving because of the use of calcium chloride for cheese making. I fear some abuses. I hope you have them in mind when you take your action on standardized milk.

The other problem is one which I have discussed at the sectional meetings, and that is the matter of the addition of calcium chloride. I took it upon myself to speak to some of the cheese makers asking if they use calcium chloride and, if so, what results were obtained. I gathered this information: Cheese makers are using calcium chloride as a substitute for part of the rennet to save money, and some claim it improves their yield. I have said repeatedly that the addition of calcium chloride is permitted for but one purpose and that is to aid in the coagulation of the milk. Rennet is used for two purposes. It aids in the coagulation of the milk and aids in the curing of the cheese. This bill authorizing the use of calcium chloride was sold to the legislature on the theory that it was necessary to add calcium chloride to milk from certain cows at certain times of the year to make up for a deficiency in the milk. It was never intended to be used as a substitute for rennet. I bring this to you because it is going to be brought up, and we think definitely that the
quality of the Wisconsin cheese has suffered because of the abuse of that statute. Now that is as far as I can go with respect to that matter. You have experts in the field and I know the college has done a lot of work on it. I just bring the matter to your attention.

It has been our privilege to try to bring some of the problems concerning the industry which confront us in the department. I am not unmindful of the privilege of meeting with you in your convention here and will be here all day today and tomorrow.

Mr. Wilson is going to discuss the bonding law. I want you, Len, and the members to know we appreciate the opportunity to discuss these matters with you.

PRES. KOPITZKE: Tony is absolutely right when he said the law giving us the right to add some calcium chloride never intended that it was to take the place of rennet. It has been brought to our attention that some are abusing the privilege. Now gentlemen, we know that we absolutely must use salt in making cheese. Two and a half to three pounds is O.K., but if we used six pounds, it would be too bad. That is what is wrong with the fellows who are abusing this privilege of using calcium chloride.

PRES. KOPITZKE: Now the next discussion is on the bonding bill. I thought this was going to take a short time and we would get rid of the questions in the department and then we would discuss things as we see fit.

We are now going to discuss the bonding bill. Clyde has done a good job, a lot of you think he is a so and so, but I am telling you he has a job. When he doesn’t do exactly what he should, then Tony is on his neck, and maybe Mr. Button, and they ask, “Clyde, why are you so easy?” Then they go after him, and at certain times it is our own fault. You will send in a financial statement to Mr. Wilson showing that you owe the farmers for a months’ milk. You have money coming for cheese sold; you have money coming for cheese on hand and not sold and you don’t show that in the report. Well, he looks at the financial statement that you sent in and he sees what you say you have coming and what you owe, and he says, he is in tough shape. I can’t give him a license because he will cause trouble the next thing I know. Now that is just what happens. There have been 17 or 18 cases, and when you see those you go after Clyde Wilson and say he is not doing a good job. Now if you look at the matter percentagewise and consider the enormous size of our dairy industry, I think you will conclude that he has done a swell
job. I am happy to present Mr. Clyde Wilson.

MR. WILSON: Nine years ago this afternoon at almost this identical hour I was out on a field trip when I got a telephone call from the office to the effect that the legislature had at last passed the so-called licensing and bonding law. I was asked to come in immediately. I was told to drop all field work and come in and take over the administration of that law which became effective the first of the following January. Since that time I have been in your hair more or less and you have been in my hair. I see you have more left than I have so I leave it to you as to who has been in whose hair. (Applause.)

You know it has not all been peaches and cream and some of you have thought I have been pretty tough. Len., you summed it up in your introductory remarks when you said I have been between two fires. There is no kidding about that.

The sole purpose of the licensing and security act was to protect the farmer’s milk checks. It was brought out in the hearings that preceded the passing of the law, that in the previous year, 1938, farmers had sustained losses aggregating $300,000. You know of such losses and may have known of others. The orginal intent was to say, let’s bond all dairy plant operators and all dairies. We got to looking into the ramifications of commercial security bonds, and we found that if we insisted on bonds all the way through, the bond premium was going to amount to as much as the losses sustained in the preceding year. This was dragged through the legislature from February until October before enacted. It came through with options providing for bond or other security. A proviso was included whereby trusteeships could be created and then there was the option of the financial statement. The law has been amended from time to time and, I believe, the amendments have been for the strengthening of the law. If the farmer who produces milk that is delivered to your factory is not paid, the community suffers. If the community suffers, you suffer. It dovetails in together as far as you operators are concerned.

As I look at this program (refers to program of the convention) I see names here in alphabetical order which look almost like my file in the office. I presume at some time in the past 9 years you have had letters from me. Sometimes you have have resented it, and sometimes I have written three or four letters to you and didn’t get an answer. When that happens, I usually come back at you with something like this: If you were to write me three or four times and