

No. 1356

Library Ag. College N. M.

1 gift from Ill. Ag. Exp. Sta^r

Received June 23, 1892



SURPLUS

TO BE REMOVED AS

Surplus

Worn Out

Obsolete

Unbindable

Duplicated

AMSU LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, Agricultural Experiment Station.

CHAMPAIGN, MAY, 1891.

BULLETIN NO. 16.

EXPERIMENTS IN PIG FEEDING.

This article gives results of experiments in feeding pigs in 1888, 1889, and 1890. These experiments are reported in full or in part:

No. 60. Feeding Value for Pigs of Corn, Corn and Grass, and Grass.

No. 87. Comparative value of Soaked and Dry Corn.

No. 27. Value in Feeding Pigs of Droppings from Cattle.

No. 113. Apple Pomace, Methods of Preserving, and Feeding Value for Pigs.

Corn is the great fattening food for pigs in a large part of the United States. In eight trials in which corn only was fed, aside from salt and coal slack, pigs varying in average weight from 65 to 290 lb. and kept in pens or small lots without grass, gained at the rate of from 10.46 lb. to 14.73 lb. per bushel, 56 lb. shelled corn, the average gain being 12.36 lb. The rate of gain for food eaten, and the food eaten in proportion to weight decreased after four or six weeks feeding with corn only. The corn eaten per day varied from 3.41 lb. eaten by pigs averaging 65.58 lb. to 10.71 lb. eaten by pigs weighing 311 lb. The corn eaten per day per 100 lb. live weight varied from 1.95 lb. eaten by pigs fed 84 days and averaging 207 in weight, to 5.19 lb. eaten by pigs averaging 65.58 lb. In one case in the fourth week of pen feeding two pigs gained 3.21 lb. each per day—at the rate of 16.81 lb. per bushel of corn. This was the greatest gain per day and was also the best rate of gain in any trial. There seemed to be no constant relation between the weight of the pigs or the season of the year and the food eaten or the gains made.

In four trials, pigs fed all they would eat of shelled corn with blue grass pasture ate 4,216.5 lb. of corn and gained 905 lb., which was at the

rate of 12.04 lb. gain per bushel of corn. Pigs under like conditions, except that they were fed but half as much corn, ate 2,190 lb. of corn and gained 505 lb., which was at the rate of 12.93 lb. per bushel. Pigs in dry lots fed shelled corn ate 4,207 lb of corn and gained 790.5 lb., which was at the rate of 10.52 lb. per bushel.

After periods varying from six to nine weeks, the pigs which had been fed a half ration of corn on pasture, were given a full feed of corn, the others being fed as before. In three trials lasting four or five weeks each, the pigs which had had a full feed of corn throughout ate 1,796 lb. of corn and gained 329 lb., which was at the rate of 10.11 lb. per bushel. Those which had been fed a half feed of corn in the first part of the trials ate 2,075.5 lb. of corn in the second part and gained 462.5 lb., which was at the rate of 12.5 lb. per bushel. Those fed corn only ate 1,624.5 lb. of corn and gained 224 lb., which was at the rate of 7.44 lb. per bushel.

In two trials pigs fed soaked corn ate more and gained more than those fed dry corn. In one trial they gained more and in one less in proportion to food eaten than those fed dry corn. The differences were not great in either case.

Two pigs in a two-acre pasture in which three yearling steers were fed corn gained in 24 weeks 195 lb. In a second trial two pigs with like conditions gained 231 lb. in 31 weeks. In neither case was the gain large. In each case the pigs at the close of the trial were in good condition for full feeding and made large gains when so fed.

A trial of apple pomace as food for pigs resulted unsatisfactorily. The pomace kept well; chemical analysis of it showed an apparently good composition for feeding purposes; but the pigs ate very little of the pomace.

Experiment No. 60. Feeding Value of Corn, of Corn and Grass, and of Grass for Pigs.

Four trials were made during 1888, 1889, and 1890 to compare the results in pig feeding of giving corn only, and a full or partial ration of corn with grass. In one trial a set of pigs had no other food than grass. In all cases coal slack and salt were supplied. In the first trial the pigs were kept in pens one rod square, these being moved as necessary. In the later trials the pigs with grass were kept in lots containing one-quarter acre each of blue grass sod of ten years' standing. The pigs fed corn only were kept in lots as nearly as possible free from vegetation. The pigs were Poland-Chinas nearly alike in age and weight in each trial; but the lots selected for the several trials differed considerably, as shown by the average weights at the commencement of each trial, which were 45, 178, 128, and 61 lb., respectively.

The summer of 1888 was characterized by unusual drought. Grass grew little and was in poor condition in the latter part of the season. Under these conditions three pigs, lot G, with no other food than grass,

lost 27.5 lb. from July 20th to Sept. 10th, losing nearly all of this during the first 10 days. With full feed of corn these pigs gained 54.5 lb. in four weeks, which was less than the gain of either of the other lots in the experiment. Probably older pigs would have done better, but it seemed so evident that it is unprofitable to confine pigs to a grass diet solely, that further trials were not made.

During the same season, for the six weeks from July 30th to Sept. 10th, the three pigs, lot H, with a full feed of corn with grass ate 412.5 lb. of shelled corn and gained 114 lb., which was a gain of one pound for 3.61 pounds of corn eaten. The three in lot I, which received a half feed of corn with grass, ate 223 lb. corn and gained 59.5 lb.—one pound of gain for 3.74 lb. corn eaten. Three in lot K, which received a full feed of corn, but without grass, ate 430.5 lb. of corn and gained 97.5 lb.—one pound gain for 4.41 lb. corn eaten. By cutting the grass from a square rod of land adjoining the pens each time they were moved, 376 lb. fresh grass, containing 200 lb. dry matter were obtained. This shows approximately the quantity of grass to which the pigs in each of the lots, H and I, had access.

For the four weeks from Sept. 10th to Oct. 8th all the pigs were given all they would eat of new corn. Lot G gained 54.5 lb.; lot H, 64.5 lb.; lot I, 77.5 lb.; lot K, 66.5 lb. The quantity of corn eaten was not determined.

In 1889 the three pigs of lot B with a full feed of corn and grass, in eight weeks from June 17th to August 12th, ate 788 lb. of corn and gained 136 lb., which was one pound of gain for 5.79 lb. of corn. The three of lot C with a half feed of corn on grass ate 391 lb. of corn and gained 36 lb., which was one pound gain for 10.86 lb. corn. The three of lot A with a full feed of corn, but without other food, ate 668 lb. of corn and gained 90.5 lb., which was one pound gain for 7.38 lb. corn. For the four weeks from Aug. 12th to Sept. 9th this experiment was continued, with a full, instead of a half feed of corn to pigs of lot C. During this period lot B ate 412 lb. of corn and gained 81 lb., which was one pound gain for 5.08 lb. corn. Lot C ate 401 lb. corn and gained 91 lb., which was one pound gain for 4.4 lb. corn. Lot A, ate 354 lb. of corn and gained 60.5 lb., which was one of grain for 5.85 lb. corn. These results are quite noticeable, in that each lot made better gains, actual and relative, than in the earlier period. The pigs which had had a half feed of corn with grass during the previous eight weeks made the best gain. The pigs without grass ate less than those with corn and grass, but made a fair gain.

In 1890, in eight weeks, from May 5th to June 30th, five pigs, lot B, with full feed of corn and pasture ate 1,665 lb. of corn and gained 363.5 lb., which was one pound gain for 4.58 lb. corn. The five, lot C, with half feed of corn and pasture ate 842 lb. corn and gained 202 lb., which was one pound gain for 4.16 lb. corn. The five, lot A, with a full feed of corn without grass ate 1,795.5 lb. corn and gained 389.5 lb., which was one pound gain for 4.61 lb. corn.

For the four weeks from June 30th to July 28th, during which lot C had a full feed of corn, the same as lots A and B, lot A ate 772 lb. of corn and gained 119.5 lb., which was one pound gain for 6.46 lb. corn. Lot B ate 747 lb. corn and gained 130.5 lb., which was one pound of gain for 5.72 lb. corn. Lot C ate 764 lb. of corn and gained 165 lb., which was one pound of gain for 4.63 lb. corn.

The results in this trial were noticeable in that during the first period of eight weeks the pigs without grass made larger gain than those with a full feed of corn and grass and with almost exactly the same rate of gain for corn eaten.

The fourth trial was commenced Sept. 1, 1890, and continued 14 weeks, until Dec. 8th. For the first nine weeks the four pigs in lot B, with a full feed of corn and pasture, ate 1,351 lb. of corn and gained 291.5 lb., which was one pound gain for 4.64 lb. corn. The four in lot C, with a half feed of corn and pasture, ate 734 lb. of corn and gained 207.5 lb., which was one pound of gain for 3.53 lb. corn. The four in lot A, with a full feed of corn without other food, ate 1,313 lb. of corn and gained 213 lb., which was one pound gain for 6.16 lb. corn.

From Nov. 3d all the pigs had a full feed of corn. Nov. 10th one of the pigs in lot B was injured in weighing and was removed. In the five weeks to Dec. 8th this lot ate 637 lb. of corn and gained 115.5 lb., which was one pound gain for 5.51 lb. corn. The four pigs in lot C ate 910.5 lb. of corn and gained 206.5 lb., which was one lb gain for 4.4 lb. corn. The four pigs in lot A ate 498.5 lb. of corn and gained 44.5 lb., which was one pound gain for 11.2 pound corn.

In this trial the pigs with a half feed of corn did better than in any other of the trials. Those fed corn only showed the bad effects of long continued feeding of this kind more decidedly, than those under like feeding in either of the other trials. The weather was mild and the blue grass continued to furnish a fair quantity of food until the close of the trial.

A summary of these trials is given in the table opposite.

GAIN FROM DRY CORN ONLY.

A summary of the results from feeding 11 different lots of pigs in different years and at different seasons with shelled corn, without other food except coal slack and salt, is given in the second table opposite.

These pigs were fed as check lots, or means of comparison in experiments designed to test comparative value of other foods. The results with lots Nos. 1, 2, and 11 are given for different periods.

Among pig feeders in the central western states a gain of 10 lb. per bushel, 56 lb. of shelled corn, is commonly considered satisfactory. It will be noticed that in 11 of the 16 trials reported this gain was exceeded. Only four of the 11 lots fell below this gain at any period of the trials reported. The largest gain was 16.81 lb. per bushel by two pigs averaging 311 lb. in the fourth week of pen feeding. These two pigs had been on grass with access to the droppings from two corn-fed heifers. When

TABLE SHOWING IN POUNDS THE TOTAL GAIN, THE CORN FED, AND THE POUNDS OF CORN FED FOR EACH POUND GAINED DURING BOTH PERIODS OF EACH OF THE FOUR TRIALS.

<i>First Period.</i>									
No. of Trial.	Lots given full feed of corn with grass.			Lots given half feed of corn with grass.			Lots given corn only.		
	Gain.	Corn.	Rate.	Gain.	Corn.	Rate.	Gain.	Corn.	Rate.
1	114	412.5	3.61	59.5	223	3.74	97.5	430.5	4.41
2	136	788	5.79	36	391	10.86	90.5	668	7.38
3	363.5	1665	4.58	202	842	4.16	389.5	1795.5	4.6
4	291.5	1351	4.64	207.5	734	3.53	213	1313	6.16
Total	905	4216.5	4.65	505	2190	4.33	790.5	4207	5.32
<i>Second Period.</i>									
No. of trial.	Same as above.			Lots given full feed of corn with grass.			Same as above.		
	Gain.	Corn.	Rate.	Gain.	Corn.	Rate.	Gain.	Corn.	Rate.
1	*64.5	*77.5	*66.5
2	81	412	5.08	91	401	4.4	60.5	354	5.85
3	130.5	747	5.72	165	764	4.63	119	772	6.46
4	115.5	637	5.51	206.5	910.5	4.4	44.5	498.5	11.2
Total	327	1796	5.49	462.5	2075.5	4.48	224	1624.5	7.25

*Not included in totals.

TABLE SHOWING RESULTS OF FEEDING CORN ONLY TO PIGS.

No. of lot.	Time of feeding.	No. of days.	No. of pigs.	Average weight of pigs.	Gain per day.	Food per day.	Pounds of food for one pound gain.	Pounds of gain per bu. of corn fed.	Pounds of corn fed per 100 lb of weight.
1	Nov. 24 to Dec. 29.....	35	2	290.37	2.56	10.48	4.18	13.39	3.69
1	Nov. 24 to Dec. 22.....	28	2	284.37	2.7	10.34	3.82	14.66	3.63
1	Dec. 15 to Dec. 22.....	7	2	311	3.21	10.71	3.33	16.81	3.44
2	May 5 to June 2.....	28	5	153.3	1.39	6.07	4.37	12.81	3.96
2	June 2 to June 30.....	28	5	192.25	1.38	6.73	4.84	11.57	3.5
2	June 30 to July 28.....	28	5	223.65	.85	5.51	6.46	8.66	2.46
3	April 29 to May 27.....	28	2	209.37	1.4	5.34	3.8	14.73	2.55
4	June 10 to July 22.....	42	2	211.62	.9	4.81	5.35	10.46	2.27
5	July 30 to Sept. 10.....	42	3	65.58	.77	3.41	4.41	12.69	5.19
6	June 17 to Sept. 9.....	84	3	207.16	.6	4.05	6.76	8.28	1.95
7	Dec. 30 to Feb. 4.....	56	5	108.9	.51	4.13	8.08	6.93	3.79
8	Jan. 24 to Feb. 21.....	28	6	105.62	1.05	4.88	4.65	12.04	4.62
9	Nov. 22 to Jan. 4.....	42	2	209.5	1.3	6.55	5	11.2	3.12
10	Jan. 17 to Feb. 21.....	35	4	191.87	1.29	5.95	4.6	12.17	3.1
11	Nov. 3 to Dec. 15.....	42	3	120.25	.74	4.49	6.05	9.25	3.73
11	Dec. 15 to Dec. 22.....	7	3	137.58	.55	3.43	6.2	8.94	2.49

put in the pen, Nov. 24th, they were in fair flesh. Contrary to usual experience they made the best gain in the fourth week after being put in pen, gaining 3.21 lb. per day and at the rate of 16.81 lb. per bushel. For

four weeks their gain was at the rate of 14.66 lb. per bushel. In only one other case was this equaled in a period of four weeks. Two pigs, averaging 209.27 lb., fed from April 29th to May 27th, gained at the rate of 14.73 lb. per bushel. In no case did pigs make satisfactory gains after six or eight weeks feeding on corn alone. This is illustrated in the case of lot 2, which during the first period of four weeks gained at the rate of 12.81 lb. per bushel; during the third period at rate 8.66 lb. per bushel. The four lots, the gain of which is reported for first four weeks of pen feeding, averaged in gain 13.56 lb. per bushel, which was one pound gain for 4.12 lb. corn eaten.

The food eaten per day per 100 lb. weight varied remarkably—from 1.95 lb. to 5.19 lb. The latter was by the youngest and lightest pigs used in any of the trials; averaging 65.58 lb. weight. The four lots eating least in proportion to weight varied in average weight from 137 lb. to 223 lb. In two of these cases the pigs had been fed several weeks, the pigs eating less, although having greater weight than in the first part of the trial.

The food required to make one pound of increase in weight in these trials depended less on the weight and age of the pigs than on other conditions. For periods of four to six weeks the greatest gain in proportion to weight was made by pigs averaging 311 lb.; the next greatest by a lot averaging 209 lb.; the next by a lot averaging 153 lb.; the next by a lot averaging only 65 lb. The least gain for periods of six weeks was by a lot averaging 223 lb.; the next smallest was by a lot averaging 120 lb.

Experiment No. 87. Comparative Value of Soaked and Dry Corn in Pig Feeding.

Two trials have been made to compare the value of soaked and dry shelled corn for pig feeding. In each case four pigs were used, two being fed soaked, and two dry corn. The pigs were kept in pens and had no other food. The first trial extended from April 29 to May 27, 1889; the second from June 10 to July 22, 1889. In the second trial the pigs were well fattened when the experiment commenced. In soaking the corn about 8 gallons of water were used for each bushel of shelled corn. Sixty pounds of corn were put in the water at a time and left until all was fed.

In the first trial pigs fed soaked corn ate 315 lb. during 28 days and made gains of 35 and 51 lb. each, or 86 lb. for the pair. This was one lb. gain for each 3.66 lb. corn eaten, or 15.30 lb. gain for each bushel of corn eaten. The pigs fed dry corn ate 299 lb. and made gains of 29 and 49.5 lb. each, or 78.5 lb. for the pair. This was one pound gain for each 3.84 lb. of corn eaten, or 14.58 lb. gain for each bushel of corn eaten.

In the second trial the pigs fed soaked corn ate 505 lb. of corn during 42 days and made gains of 47 and 41 lb. each or 88 lb. for the pair. This was one pound of gain for each 5.73 lb. corn eaten, or 9.77 lb.

gain for each bushel of corn eaten. The pigs fed dry corn ate 404 lb. and made gains of 39.5 and 36 lb. each, or 75.5 lb. for the pair. This was one pound gain for each 5.35 lb. corn eaten, or 10.46 lb. gain for each bushel of corn eaten.

In each experiment the pigs fed soaked corn ate more and gained more than those fed dry corn. In the first trial they made better gains for the food eaten; in the second trial not quite so good. In the first trial the gains made by each lot were very satisfactory; in the second trial less so, probably because the pigs were fairly fat at the commencement of the trial.

Experiment No. 27. Value of Droppings from Corn-fed Cattle for Pigs.

In 1889, and 1890, tests have been made of the value of the droppings from corn-fed cattle on pasture as food for pigs.

June 10, 1889, two Poland-China pigs, one weighing 150.5 lb., the other 135 lb., were placed in a two-acre pasture in which three yearling steers were grazed and liberally fed with shelled corn. In 24 weeks, up to Nov. 25th, these pigs had gained 195 lb.

April 28, 1890, two pigs, one weighing 125 and the other 137 lb., were placed in the same pasture in which three heifers were grazed and fed corn. In 31 weeks, to Nov. 24th, these pigs gained 231 lb., one gaining 147 lb., the other 84 lb.

In 1889, three pigs with a full feed of corn on a pasture adjacent to the one used in these trials gained 217 lb., the average weight increasing from 180 lb. to 253 lb. in 12 weeks, from June 17th to Sept. 9th. In the same number of weeks the two pigs following the corn-fed cattle gained 117 lb. This is an average of 58.5 lb. gain for each as compared with an average gain of 72.3 lb. made by the full fed pigs.

In 1890, five pigs with a full feed of corn on grass, in 12 weeks, from May 5th to July 28th, gained 494 lb., an average of nearly 99 lb. each. In the same time the two pigs following the cattle gained 118 lb., an average of 59 lb. each.

The two pigs used in the test of 1890, when put in a pen and fed corn alone from Nov. 28th to Dec. 29th, made more rapid gain than we have secured in any other trial with pigs. During the fourth week of this period the two gained 45 lb., or 3.21 lb. each per day, with consumption of 3.33 lb. corn for one pound gain, or 16.81 lb. gain for one bushel, 56 lb. corn.

During 28 days in May, 1891, two pigs following two grass-fed yearling steers gained 44 lb.

Experiment No. 113. Apple Pomace, Methods of Preserving, and Feeding Value.

In October, 1890, fresh apple pomace was obtained from the cider press of H. M. Dunlap, Savoy, and placed in a large box made of matched lumber, with tight fitting lid. The box was filled, the lid was closed and

the box left in the barn until Feb. 21, 1891, when it was opened. For about four inches the pomace was rotten. Below this it was in good condition. For six weeks it was fed to two lots of three pigs each, in pens, they having shelled corn in addition. The pigs cared little for the pomace. They did not eat much of it at first and less as the time advanced. The first week 145 lb. was given the six pigs; the sixth week only 24. In each case the larger part was not eaten. The pigs had been fed corn only for several weeks before the feeding of the pomace was begun. A more favorable result was anticipated. Mr. Dunlap has found pigs eating freely of pomace for years past, apparently with satisfactory results, but no careful tests have been made. In his experience the pomace when thrown out in large piles in the open air kept for months in, apparently, good condition.

A sample of the pomace was analyzed by Mr. Farrington with the following results:

	Fresh.	Water-free.
Water.....	44.36
Ash.....	2.09	3.75
Protein.....	4.75	8.16
Crude fiber.....	12.72	22.85
Nitrogen-free extract.....	28.75	52.07
Ether-extract.....	7.33	13.17
Total.....	100	100

The pomace was evidently quite acid. The large percentage of "ether-extract" also indicates this. This acidity probably explains the unpalatability of the food. Its composition would indicate a good feeding value. Evidently the pomace can be preserved for months in a fairly air tight box without much change aside from a probable increase in acidity.

GEORGE E. MORROW, A.M., *Agriculturist.*

COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES TESTED FOR BUTTER FAT.

Experiment No. 122.

This article includes a record of observations made at a creamery where the patrons are paid on the test plan.

As farmers and dairymen become familiar with the fact that creameries can pay them for milk on its merits, they are anxious to patronize those creameries that adopt the test plan. They are also learning that they can improve the quality of the milk and increase the returns for their work by testing their cows and weeding out the unprofitable ones.

By keeping records of each cow it is soon evident that if one cow is paying her expenses, another one is paying ten, twenty, thirty, or more,

per cent. profit. A very simple account with each cow will pay well for the time required to keep the record. First of all, each cow should be given a number or a name. The record may include the cow's weight, age, and feed; and still more important as a beginning would be blank sheets containing for each cow, columns with the following heads: Date when expected to calve; date of calving; when dried up; number of days in milk; weight of milk given at each milking. Also an occasional test of the milk should be made and recorded during the period of lactation. Supplied with such important information and evidence as this the owner can decide, not as a matter of opinion simply, but as something clearly demonstrated, which cows should go to the butcher and which he should use for continuing his dairy.

The increased attention given by the dairymen to their cows has necessarily increased the number of creameries which pay for their milk on the basis of the number of pounds of butter fat instead of the number of pounds of milk. There seems to be a growing demand among patrons that creameries shall pay them on the "test plan."

It has already been proposed that a test of what is called a "composite" sample of the milk is sufficiently accurate and requires much less work and expense than a test of the milk brought by each patron daily.

This composite sample can be obtained by putting into a quart glass fruit jar, which is a convenient receptacle for this purpose, a small quantity of the milk brought by the patron each day. At the end of the week the jar contains a mixture of the milk brought during the seven days, and a test of this mixture (composite sample) is to take the place of the daily test. From the record of the pounds of milk brought by each patron during the week and the test of his composite sample for the week a simple calculation shows the pounds of butter fat supplied to the creamery by each patron, and for that he is paid.

The accuracy of one test by the composite sample, as a substitute for seven or more separate tests of the samples, depends, when made as detailed in the following pages, on the uniformity in quantity and quality of the milk from which the composite sample is made up; but, as will be seen, the method is sufficiently accurate for all practical purposes at a creamery.

In testing milk for the amount of butter fat it contains it is necessary to have the milk thoroughly mixed and homogeneous, and not separated as when sour, or when the cream has risen. The milk of the composite sample when kept seven days will naturally sour, and the cream will separate to a certain extent.

To make some observations on the practicability of the test of composite samples of milk, the following investigation was undertaken at the creamery of Gurler Bros., De Kalb, Ill.

Twenty patrons of the creamery were selected, and among them were included those who brought milk that varied most from day to day in quantity and quality.

First. The milk brought by each of these patrons was tested each day, the per cent. of butter fat, "test," and the pounds of milk recorded.

Second. A quantity of the well-mixed milk was taken daily from the large weighing can and used to make up a composite sample in three different ways, series A, B, C. Quart glass fruit jars were used for holding the composite samples, each jar being labeled with the patron's name or number.

To the jars of series A the same quantity of milk, one-tenth of a quart, was added each day.

To the jars of series B the quantity of milk added each day was governed by the number of pounds of milk of which it was a part; the same fraction of the milk brought by each patron was saved every day, but the fraction varied for different patrons. For instance, to jar B, patron No. 1, one-thousandth of the quantity of milk he brought was added every day; to jar B, patron No. 2, one-five-hundredth of the quantity of milk; and so on, taking in each case such a fraction of the pounds of milk brought that the sum of the seven fractions for the week would make about a pint of milk.

The purpose in doing this was to find out whether any error would be introduced by using one dipper in making up the composite sample from rich or poor milk in large or small quantities.

To the jars of series A and B were added 15 to 20 grains of a preservative that would keep the milk from souring. The preservative used was a mixture made at a drug store by the following formula:

Corrosive sublimate.....	2	oz.
Fine salt [Na. Cl.].....	2	oz.
Powdered borax.....	8	oz.
Aniline red.....	1½	dr.

This preservative is a deadly poison, and the aniline is put into the mixture for the purpose of highly coloring the milk and thus showing that something has been added to it, and so guarding against tasting it.

The cost of the quantity of this preservative used in each jar was a little more than one-tenth of a cent.

Into the jars of series C the milk was put in the same quantity as into jars of series A, but *no preservative whatever* was added. After putting the milk into the jars in series A, B, and C, it was thoroughly mixed each day, by holding the jar right side up and giving it a motion that caused the milk to revolve in it as if on an axis which extended through the center of the jar from top to bottom. This sort of a motion cleans the cream from the sides of the jar and mixes it again with the milk in a very satisfactory way. Unless some such precaution is used to clean the cream from the sides of the jar, a portion of it sticks to the jar very tenaciously and vitiates the results of the test. After the jars have received the milk for the day and it has been mixed, they are covered to prevent any evaporation. The temperature of the room in which the composite samples were kept ranged during the week between 50° and 80° F.

Table 1 shows the pounds of milk brought by each patron during seven days and the test or per cent. of butter fat in the milk each day.

TABLE 1. POUNDS OF MILK BROUGHT TO CREAMERY DAILY, FOR SEVEN DAYS, BY EACH OF TWENTY PATRONS, AND TOTAL. PER CENT. OF BUTTER FAT, "TEST," FOUND BY TEST MADE OF EACH LOT OF MILK WHEN BROUGHT, AND AVERAGE OF THE SEVEN TESTS. TOTAL POUNDS OF BUTTER FAT CALCULATED FROM THIS AVERAGE PER CENT. AND FROM THE PER CENT. FOUND EACH DAY.

Patron.		Day in April, 1891, when milk was received.							Total milk, lb.	Av'ge Per Cent. fat, 7 tests.	Total butter fat, lb., calculated from.	
		9	10	11	12	13	14	15			Av'ge Per Cent. "test"	Daily Per Cent. "test"
1	Milk, lb.	159	151	165	172	167	172	193	1,179	3.62	42.68	42.64
	Per cent. fat, "test"	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.7				
2	Milk, lb.	127	101	112	116	117	121	111	805	3.71	29.86	29.7
	Per cent. fat, "test"	3.2	4	4	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.8				
3	Milk, lb.	130	118	126	137	136	135	122	904	3.75	33.9	34.08
	Per cent. fat, "test"	3.7	4	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	4				
4	Milk, lb.	179	168	163	170	272	267	170	1,389	3.63	50.42	50.25
	Per cent. fat, "test"	3.4	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.8				
5	Milk, lb.	70	61	56	50	108	56	50	451	3.95	17.81	17.73
	Per cent. fat, "test"	3.5	4.2	4	4	4	3.5	4.4				
6	Milk, lb.	142	116	126	115	128	128	139	894	3.64	32.54	32.52
	Per cent. fat, "test"	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.9				
7	Milk, lb.	248	226	225	223	225	244	236	1,627	3.82	62.15	62.16
	Per cent. fat, "test"	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.9	4				
8	Milk, lb.	115	72	115	96	137	105	64	704	4.10	28.86	28.81
	Per cent. fat, "test"	4.3	4.7	4.1	4.2	4	3.6	3.9				
9	Milk, lb.	658	590	586	587	592	595	580	4,188	4.30	180.08	179.85
	Per cent. fat, "test"	4	4	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.4				
10	Milk, lb.	475	465	453	457	480	475	436	3,241	4.16	134.82	134.65
	Per cent. fat, "test"	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2	4	4.2				
11	Milk, lb.	141	143	146	146	177	151	152	1,056	3.96	41.82	41.78
	Per cent. fat, "test"	4	4	4.1	3.8	4.1	3.8	3.9				
12	Milk, lb.	183	178	179	180	182	190	174	1,266	4.52	57.22	57.28
	Per cent. fat, "test"	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.7				
13	Milk, lb.	128	130	126	130	211	184	125	1,034	4.22	43.63	43.58
	Per cent. fat, "test"	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.4				
14	Milk, lb.	159	153	134	152	148	155	127	1,028	3.77	38.75	38.76
	Per cent. fat, "test"	3.6	3.7	4.1	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.9				
15	Milk, lb.	128	111	102	111	110	112	97	771	3.82	29.45	29.43
	Per cent. fat, "test"	3.5	4	4.1	3.9	4	3.6	3.7				
16	Milk, lb.	212	217	210	191	213	266	190	1,499	3.77	56.51	56.41
	Per cent. fat, "test"	3.6	3.7	3.7	4	4	3.4	4.1				
17	Milk, lb.	197	202	206	211	210	208	206	1,440	3.63	52.27	52.28
	Per cent. fat, "test"	3.2	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.7				
18	Milk, lb.	108	98	106	...	141	98	105	656	3.71	24.33	24.33
	Per cent. fat, "test"	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.8				
19	Milk, lb.	106	107	105	93	...	105	74	590	4.11	24.11	24.24
	Per cent. fat, "test"	3.7	4.1	4.3	4.3	...	3.7	4.6				
20	Milk, lb.	256	237	250	224	408	255	203	1,833	3.95	71.40	72.07
	Per cent. fat, "test"	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.8				

ONE TEST EACH WEEK NOT SUFFICIENT.

The table also shows the variation from day to day in the pounds of milk brought by each patron and in the per cent. of butter fat in the same.

Although the quantity of milk and the test is about the same every day for one patron, these figures show that a test of the milk only once in a week may not be sufficiently accurate to warrant the adoption of a weekly test of the milk as the percentage of butter fat to be used in paying the patron for the milk he brings.

For instance, the table shows that the total milk brought by patron No. 2 for the week was 805 pounds. If he were paid for his milk by the test made on April 9th (3.2 per cent.), the account would show that he had brought to the creamery during the week $805 \times .032 = 25.76$ lb. of butter fat. If, however, the weekly test made on April 10th (4 per cent.) were taken, his account would show $805 \times .04 = 32.20$ lb. of butter fat as his weekly contribution to the creamery. That is, there would be a difference of 6.44 lb. in the total butterfat he should be paid for, depending on which of the two days in the week the test was made.

Another illustration of this is shown in the case of patron No. 9, who brought during the week 4,188 lb. of milk. If the weekly test had been made April 9th (4 per cent.), the weekly account would show $4,188 \times .04 = 167.52$ lb. butter fat. If the test had been made April 12th (4.6 per cent.) his account would show $4,188 \times .046 = 192.65$ lb. butter fat—a difference of 25.13 lb. butter fat in the amount shown by the two days' tests. This is shown in the following table:

Patrons.	Pounds milk for the week.	Per cent. Fat.	Pounds fat.
No. 2.	805	$\times .04$, "test" on April 10th,	= 32.20
	805	$\times .032$, "test" on April 9th,	= 25.76
	Difference.....		6.44
No. 9.	4188	$\times .046$, "test" on April 12th,	= 192.65
	4188	$\times .04$, "test" on April 9th,	= 167.52
	Difference.....		25.13

Table 1, p. 507, shows the total pounds of milk brought by each patron for the week, an average of the seven daily tests,* and the pounds of butter fat found by multiplying the milk for the week by this average test, also the pounds of butter fat found by adding together the amounts found by testing the milk each day.

To obtain the results in the last column requires seven times as much work as to get those in column next to the last, for it necessitates making a test of the milk brought by each patron each day. The small difference in the pounds of fat given in these two columns is due to the mathematical error from averaging percentages. If the test of the composite samples corresponds to the average of the seven daily tests, paying for the milk by using the composite test is practically as accurate and takes but

* The average has been found by dividing by seven the sum of the seven per cents.

about one-seventh as much work as calculating from a daily test the pounds of butter fat supplied by each patron.

TEST OF THE "COMPOSITE" SAMPLES.

At the end of the week the jars in series A, B, and C contained a portion of the milk brought by each of the 20 patrons each day of the week.

These composite samples were each tested and the results are given in table 2.

TABLE 2. COMPARISON OF THE PER CENT. OF BUTTER FAT, OR "TESTS," OF THE "COMPOSITE" MILK SAMPLES COLLECTED FOR ONE WEEK IN THREE DIFFERENT WAYS, WITH THE AVERAGE OF SEVEN DAILY TESTS OF THE MILK USED IN MAKING THE COMPOSITE SAMPLES.

Patron.	Average of the seven daily tests.	Per cent of butter fat or test of "composite" sample. Series A, B, and C.		
		Same measure of milk each day.	Constant proportion of pounds of milk.	Same measure of milk each day.
		Series A, poisoned.	Series B, poisoned.	Series C, <i>not</i> pois'n'd
1	3.62	3.6	3.6	3.6
2	3.71	3.8	3.7	3.7
3	3.75	3.7	3.7	3.7
4	3.63	3.8	3.6	3.7
5	3.95	4.	4.1	4.1
6	3.64	3.7	3.6	3.7
7	3.82	3.9	3.8	3.8
8	4.10	4.1	4.	4.1
9	4.30	4.3	4.4	4.3
10	4.16	4.2	4.2	4.3
11	3.96	4.	3.9	3.9
12	4.52	4.6	4.6	4.6
13	4.22	4.4	4.4	4.4
14	3.77	3.9	3.9	3.9
15	3.82	3.8	3.9	3.9
16	3.77	3.8	3.8	3.8
17	3.63	3.7	3.6	3.7
18	3.71	3.8	3.7	3.7
19	4.11	4.	4.	4.1
20	3.90	4.	4.	3.9

The milk had not soured in jars A and B, to which the preservative had been added. The cream had separated to some extent but was easily mixed with the milk by first giving the jar a circular motion that causes the milk to revolve in the jar and clean off any cream that sticks to the glass; and then by pouring a few times from one jar to another this milk that was seven days old was as thin and as easily tested as new milk.

In the jars of series C, to which no preservative had been added, the milk of the composite samples was sour and curdled; the whey and curd had separated. The butter fat of the milk was of course not destroyed; but a pipette filled with sour, curdled milk will not contain a fair proportion of all the constituents of the milk, and consequently such milk cannot be tested until it is thoroughly mixed and contains no lumps of cream or curd.

After some investigation I found that the sour, curdled milk could be safely made for this purpose as thin and homogeneous as new milk by adding to the sour milk about one-half a teaspoonful of "powdered lye" (98 per cent. caustic soda). This lye is sold by grocers in small cans for making soap by dissolving and mixing with grease. By the action of this concentrated alkali the acid of the sour milk is neutralized and the curd dissolved so that by pouring the milk from one jar to another it soon becomes completely mixed and can be successfully tested. The action of the lye on sour milk is hastened by adding it to the milk in small quantities so that the lye is dissolved. If one-half a teaspoonful of the lye is thrown into the milk at once, it collects together in a hard lump which is dissolved with difficulty. The whole process of thinning the thick, sour milk with lye is aided by warming the milk at a temperature of 100° to 140° F., and by letting it stand for an hour or more. The time and heat both help the solvent action. Pouring from one jar to another is also an important factor in getting the milk thoroughly mixed.

METHODS OF SAMPLING MILK FOR TESTING.

Table 3 gives the tests of the same milk from which samples were taken in two or three different ways, by a dipper, by the milk "thief," a small tube, and by a tube in the conductor spout (described in *Bulletin No. 14, of this Station, p. 462*). The last is perhaps the most nearly automatic, but in some places may be inconvenient.

TABLE 3. TEST OF MILK SAMPLES TAKEN FROM LARGE WEIGHING CAN AT A CREAMERY BY DIPPER, MILK "THIEF," TUBE IN CONDUCTOR SPOUT.

Patron.	Dipper.	Milk "thief."	Tube in con- ductor spout.	Patron.	Dipper.	Milk "thief."	Tube in con- ductor spout.
1	3.6	3.5	11	4.5	4.5
2	4.1	4	12	4.2	4.2
3	4.4	4.2	13	4.4	4.5
4	4	3.9	14	3.8	3.8	3.8
5	4	4.4	15	4	3.8	3.9
6	3.5	3.5	16	4.4	4.5	4.4
7	4.4	4.4	17	3.8	3.6	3.6
8	4	3.9	18	4	3.9	3.9
9	4.1	4	19	4	3.9	4
10	4.5	4.6	20	4.3	4.2	4.1

The results of this trial indicate that there is practically no difference in the methods of taking a sample of milk for testing, if proper care is used.

All the results given in this bulletin were obtained by the use of the Babcock "milk tester."

APPLICATION OF THE COMPOSITE TEST TO THE DAIRY.

This plan of testing composite samples of milk brought to a creamery by its patrons has the same practical value to the dairyman, who may use it in testing each of his cows.

Recording the weight of milk produced by each cow at each milking, saving a little of the milk in a fruit jar (labeled with the name or number of the cow), and testing this composite sample at the end of a week will furnish data from which to calculate the amount of butter fat produced by each cow.

The following record of observations made with five cows shows that the test of each cow made once for the week on a composite sample was practically as accurate as a daily test.

TABLE GIVING DESCRIPTION OF COWS USED, APRIL 24, 1891.

No.		Weight, ap'r'xim'te	Age, years,	Calved.	Expected to calve.
1	A young Jersey.....	650	3	Over 1 year ago.	September 15.
2	Belle, Jersey.....	800	13	April, 1891.
3	Med, Holstein.....	1000	10	Over 1 year ago.	October 31.
4	Jock, Holstein.....	1200	10	February 15, 1891.	November 31.
5	Med 3d, Holstein ...	800	2	March, 1891.

Good pasture was the only feed the cows had.

The milk of each cow was weighed at each milking, and these weights of milk are given in the following table. After weighing the milk from a cow it was thoroughly mixed with a long-handled tin soup ladle and a small quantity, about 1-20 of a quart, poured into a bottle; at the next milking this was repeated, so that the bottle contained equal quantities of the a. m. and p. m. milk from the cow. One exception was made to this rule. In the case of cow No. 2, the a. m. milk was not mixed with the p. m. milk; but each collected in a separate bottle, in order to observe the difference, if any, in the test of the morning and the night milk. For each cow there was a different bottle labeled with the name or number of the cow, cow No. 2 having two bottles.

In this trial the milk in each bottle was tested every day and a portion of it was also poured into a quart glass fruit jar labeled with the name or number of the cow. The table on the next page shows the daily tests of the mixture of a. m. and p. m. milk for four of the cows and the separate tests of the a. m. and p. m. milk of cow No. 2.

At the end of the week the jars contained a portion of the milk given by the cows every day of the week. This milk was sour and curdled, but it was completely mixed by the use of the lye as before described in this article. These composite samples of milk were tested at the end of the week and the results are given herewith, compared with the average of the seven daily "tests" of the milk from which was made up the composite sample.

These figures show that in this trial the test of these cows was practically as accurate when the milk was tested once a week by a composite sample as when a test of the milk was made every day.

TABLE SHOWING WEIGHT AND PER CENT. OF BUTTER FAT, "TEST," OF MILK GIVEN
BY FIVE COWS FOR ONE WEEK.

Date, 1891.		Jersey No. 1.	Belle, No. 2		Med, No. 3.	Jock, No. 4.	Med 3rd, No. 5.	
			a.m.	p.m.				
	<i>Daily weights of milk and</i>	<i>per</i>	<i>cents</i>	<i>of</i>	<i>butter</i>	<i>fat.</i>		
April 27.	Milk lb. { Night.....	6	11	5	21	13½	
	Milk lb. { Morning.....	5	11	5	19	9	
	"Test" of mixed milk.....	4.8	4.4	4	3.8	2.6	2.8	
April 28.	Milk lb. { Night.....	6½	10½	6	21½	11½	
	Milk lb. { Morning.....	5¾	9¾	5	18¾	9½	
	"Test" of mixed milk.....	4.4	4.4	3.8	3.4	2.8	2.7	
April 29.	Milk lb. { Night.....	6¼	11	6	23	10	
	Milk lb. { Morning.....	5	11	5½	19	9	
	"Test" of mixed milk.....	4.8	4.4	4	3.3	2.6	3	
April 30.	Milk lb. { Night.....	5½	10	5½	21	10	
	Milk lb. { Morning.....	5¾	10	5	21	10	
	"Test" mixed milk.....	4.7	4.8	4.4	3.4	2.9	2.7	
May 1..	Milk lb. { Night.....	5½	10	5½	20½	10½	
	Milk lb. { Morning.....	5½	9	5	19	9	
	"Test" of mixed milk.....	4.9	4.4	4	3.2	2.6	3	
May 2..	Milk lb. { Night.....	5½	9	5	21	9½	
	Milk lb. { Morning.....	6	12	5½	22	10	
	"Test" of mixed milk.....	4.6	4.4	4	3.3	2.6	3.2	
May 3..	Milk lb. { Night.....	6	9	5½	20	9½	
	Milk lb. { Morning.....	5½	10½	5½	20	10	
	"Test" of mixed milk.....	4.7	4.8	3.6	3.3	2.6	3	
.	<i>Total weight of milk for</i>	<i>the</i>	<i>week.</i>					
	Milk lb. { Night.....	41¼	70½	38	148	74½	
	Milk lb. { Morning.....	38¾	73¾	36	138	66½	
	Total.....	79½	143¾		75	286	141	
<i>Per cent. of butter fat.</i>								
Average of the seven daily "tests".....			4.7	4.5	3.97	3.4	2.67	2.9
Composite sample "test".....			4.8	4.6	3.95	3.5	2.70	3
<i>Pounds of butter fat, calculated—</i>								
From daily weight of milk and daily test....			3.73	3.30	2.80	2.53	7.65	4.10
From total weight of milk and average test..			3.73	6.10 3.29	2.80	2.55	7.65	4.09
From total weight of milk and composite test.			3.81	6.09 3.38	2.78	2.62	7.72	4.23
				6.16				

The table opposite shows the pounds of butter fat produced by each cow during the trial, as ascertained by using the daily weights of the milk and both the daily and weekly "test."

TABLE SHOWING POUNDS OF BUTTER FAT IN MILK PRODUCED BY EACH COW EACH DAY AND DURING THE WEEK CALCULATED FROM DAILY TESTS AND WEIGHTS OF MILK. ALSO POUNDS FOR THE WEEK CALCULATED FROM WEEKLY TEST AND DAILY WEIGHTS OF MILK.

Date, 1891.	Jersey, No. 1. Pounds	Belle, No. 2.		Med, No. 3. Pounds.	Jock, No. 4. Pounds.	Med 3d. No. 5. Pounds.
		a.m. Pounds	p.m. Pounds.			
	<i>Calculated from</i>	<i>daily</i>	<i>tests.</i>			
April 27.....	0.528	0.484	0.44	0.38	1.04	0.63
" 28.....	0.528	0.420	0.39	0.374	1.127	0.567
" 29.....	0.54	0.484	0.44	0.379	1.092	0.57
" 30.....	0.528	0.48	0.44	0.357	1.218	0.54
May 1.....	0.539	0.396	0.4	0.336	1.027	0.585
" 2.....	0.529	0.528	0.36	0.346	1.118	0.624
" 3.....	0.54	0.504	0.32	0.363	1.04	0.585
		3.3	2.8			
Total.....	3.73	6.10		2.53	7.65	4.1
	<i>Calculated from</i>	<i>the</i>	<i>comp'site</i>	<i>sample</i>	<i>test.</i>	
		3.38	2.78			
Total.....	3.81	6.16		2.62	7.72	4.23

Further Trials of the "Composite" Test.—The milk from these cows has been weighed every day and tested daily for butter fat; a "composite" sample of the milk from each cow has also been saved during the same time and tested every week. Up to date [June 22d] seven comparisons have been made with each of these five cows of a seven-days-old composite test with the average daily tests for each of the seven weeks. The temperature of the room in which the composite samples of milk have stood, has ranged from 64° to 91° F.

Space will not permit giving the tabulated results of these comparisons; they have, however, been as favorable as the one already given; in only one case did the test of the composite sample differ more than two-tenths of one per cent. from the average of the seven daily tests for the same time; and the average variation was 0.05 of one per cent.

By the daily test for butter fat of the milk of each cow, very striking variations are noticed from day to day in the same cow. The composite sample test, as here described, gives an average figure which is demonstrated to be an accurate one, and thus furnishes a method that can be used with great advantage to save time in testing cows, either in comparison with each other or for the influence of feed on the amount of butter production.

COMPOSITE MILK SAMPLES TESTED FOR CASEIN.

An investigation has also just been made to determine the casein in the composite samples of milk; and to compare this result with the average seven determinations of casein in the portions of milk which make up the composite sample. The results for one week were as follows:

TABLE SHOWING PER CENTS. OF CASEIN IN MILK; COMPARISON OF AVERAGE OF DAILY TESTS FOR ONE WEEK WITH TEST OF COMPOSITE SAMPLE.

	Jers'y, No. 1.	Belle, No. 2.		Med, No. 3.	Jock, No. 4.	Med 3d, No. 5.
		a. m.	p. m.			
<i>Per cent. of Casein in—</i>						
Average of the seven daily "tests"	4.02	3.6	3.3	3.93	3.07	2.92
Composite sample "test"	3.83	3.51	3.21	4.04	3.19	2.92

In all of this work on composite milk samples no preservative was added. The milk soured and separated; but when the test was made, a small quantity of "powdered lye" was used to put the soured milk into a proper condition for testing.

AUTOMATIC PIPETTE.

The automatic pipette (*see opposite*), for measuring the acid into each test bottle was used with good satisfaction. Illustrations of two of these pipettes were given in *Bulletin No. 14, of this Station, pp. 466-467*.

After extended practical use of the two, we find that the one given herewith is the best to recommend. By connecting the pipette with a bottle or carboy of the acid, measuring the acid into each test bottle is very much more convenient than by the use of a graduated cylinder; and the pipette seems to wear well. The inside diameter of the tube connecting the bottle of acid with the pipette should be 3-16 in.; the holes through the glass cock $\frac{1}{8}$ in.; and the delivering tube from the pipette to the test bottle should have an inside diameter of $\frac{1}{8}$ in., and an outside diameter of 7-32 inches.

It has been suggested by Dr. S. H. Peabody that a lead tube be substituted for the glass tube connecting the bottle of acid with the pipette. For making connections between the lead tube and the pipette, a rubber tube or hose with walls at least 3-16 in. thick should be used and tightly wound with copper wire.

STAND FOR HOLDING COMPOSITE-SAMPLE JARS.

Support two or more circular shelves, upon a central upright stand so that they will revolve. Make the whole movable. It will facilitate handling the apparatus to set the base of the standard on heavy casters. Put the jars for the composite samples on the outer edge of the shelves so that the labels for the patrons' names are in sight. When milk is to be sampled, move the stand with its jars near the weighing can, and the weighman can easily revolve the shelves until the jar he wants is within reach.

CONCLUSIONS.

The results in tables 1, 2, and 3 show:

First. That in this trial testing the "composite" sample once each week was practically as accurate as testing the milk every day.

Second. That one dish can be used for dipping out all the samples of milk that make up the composite sample.

Third. That it is not necessary to use a poison for preserving the milk; but that satisfactory results can be obtained by allowing the composite sample to sour, and thinning the sour milk by use of "powdered lye" when a test is to be made.

Any dairyman wishing to ascertain the value of any cow for butter-making can, with practical accuracy, make use of the composite test in this way:

Get a pint or quart glass fruit jar, with cover, for each cow to be tested; mark it with name or number of the cow; into each jar put about $\frac{1}{2}$ teaspoonful of powdered concentrated lye, or use the lye in the way already described on p. 509 for thinning the milk after the composite sample has been collected. Record the weight of the milk given by each cow at each milking; after weighing the milk, mix it thoroughly and dip out a small quantity, say about 1-20 qt., and pour this into the jar containing the lye. Repeat this weighing and saving of the sample as many days as desired; every seventh or tenth day carefully mix the milk collected in the jar and test the milk for the per cent. of butter fat it contains. This "test" together with the weight of the milk given by each cow during the time this composite sample was accumulating will furnish very accurate data for calculating the amount of butter fat produced by each cow during the time covered by the test.

It seems hardly necessary to say that the longer such testing as this is carried on, the more intimately acquainted the owner becomes with his cows.




FIG. 2.

E. H. FARRINGTON, M.S., *Chemist*

INDEX.

	PAGE.		PAGE
Acetic acid in ensilage.....	190	Apparatus—	
Acids, in ensilage.....	190	For measuring acids for milk tests.....	466,
Measured for milk tests.....	466, 467,	467, 514
Agricultural Experiment Station, Univer-	514	For taking samples of milk.....	462, 510
sity of Illinois.....	2	Apple pomace.....	497, 503
Acts of Congress under which estab-		Chemical composition of.....	497, 504
lished.....	4, 7	Methods of preserving.....	497, 503
Bulletins of, how distributed.....	13	Used in pig feeding.....	497, 504
Communications for, how addressed..	13	Apple, "scab" on.....	489
Governing boards and staff.....	2, 7, 9,	Sprayed with fungicides.....	489
.....139, 176, 288, 328, 388, 452,	524	Apple trees, injured by fruit bark beetle	
Information given.....	13	470, 472, 473
Limits of.....	13	Apricot, injured by fruit bark beetle....	473
Joint resolution of legislature concern-		Armsby H. P.....	303, 316, 413
ing.....	6	<i>Arrhenatherum avenaceum</i> , see "Tall	
Objects of the Station.....	4, 7	meadow oat grass."	
Place of organization.....	7	Ash, mountain, injured by fruit bark	
Relations to the State Board of Agri-		beetle.....	473
culture.....	7	Atkinson, G. F.....	472
To the State Dairymen's Association	7	Atwater, W. O.....	144, 145, 148, 152, 153
To the State Horticultural Society..	7	<i>Avena florescens</i> , see "Yellow oat grass,"	
To the University.....	3, 5, 7	Babcock "milk test".....	462, 510
Work for season of 1888.....	10	Babcock, S. M.....	292
<i>Agrostis Vulgaris</i> , see "Red top,"....		<i>Bacillus amylobacter</i> ,.....	188
"Air-dry" as applied to corn.....	44	<i>Bacillus butyricus</i>	188, 189
Alfalfa, compared with grasses and clo-		<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	188, 189
vers.....	484	Bacteria, general description.....	166
Vitality of seed of.....	30	Of corn disease.....	172
<i>Alopecurus pratensis</i> , see "Meadow fox-		Of fermentation.....	180
tail."		In ensilage.....	22
Alsike clover, compared with grasses		Bacterial disease of corn.....	165
and other clovers.....	485	Appearance in the field.....	167
Mixed with grasses.....	485	History of investigation.....	169
Vitality of seed of.....	30	The bacteria.....	172
Ammonical copper carbonate, formula		Treatment.....	174
for.....	495	<i>Bacterium aceti</i>	22
Used in spraying.....	490, 492, 493	<i>Bacterium lactis</i>	22
Analyses, chemical—		Barium butyrate in ensilage.....	192
Apple pomace.....	504	Barium caproate in ensilage.....	192
Butter.....	291	Barium propionate in ensilage.....	191
Buttermilk.....	301	Beimling "milk test".....	453, 463
Cream.....	299	Billings, F. S.....	170, 171
Clovers.....	148, 149, 164	Biology of ensilage.....	22, 177
Corn.....	68, 69, 92, 237, 315, 398, 413, 448	Opportunity for study and methods..	180
Corn-fodder.....	315, 448	Results.....	182
Ensilage.....	20, 190, 315	Chemical analyses.....	190
Corn.....	92	Summary.....	193
Fertilizers.....	120, 429	Board of Direction.....	2, 7, 9, 139, 524
"Germ meal".....	467	Powers and duties.....	7
Grasses.....	144, 145, 147, 148, 149	Bone meal, analyzed.....	120
Hays.....	150	Used on corn.....	119, 269
Milk.....	289, 294, 332, 334, 370, 457, 460, 462	Bordeaux mixture, formula for.....	495
"Oat dust feed".....	467	Used upon the apple.....	489
Analyses, mechanical, fertilizers.....	429	The potato.....	492
Annual reports.....	4	The grape.....	492
<i>Anthoxanthum odoratum</i> , see "Sweet		Buildings, rooms, etc.....	5, 9
vernal grass."		Bulletins, printing and distribution..	4, 8, 13

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Burrill, Thomas J....	138, 175, 194, 287,	Germination tests.....	43, 236, 398
.....	387, 447, 496	Harvesting.....	126, 448
Butter, American prize, composition...	290	In rotation experiments.....	266, 431
Creamery, from Conn.....	293	Planting.....	96, 125, 247, 249, 407
From sweet cream.....	293	Plat experimentation.....	38, 215, 393
Made at this Station.....	293	Pounds ear corn for a bushel, 1889...	273
Butter fat, see "Milk, Tests of, for but-		1890.....	450
ter fat."		Soil prepared for.....	124
Buttermilk, tested for butter fat....	335, 463	Fertilization of.....	124
Calories in corn-fodder and ensilage....	318	See "Fertilizers. Used on corn."	
Canada thistles.....	379	Summary of results of experiments,	
Extermination of 2½ acre patch.....	383	1889.....	272
Of small patch in blue grass sod...	386	Variety tests.....	38, 214, 273, 389
Natural enemies of.....	383	Classification of varieties....	47, 220, 394
Seed, how produced.....	382	Description of varieties.....	48, 220
Not produced in Illinois.....	381	Arleus.....	228
Spread by roots.....	382	Blakeway.....	223
Casein in milk, by "composite" test...	513	Bloody butcher.....	60, 64
Cattle tankage, analyzed.....	120, 429	Bonus Prairie yellow.....	48
Used on corn.....	119, 269, 428	Brazilian flour corn.....	221
Kentucky blue grass pasture.....	487	Burr's white.....	58, 229
Wheat.....	339, 340	Calico.....	60, 230, 231
Cherry trees, injured by fruit bark		Calico, old variety.....	64
beetle.....	471, 472, 473	Carle's prolific.....	56
<i>Clostridium butyricum</i>	188	Champaign.....	57, 228
Clover seed, germination of.....	30	Champion of the north.....	51, 225
Clover seeds, in a gram.....	33	Champion white pearl.....	58
A pound.....	33	Chester county mammoth.....	66, 234
Sown on an acre.....	33	Clark's Iroquois.....	57, 226
A square foot.....	33	Clark's 100-day.....	54
Cochran "Milk Test".....	333	Clark's orange yellow.....	57
Co-efficient of digestion, defined.....	142	Clark's premium 110-day.....	64, 233
Communications for Station, how ad-		Cloud's early.....	232
dressed.....	13	Common early white.....	59, 230
"Composite" milk test—		Common red.....	60
For butter fat....	504	Chester county early dent.....	232
For casein.....	513	Cranberry.....	231
Cooke, W. W.....	463	Dakota 90-day.....	50
Copper carbonate, formulas for....	491, 495	Dakota red.....	53
Used in spraying.....	491, 492, 493	Dammell's.....	48
Corn, corn and grass, and grass, value		Dresback.....	58
of in pig feeding.....	497, 498	Early Wisconsin white cap.....	52
Corn, dry, value of in pig feeding....	497, 500	Eclipse.....	229
Corn, field—		Edmonds.....	50, 223
"Air dry," water in.....	44	Ensilage.....	236
Bacterial disease of.....	165	Farmers' favorite.....	49, 234
Cultivation....	37, 107, 126, 254, 260,	Feeders' favorite.....	61, 232
.....	273, 274, 416, 419	Fisk.....	55, 227
Digestible substance per acre.....	413	Giant Normandy.....	58
Effect of different depths of seed-bed		Goddard's favorite.....	48
without cultivation.....	420	Gold dust.....	65
Experiments with....	37, 214, 389, 448	Golden beauty.....	56, 65, 234
Depth of cultivation.....	110, 260, 419	Golden rod.....	49, 222
Depth of planting.....	96, 249, 407	Gould Hill prolific.....	66
Effect of Fertilizers (Large Plats)		Gourd-seed.....	59, 230
.....	116, 267	Grange favorite.....	223
Effect of Fertilizers (Small Plats)		Helms improved.....	233
.....	119, 269, 428	Hickory king.....	63, 229
Effect of root pruning.....	111, 261, 420	Hill's improved 90-day.....	51
Frequency of cultivation....	107, 254, 416	Hiwassee mammoth.....	235
Planting in hills or drills.....	106, 415	Hogue's yellow dent.....	57, 228
Rate of growth.....	448	Hominy.....	67
Root growth.....	113, 263, 423	Howard's improved yellow.....	60, 232
Rotation, University experiments		Hugh's choice.....	58
continued.....	266, 431	Illinois premium yellow dent.....	66
Thickness of planting.....	98, 250, 407	Imperial.....	65
Time of planting.....	93, 247, 405	Improved Blountz prolific.....	63
Testing varieties.....	38, 214, 389	Improved orange pride.....	231
Testing varieties for ensilage.....	88	Iowa king.....	51, 54

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Kane county pride.....	50, 223	Yellow Blanchard.....	54
King of the earliest.....	50, 224	Yellow Clauge, 90-day.....	49
Kirby.....	56	Yellow king.....	62
Lape's mixed dent.....	59, 231	Zeigler's 90 day.....	50, 58
Leaming.....	54, 226	Water in, how determined.....	399
Legal tender.....	53, 225	Weather effects upon.....	45, 46, 219, 393
Log cabin.....	58, 229	Corn-fodder—	
Long John.....	66	Compared with ensilage, in composi-	
Madison county mammoth.....	66	tion.....	20
Mammoth club.....	66	In feeding heifers.....	302
Mammoth white surprise.....	235	Corn, pop, variety test.....	443
Menhall.....	62	Classification of varieties.....	444
Minnesota king.....	223	Description of varieties.....	444
Missouri mammoth.....	65	Blush.....	444
Murdock.....	48, 222	California.....	445
90-day white.....	51	Common white.....	446
90-day yellow.....	56	Dwarf golden.....	447
Northern queen.....	58	Egyptian.....	445
North star.....	49, 56, 222	Golden Tom Thumb.....	447
Ohio white cap.....	52	Maple Dale prolific.....	446
Ohio white dent.....	64, 233	Monarch rice.....	444
Old cabin home.....	235	Nonpareil.....	446
Orange pride yellow.....	61	Page's striped rice.....	445
Parrish.....	236	Pearl.....	446
Paulin dent.....	228	Queen's golden.....	447
Piasa king.....	66, 235	Silver lace.....	445, 447
Piasa pet.....	67	Snowball.....	445
Piasa pride.....	64	White rice.....	445
Piasa queen.....	234	Wisconsin prolific.....	445
Prairie queen.....	48, 56, 222	Corn, soaked and dry, comparative	
Pride of Missouri.....	65	value of in pig feeding.....	497, 502
Pride of the north.....	224	Corn, sweet, variety tests.....	128, 274, 432
Princeton.....	52, 224	Classification.....	128, 274, 432, 435
Queen of the prairie.....	48, 222	Description of varieties.....	128, 275, 434
Queen's golden.....	65	Adams.....	437
Ridott pride.....	227	Adams early.....	130
Riley's favorite.....	55, 228	Albany.....	439
Ripley 120-day.....	58	Albany sugar.....	131, 439
Rural heavy dent.....	62	Amber cream.....	136, 443
St. Charles.....	66	Amber cream sweet.....	136
St. Charles improved.....	66	Asylum.....	440
St. Clair.....	66	Asylum sugar.....	133
Seeknofurther.....	55, 227	Ballard's extra early.....	130, 438
Shoe peg.....	67	Black Mexican.....	133, 440
Sibley's pride of the north.....	49	Black Mexican sugar.....	133, 440
Smedley.....	227	Black Mexican sweet.....	133, 440
Smith's favorite.....	58	Black sugar.....	280, 440
Smith's mixed dent.....	52, 225	Boston market.....	439
Smith's surprise.....	56	Breck's premier.....	131, 434
Smith's white dent.....	52	Burbank's.....	434
Southern Queen.....	56	Burbank's early.....	275, 434
Steward's improved yellow.....	62, 233	Burbank's early Maine.....	437
Strawberry.....	64	Burlington hybrid.....	436
Swengel corn.....	61, 232	Chicago market.....	130, 438
True Leaming.....	226	Concord.....	439
Turkey.....	50	Cory.....	130, 438
Victor Blanchard.....	62	Cory early sugar.....	130, 438
White cap.....	52, 224	Creedmoor.....	279, 441
White dent.....	63	Crosby.....	437
White gourd seed.....	233	Crosby's early.....	129, 437
White Hunt.....	63	Crosby's early sugar.....	129, 437
White pearl.....	230	Darling.....	131, 436
White queen.....	58	Darling's sugar.....	134, 441
White Wabash.....	52	Dolly Dutton.....	434
Will's 90-day.....	48	Dolly Dutton Sugar.....	129
Wisconsin white dent.....	225	Dreer's.....	437
Wisconsin yellow dent.....	222	Dreer's first of all.....	437
Woodworth 80 day.....	52	Durkee.....	277, 436
Woodworth yellow dent.....	223	Earliest Rockford market.....	438

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Early Adams.....	133, 278, 437	Marblehead sugar.....	130, 438
Early bonanza.....	278, 439	Maule's mammoth.....	441
Early Boston market.....	276, 436	Maule's XX sugar.....	439
Early Boynton.....	276, 434	Minnesota.....	434
Early Concord sugar.....	131, 439	Moore's early Concord.....	131, 439
Early conqueror.....	439	Narragansett.....	438
Early Cory.....	130, 438	Ne plus ultra.....	443
Early Des Moines.....	277, 437	New Cory.....	130, 438
Early 8-rowed.....	134, 441	New England 8-rowed.....	279, 441
Early La Crosse.....	277	New England orange.....	277
Early Landreth market.....	129, 437	Northern pedigree.....	136, 275, 434
Early large red cob Perry's.....	440	No. 48.....	277, 438
Early mammoth.....	280, 441	Old Colony.....	135, 442
Early mammoth sugar.....	134, 441	Original Crosby.....	276, 436
Early Minnesota.....	129, 434	Pee and kay.....	132, 439
Early orange.....	434, 438	Perry's.....	439
Early orange sugar.....	128	Perry's hybrid.....	131, 134, 439
Early orange sweet.....	133, 438	Potter's excelsior.....	135, 442
Early red cob.....	440	Pratt's early.....	275, 434
Early red Narragansett.....	130, 438	Red cob.....	440
Early Rockford market.....	277	Red cob sugar.....	133, 440
Early southern.....	437	Rochester 8 rowed.....	279, 441
Early southern sugar.....	278	Roslyn.....	442
Early sugar.....	134	Roslyn hybrid.....	135, 278, 442
Early sweet or sugar.....	129, 436	Roslyn hybrid sweet.....	135
Egyptian.....	136, 443	Ruby.....	279, 442
Egyptian sugar.....	136, 443	Russell's prolific.....	440
8 rowed.....	441	Shakers'.....	439
Eruda.....	136	Shakers' early sweet.....	132, 439
Evergreen sweet.....	134, 443	Shoe peg.....	443
Excelsior.....	442	Simpsonia.....	442
Excelsior sugar.....	135, 442	Sonyea intermediate.....	278, 442
Extra early Adams.....	130, 437	Squantum.....	439
Extra early Cory.....	438	Squantum sugar.....	132, 439
Extra early Crosby's sugar.....	129	Stabler's early.....	132, 440
Extra early dwarf.....	276, 434	Stabler's early sugar.....	132, 440
Extra early Marblehead.....	130, 438	Stabler's extra early sugar.....	132
Extra early Minnesota sugar.....	129, 434	Stabler's extra early sweet.....	132
Extra early Narragansett.....	130	Stabler's extra early sweet or sugar.....	440
Extra early Narragansett sugar.....	438	Stabler's nonpareil.....	443
Extra early Tom Thumb.....	129, 278, 434	Stabler's pedigree.....	443
Ford's.....	436	Stowell's evergreen.....	134, 443
Ford's early.....	276, 436	Sweet fodder.....	132, 278
Gold coin.....	279, 440	Tom Thumb.....	434
Golden sugar.....	128, 131, 434, 438	Triumph.....	135, 441
Hawaii sugar.....	276, 434	Triumph sugar.....	135, 441
Henderson.....	279, 442	Triumph sweet.....	135, 441
Hickox.....	441	Western queen.....	277, 439
Hickox improved.....	134, 441		135
Hickox improved sugar.....	134, 441	Vitality of seed.....	281, 287
Honey.....	279, 442	Yield.....	137, 280, 283
Improved evergreen.....	135, 443	Cows, value of, for butter making.....	289, 329, 453, 454, 504
La Crosse.....	438		
Landreth market.....	437	Cream, acidity of, as affecting yield of butter.....	298
Landreth sugar.....	133, 442	Crimson trefoil, compared with other clovers.....	485
Large early 8-rowed sweet.....	134, 441	Vitality of seed of.....	30
Large 8 rowed.....	134, 441	Crude ash, defined.....	142
Large excelsior.....	442	Crude fat, defined.....	142
Late mammoth.....	136, 441	Crude fiber, defined.....	142
Leet's.....	436	Crude protein, defined.....	142
Leet's early.....	277, 436	<i>Dactylis glomerata</i> , see "Orchard grass."	
Little gem.....	443	Dairy cows, records of.....	504
Livingston's evergreen.....	133, 440	Disease germs.....	166
Mammoth.....	280, 441	Dissolved bone-black, analyzed.....	120
Mammoth early.....	278, 441	Used on corn.....	
Mammoth sugar.....	136, 280, 441 116, 119, 266, 267, 269, 428, 431	
Marblehead.....	438		
Marblehead early.....	130, 438		
Marblehead mammoth.....	278, 441		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Droppings from corn-fed cattle, value of,		Sown on an acre.....	33
for pigs.....	497, 503	On a square foot.....	33
Duplicate plats, in corn experiments.....	38, 215, 393	Vitality of.....	30, 478
In oat experiments.....	361	Gypsum, used on Kentucky blue grass	
<i>Eau Celeste</i> , formulas for.....	495	pasture.....	487
Used on the apple.....	489	Hagen, H. A.....	472
The grape.....	492	Hamilton, John.....	472
The potato.....	492	Hard fescue, compared with other grasses	483
Elm, injured by fruit bark beetle.....	473	Vitality of seed of.....	30
Endicott, Geo. W.....	470	"Hatch Act".....	4
Eureka sprayer.....	495	Hay and grain, in feeding young cattle.....	324
Failyer & Willard "Milk Test".....	333	Hays, comparison of.....	150
Farrington, E. H. 319, 336, 377, 468, 515		Hawthorn, injured by fruit bark beetle.....	473
Fermentation.....	177	Heifers, Shorthorns, fed ensilage.....	19, 302
In ensilage.....	23	Heifers, yearlings, fed ensilage and corn-	
Fertilizers, analyses of, chemical.....	120, 429	fodder.....	302
Mechanical.....	429	Food given and eaten.....	304
Used on corn. 116, 119, 124, 267, 269,		Analyses of.....	315
274, 428, 431		How grown and harvested.....	304
Kentucky blue grass pasture.....	487	Method of feeding.....	305
Wheat.....	337, 338	Pounds of food to make pound of live	
<i>Festuca duriuscula</i> , see "Hard fescue."		increase.....	314
<i>Festuca ovina</i> , see "Sheep's fescue."		Water consumed.....	310
<i>Festuca pratensis</i> , see "Meadow fescue."		Weights.....	310
Forbes, S. A.....	165, 169, 171, 379, 478	Henry, W. A.....	18
Formula for fungicides.....	495	Hessian Fly.....	377
Frear, William.....	152	Illustrations.....	380
Fresh substance, defined.....	142	Life history.....	377
Fruit bark beetle.....	469	Preventive and remedial measures.....	379
Accounts of, in Europe.....	473	Hickory trees, injured by fruit bark beetle.....	472
Description of.....	476	Hog tankage, analyzed.....	120, 429
History of, in Illinois.....	470	Used on corn.....	116, 119, 267, 428
In United States at large.....	472	Hogs following cattle fed grass and	
Illustrations.....	Facing 476	grain.....	319, 322
Injuries by, to vegetation.....	473	Hunt, Thomas, F.....	15, 35, 127,
Life history and remedies.....	472, 473, 477	164, 213, 272, 314, 352, 370, 432, 489	
Parasites upon.....	473, 478	Italian rye grass, compared with other	
Fry, G.....	182	grasses.....	483
Funds for maintenance of Station.....	5	Vitality of seed of.....	30
Held by University Treasurer.....	5, 8	Jenkins, E. H.....	151, 152, 292, 293
Fungi.....	180	Jordan, W. H. 144, 145, 147, 148, 152, 153	
In ensilage.....	189	Kentucky blue grass—	
Fungicides, use of, on the apple.....	489	Cut at different dates.....	145
On the grape.....	492	Composition, proximate.....	145, 155
On the potato.....	492	Digestible organic substance.....	146, 161
<i>Fusicladium dendriticum</i> , on the apple.....	489	Yield.....	146, 158
Gases in the silo.....	193	Hay, compared with other hays.....	
Geneva germination apparatus.....	30	150, 163, 164
Germination tests, of field corn. 43, 236, 398		Pastures, effect of fertilizers on.....	487
Of grasses and clovers.....	30, 278	Used in feeding experiment.....	319
Of sweet corn.....	281, 287	Seed, vitality of.....	30, 479
Goessman, C. A.....	147, 152	Kuhn, Julius.....	153
Goedrich, Theodore.....	469	Lactic acid in ensilage.....	190
Grain with hay for young cattle.....	324	Lactoscope.....	294
Grain with pasture for young cattle. 319, 323		Ladd, E. F.....	144, 147, 152, 153
Grape, black rot on.....	492	Lands.....	9
Sprayed with fungicides for.....	492	<i>Lolium perenne</i> , see "Perennial rye	
Grass, and grass with corn, value of, in		grass."	
pig feeding.....	497, 498	<i>Lolium italicum</i> , see "Italian rye grass."	
Grass for young cattle, see "Pasture,		Lye, concentrated, used in "composite"	
Value of".....		tests of milk.....	510, 514, 515
Grasses and clovers, effect of ripeness on		McCluer, George W.....	138, 287, 447, 496
yield and composition.....	141	Mammoth red clover—	
Water in green substance.....	149, 164	Compared with other clovers and	
Lost in curing.....	149, 164	grasses.....	484
Grass seeds, in a gram.....	33	Cut at different dates.....	148
A pound.....	33	Composition, proximate.....	148, 157
Germinating on a square foot.....	33	Digestible organic substance.....	149, 160
		Yield.....	149, 162

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Hay, compared with other hays.....	150, 163, 164	Methods of using.....	334, 461
In rotation experiments.....	266, 431	Mixtures of grasses and clovers tested....	485
Mixed with other grasses.....	485	Morrow, Geo. E.....	35, 127, 274, 293, 325, 370, 375, 377, 432, 450, 451, 489, 504
Seed, vitality of.....	30	Mucor, in ensilage.....	189
Water in fresh substance.....	164	Muriate of potash, analyzed.....	120, 429
Lost in curing.....	164	Used on corn.....	116, 119, 266, 267, 269, 428, 431
Mannite in ensilage.....	192	Kentucky blue grass pasture.....	487
Manns, Albert G.....	193, 302	Wheat.....	338, 339, 340
Marten, John.....	383, 470	<i>Mycoderma vini</i> , Pasteur.....	183
Meadow fescue—		Myers, John A.....	301
Compared with other grasses and clovers.....	483	Nitrate of soda, analyzed.....	120, 429
Cut at different dates.....	147	Used on corn.....	119, 269, 428
Composition, proximate.....	147, 156	Grass lands.....	487
Digestible organic substance.....	162	Wheat.....	338, 339, 340
Yield.....	147, 159	Nitrogen-free extract, defined.....	142
Hay, compared with other hays..	150, 163	Nutritive ratio, defined.....	143, 319
Meadow foxtail, compared with other grasses.....	484	"Oat dust feed," analysis of.....	467
Seed, vitality of.....	30	Oats—	
<i>Medicago sativa</i> , see "Alfalfa."		Duplicate plats of.....	361
Medium red clover—		Field experiments with—	
Compared with other clovers and grasses.....	484, 485	Compact or loose seed-bed.....	26, 195, 355
Cut at different dates.....	147	Depth of sowing.....	27, 196, 357
Composition, proximate.....	148, 156	Effect of sowing spring wheat with.....	358
Digestible organic substance.....	148, 163	In 1888.....	25
Yield.....	148, 162	Summary.....	29
Hay, compared with other hays.....	150, 163, 164	In 1889.....	194
In rotation experiments.....	266, 431	Summary.....	212
Mixed with grasses.....	485	In 1890.....	353
Seed, vitality of.....	30	Quantity of seed per acre.....	25, 194, 354
Water in fresh substance.....	164	Tests of varieties.....	197, 360
Lost in curing.....	164	Time of sowing.....	26, 195, 356
Miles, Manly.....	22, 182	Germination in field, 1888.....	28
Milk—		In rotation experiments.....	266, 431
"Composite" tests of.....	504	Purity of seed.....	201, 363
At the creamery.....	505	Stooling.....	28
At the dairy.....	510	Varieties, classified as to time of ripening.....	198
Compared with daily.....	504, 508	Described.....	198
Methods of making.....	505, 510	American banner.....	199
Paying for by the pound.....	293, 329, 460	American triumph.....	200
By the pounds of butter fat.....	293, 296, 461, 504, 506	Badger queen.....	198
Samples for testing, methods of taking.....	461, 509, 510	Black prolific.....	199
Apparatus for.....	462, 510	Black Russian.....	199
"Composite".....	504	Black Tartarian.....	200
Preservative for.....	506	Canadian black.....	200
Tests of, for butter fat.....	289, 293	Centennial.....	199
From cows of different breeds.....	290, 370	Clydesdale.....	199
From cows in herds.....	296, 331, 453, 460, 511	Common mixed.....	200
From single cows.....	290, 329, 370, 376, 457, 513	Early Dakota.....	199
One test a week not enough.....	508	Egyptian.....	199
Value of, for the creamery.....	329, 453, 504	Giant yellow French.....	200
For the dairyman.....	329, 454, 505	Hargett's white.....	199
"Milk tests," investigation of.....	293, 329, 453	Hopetown.....	198
Babcock.....	462	Improved American.....	199
Beimling.....	462	Japan.....	199
Cochran.....	333	New Dakota gray.....	200
Failyer & Willard.....	333	New red rust proof.....	198
Lactoscope.....	294	Pringle's progress.....	199
Parsons.....	333	Prize cluster.....	198
Patrick (Iowa).....	333, 462	Probsteir.....	199
Short.....	289, 294, 296, 332	Texas rust proof.....	198
		Virginia winter.....	200
		Welcome.....	198
		White Belgian.....	198
		White bonanza.....	198
		White Russian.....	200
		White wonder.....	198

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Wide awake.....	199	Vitality of seed.....	30, 478
Notes on quality.....	207, 368	Richardson, Clifford.....	144, 146, 147, 148, 152
Yield.....	202, 363	Riley, C. V.....	472
Synopsis of.....	200, 364	Rotation experiment.....	266, 431
Tests of.....	197, 360	Rough-stalked meadow grass, compared	
See also tables ..	204, 208, 365, 366, 369	with other grasses.....	483
Vitality of seed.....	201, 362	Vitality of seed of.....	30
Oat straw mulch on wheat.....	339	Russell, H. L.....	182
Orchard grass—		<i>Saccharomyces mycoderma</i> , Rees.....	183
Compared with other grasses and		<i>Saccharomyces Pastorianus</i>	22
clovers.....	482, 485	“Scab,” on the apple.....	489
Cut at different dates.....	146	Use of fungicides for.....	489
Composition, proximate.....	147, 155	Schmidberger, J.....	473
Digestible organic substance.....	147, 162	Schwarz, E. A.....	472
Yield.....	159	<i>Scolytus rugulosus</i> , Ratz.....	469
Hay, compared with other hays.....		Illustrations.....	Facing 476
.....	150, 163, 164	Scovell, M. A.....	145, 146, 152, 292
Mixed with clovers.....	485	Sheep's fescue, compared with other	
Seed, vitality of.....	30	grasses.....	483
Water in fresh substance.....	164	Vitality of seed of.....	30
Lost in curing.....	164	Short “milk test”.....	289, 294, 296, 332
Osborn, Herbert.....	472	Silage, biology of.....	22, 177
Palmetic acid, in ensilage.....	191	Silage, experiment of 1887-8.....	15
Parasites on the fruit bark beetle.....	473, 478	Biology of.....	22
Parson's “milk test”.....	333	Chemical composition of, and of corn	
Pasteur, L.....	178	fodder.....	20
Pasture, Kentucky blue grass, fertilizers		Condition when silo was opened	17
on.....	487	Better next boards than next stone or	
Pasture with grain ration, for young		brick walls.....	17
cattle.....	319, 323	Fed to cattle, mixed lot.....	18
Pasture, value of, for young cattle.....	319, 322	To Shorthorn heifers.....	19
Patrick (Iowa) “milk test”.....	333, 462	The silo.....	15
Peabody, Selim H.....	13	Capacity.....	15
Peach trees, injured by fruit bark beetle		Filling.....	15
.....	471, 472, 473	Silage—	
<i>Pencilium</i> , in ensilage.....	189	Fermentation.....	23, 183
Perennial rye grass, vitality of the seed.....	30	Skim milk, tested for butter fat....	333, 463
<i>Phleum pratense</i> , see “Timothy.”		“Smut”.....	166
<i>Phylospora Bidwelli</i> , on the grape....	492	Sodium acetate, in ensilage.....	191
Spraying with fungicides.....	492	Soil of experiment farm.....	389
Pickles, T.....	471	Stable manure, used on corn.....	
Pigs, feeding experiments with—		116, 119, 269, 272, 274, 428
Apple pomace, feeding value of, and		Kentucky blue grass pasture.....	487
methods of preserving.....	497, 503	Wheat.....	337, 339, 340
Comparative value of soaked and dry		Staff of the Experiment Station.....	
corn in feeding.....	497, 502	2, 8, 139, 176, 288, 388, 452, 524
Comparison between corn, grass, and		State Board of Agriculture nominates a	
corn and grass in feeding.....	497, 498	member Board of Direction.....	7
Value of droppings from corn-fed cat-		State Dairymen's Association nominates	
tle for.....	497, 503	a member Board of Direction.....	7
Plat experimentation discussed—		State Horticultural Society nominates a	
Corn.....	38, 215, 393	member Board of Direction.....	7
Oats.....	361	Stooling of oats, 1888.....	28
Plum trees, injured by fruit bark beetle..		Sturtevant, E. L.....	303
.....	470, 472, 473	Sulphate of ammonia, analyzed....	120, 429
<i>Poa nemoralis</i> , see “Wood meadow		Used on corn.....	
grass.”		116, 119, 266, 267, 269, 428, 431
<i>Poa pratensis</i> , see “Kentucky blue grass.”		Superphosphate (Dissolved bone, Glue	
<i>Poa trivialis</i> , see “Rough stalked		factory superphosphate) analyzed..	
meadow grass.”		120, 429
Pounds of ear corn per bushel of		Used on corn.....	119, 267, 269, 428
shelled corn, 1890.....	450	Kentucky blue grass pasture.....	487
Potassium sulphide, used in spraying		Wheat.....	339, 340
apple trees for “scab”.....	490	Sweet silage.....	182, 184, 187
“Preservative ” for milk samples.....	506	Sweet Vernal grass, compared with other	
Potato, sprayed with fungicides.....	492	grasses.....	484
<i>Puccinia suaveolens</i> , on Canada thistles		Vitality of seed of.....	30
383		Tall meadow oat grass, compared with	
Quince trees, injured by fruit bark beetle.	473	other grasses.....	483
Red-top, compared with other grasses..	482		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Vitality of seed of.....	30	Vitality tests of seeds—	
Taschenberg, E. L.....	473	Corn, field.....	68, 236, 398
Timothy—		Sweet.....	281, 287
Compared with other grasses and		Grasses and clovers.....	30, 478
clovers.....	482, 485	Oats.....	28, 201, 362
Cut at different dates.....	143	Voelcker, A.....	148, 153, 182
Composition, proximate.....	144, 154	Water-free substance, defined.....	142
Digestible organic substance.....	145, 161	Water in shelled corn, method of de-	
Yield.....	144, 158	termining.....	399
Hay, compared with other hays.....		Weather, effects of, on field corn. . . .	
.....	150, 163, 164	45, 46, 219, 393
Composition of.....	467	Weiske, H.....	303
Mixed with clovers.....	485	Wheat, experiments with.....	337
Seed, vitality of.....	30, 478	Effect of fertilizers on (1887-8)....	338
Water, in fresh substance.....	164	Effect of fertilizers on (at Station)..	339
Lost in curing.....	164	Effect of fertilizers on (in southern	
<i>Trifolium hybridum</i> , see "Alsike		Illinois).....	340
clover."		Effect of time and manner of harvest-	
<i>Trifolium incarnatum</i> , see "Crimson		ing on yield of.....	349
trefoil."		Method of soil preparation.....	345
<i>Trifolium medium</i> , see "Mammoth red		Quantity of seed per acre.....	347
clover."		Time of sowing.....	348
<i>Trifolium pratense</i> , see "Medium red		White clover, vitality of seed of.....	30
clover."		Wiley, H. W.....	292
<i>Trifolium repens</i> , see "White clover."		Wolf, E.....	413
True protein, defined.....	142	Woll, F. W.....	303
<i>Trypeta florescentia</i> , on Canada thistles	383	Wood meadow grass, compared with	
Valeric acid, in ensilage.....	192	other grasses.....	483
Variety tests—		Vitality of seed of.....	30
Corn, field.....	37, 214, 389	<i>Xyleborus pyri</i>	470
Pop.....	443	Yeast.....	180
Sweet.....	128, 274, 432	In ensilage.....	183
Grasses and clovers.....	141, 478	Yellow oat grass, vitality of seed of....	30
Oats.....	197, 360		

All communications intended for the Station should be addressed, not to any person, but to the

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION, CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS.

The bulletins of the Experiment Station will be sent free of all charges to persons engaged in farming who may request that they be sent.

This bulletin closes a volume, and a title page and index are sent herewith, so that those who wish may preserve the bulletins by having them bound. The same plan will be pursued in the future.

SELIM H. PEABODY,

President Board of Direction.

ORGANIZATION.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

SAMUEL A. BULLARD, Springfield, President.

JOSEPH W. FIFER, Governor of Illinois.

LAFAYETTE FUNK, Shirley, President State Board of Agriculture.

HENRY RAAB, Superintendent of Public Instruction.

EMORY COBB, Kankakee.

GEORGE R. SHAWHAN, Urbana.

W. W. CLEMENS, Marion.

FRANCIS M. McKAY, Chicago.

JOHN H. BRYANT, Princeton.

RICHARD P. MORGAN, Dwight.

NELSON W. GRAHAM, Carbondale.

BOARD OF DIRECTION OF THE EXPERIMENT STATION,

SELIM H. PEABODY, LL.D., Champaign, Regent of the University, President.

E. E. CHESTER, Champaign, of State Board of Agriculture.

HENRY M. DUNLAP, Savoy, of State Horticultural Society.

H. B. GURLER, DeKalb, of State Dairymen's Association.

EMORY COBB, Kankakee, Trustee of the University.

LAFAYETTE FUNK, Trustee of the University.

GEORGE E. MORROW, A.M., Champaign, Professor of Agriculture.

THOMAS J. BURRILL, Ph.D., Urbana, Professor of Botany and Horticulture.

EDWARD H. FARRINGTON, M.S., Chemist of Station.

THE STATION STAFF.

SELIM H. PEABODY, Ph.D., LL.D., President of Board of Direction.

WILLIAM L. PILLSBURY, A.M., Champaign, Secretary.

GEORGE E. MORROW, A.M., Agriculturist.

THOMAS J. BURRILL, Ph.D., Horticulturist and Botanist.

EDWARD H. FARRINGTON, M.S., Chemist.

STEPHEN A. FORBES, Ph.D., Consulting Entomologist.

DONALD McINTOSH, V.S., Consulting Veterinarian.


GEORGE W. McCLUER, B.S., Assistant Horticulturist.


GEORGE P. CLINTON, B.S., Assistant Botanist.


E. K. NELSON, Assistant Chemist.


FRANK D. GARDNER, B.S., Assistant Agriculturist.











UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 054451593