

Dear Editor:

Joyce Bupp's article on workmen's compensation in the June 21st issue of Lancaster Farming certainly hits the nail on the head and all I can say is Amen and

P-L-E-A-S-E keep writing more articles on this subject. We dairy farmers have

enough aggrivation to contend with without any unnecessary aggrivation.

May I take this op-portunity to tell you how very much I enjoy your articles each week.

> Ona M. Atkison Box 157 Churchville, MD.

Dear Editor:

Your editorial comments about independent dairymen needing a single united voice is very interesting. Do you realize that cooperatives are made up of independent dairymen who see strength in unity?

Cooperatives are not entities apart from the members. Some dairymen combine their voices only for legislation, bargaining, market orders and other common problems; these are called bargaining cooperatives Other dairymen provide capital money to acquire plants to process and manufacture their milk for a greater assurance of market.

Independent dairymen have made a choice to accept the risk of going it alone in exchange for a few cents' higher price. Then when calamity strikes, there is a public outcry of sympathy for the poor lone dairymen with no voice.

People came to this land to be independent but soon found they needed to join together to protect this independence - the result we call our United States.

There are responsibilities that go along with trying to protect markets. Who do you think provides the legal and technical service to call market order hearings, provide and present testimony, file briefs, and inform producers? Who provides plants to manufacture week-end milk, holiday milk, and school vacation milk? Many handlers buy milk direct

from producers and also from cooperatives.

When a handler does not need all the milk produced, who do you think gets backed out of the plant - the independent producer or the co-op? Who bears the expense of their balancing? I think you will find the answers to be almost exclusively the cooperatives.

Where were the independent dairymen during the development of the proposed security fund? If it had been left up to them, they would probably be providing their own security fund, which is essentially no security at all.

The cooperatives provided the personnel, the time and expense, to help develop a security fund that will give some protection to the independent dairymen, as well as to the cooperatives who market their members' milk handlers The cooperatives who process their members' milk and sell to stores may participate in

a cooperative fund or opt

A cooperative does not buy its member's milk, but markets it, pays the expenses, including those outlined above, and returnes the balance as payment. If a store account goes bad, it becomes an expense which is shared by all members in the co-op.

I believe most cooperatives, insofar as possible, are balancing out each month's income and expense, which sometimes yields a price less than the administrator's price for that month. If any expenses are allowed to accumulate to the end of the year or longer, they assume the unpleasant term of assessment. To build a security fund with members' money against the failure of the cooperative to balance out the milk returns would be a duplication of expense to the members. Thus the option for cooperatives.

Robert F. Pardoe R1 Milton

Tewksbury's Eastern

SYRACUSE, N.Y. -

Tewksbury then was reported to have been hired by Co-op General Manager Howard McDonald, at an annual salary of \$30,000.

An Eastern Co-op spokesman said there was discussion on the appointment but no motions were delivered to the meeting and nothing was made firm.

He said that included no action on firming

Tewksbury's proposed position as Assistant to the General Manager nor on any move to prevent him from holding such a post.

He did say there had been discussion of the matter. Reports that Tewksbury would have to give up the annual salary and be retained on a per diem basis by the Co-op were not accurate, Eastern said.

With Howard McDonald on vacation, no official action was possible, Eastern said.

The Eastern spokesman also said nothing else of interest happened at the Board of Directors meeting.



job still up in the air

According to Eastern Milk Producers Cooperative, no official action was taken at the June 24 meeting of the Co-op with regards to Arden Tewksbury's continued employment.

Tewksbury retired from his duties as Co-op president at the June 4 annual meeting of Eastern. According to Coop rules he was allowed to serve only nine years on the Board, and he had completed a full term.

Tewksbury's title was to be Assistant to the General Manager.



ONE MONTH SPECIAL on Sild-Prime

75[¢] PER POUND

WHY PAY MORE WHEN YOU CAN GET THE SAME FOR LESS

★ Special Ends July 31, 1980, **Take Delivery in August**

WHAT IS SILA-PRIME?

It is a Probiotic fermentation aid containing dried, viable Lactobacillus bacteria that aids on lowering pH to control heating, and retain moisture and reduce spoilage in hay, haylage, corn silage and high moisture grain It also reduces the danger of nutrient burn-out so hay can be put u at higher than usual moisture

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF USING SILA-PRIME?

The major benefit is simple economics. Under NORMAL CONDITIONS, Sila-Prime significantly increases the dollar-value of baled hay, haylage and silage.

HOW IS SILA-PRIME APPLIED?

Silage: Through a mechanical applicator mounted at the cutter bar or blower, or by hand-broadcasting evenly over the top of each load of silage.

Hay: Sila-Prime must be applied from the inside out on large round bales. A mechanical applicator mounted on the baler is the recommended method On small bales, topdressing each layer as the bales are stacked is an alternative method

NITRATE LEVELS IN EXPERIMENTAL FIELD TEST SILAGES

CONTROL PIT	TEST PIT
1. COLORADO	44% REDUCTION
2. MINNESOTA	39% REDUCTION
3. NEW YORK STATE	64% REDUCTION
4. OHIO	37% REDUCTION



UNIVERSITY RESEARCH

Inoculated

Corn Silage

Controlled Research of Inoculated Silage Dr M E McCullough, University of Georgia

No inoculation

Moisture In	72%	74%	
pH Ensiled	39	4 1	
Crude Protein	9 4%	8 3%	
Dry Matter Per Ton Dry Matter	560 lbs	520 lbs	
Retained	465 lbs (83%)	369 lbs (71%)	
Shrinkage	95 lbs (17%)		
Difference	96 lbs	` '	
	(D M /ton)		
Protein Retained	94%	71%	
Fiber Retained	83%	82%	
N F E Retained	80%	67%	
Energy Retained	88%	75%	
Digestibility of			
Protein	58%	55%	
Dry Matter	70%	68%	
Energy	70%	67%	
Crude Protein			
Per Ton	52 64 lbs	43 16 lbs	
Crude Protein			
Retained	49 48 lbs	30 64 lbs	
Digestible Protein			
Retained	29 19 lbs	16 85 lbs	
Difference Per Ton Preserved by Inoculation 96 00 lbs Dry Matter Per Ton of Silage			

18 84 lbs Total Protein

12 34 lbs Digestible Protein Per Ton of Silage 18 lbs Total Crude Protein Compares to 42 lbs of



GORMAN BEITZEL

Bittinger, MD. 21522 **Garrett County** 301-245-4121

LEVI G. HIGH

513 Mt. Sidney Road, Lancaster, PA Phone 717-394-2389

RD #1 Ephrata, PA. 17522 717-733-7213

AARON RIEHL

4911 Mrytle St. Lynchburg, VA. 24502 804-239-5143

