

THE USDA 1962 feed barley program is unusual in several respects. Due to the fact that premiums are paid for malting barley, it was concluded that malting barley was not in surplus and thus the grower of malting barley should be encouraged to produce more, not less, barley of malting quality.

Three regulations under the program are pertinent here. A producer of malting barley is eligible for price support on his 1962 crop without participating in the 1962 feed grain program provided he meets the following conditions:

1. Planted a malting barley variety for commercial purposes in one of the last five years in the 14 states designated by the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

2. Plants only acceptable malting varieties in 1962.

3. Does not plant a 1962 barley acreage in excess of 110 per cent of the farm's 1959-60 average barley acreage.

The fourteen states designated are California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota and Wisconsin. The 21 eligible varieties are Atlas, Barbless, Betzes, Forrest, Hanna, Haisa II, Hannchen, Heines Hanna, Idaho Club, Kindred, Manchuria, Montcalm, Moravian O.A.C. 21, Oderbrusker, Odessa, Park-

Under Malting Exemption

Montana Takes Rap In Barley Program

By ROBERT F. ESLICK*

land, Traill, White Winter, Winter Club and Winter Tennessee.

Barley Acreage

Utilizing data compiled by the USDA marketing service and cooperating state agencies, it is possible to calculate what may happen to barley acreages under certain assumptions. The tables below presents one of such calculations representing about two-thirds of the total United States barley acreage. Since varietal survey percentages were available from only eight states, it was possible to predict acreages for only these eight states.

The second to fourth columns of the table show the relative acreage planted to feed varieties and malting varieties in each state, based on the two year average 1959-60. The total possible acre-

*Professor of Agronomy, Montana State College.

age that could be planted to malting barley is probably much higher, as any producer who grew a malting barley variety in any one of the past five years is eligible as a malting barley grower. He can qualify for supports by shifting all of his acreage to a malting barley variety.

The last column of the table shows the net effect of the program, assuming that those who have grown malting barley the past two years will increase their acreage by 10 per cent and those who have grown feed barley will decrease their acreage an average of 20 per cent.

Acreage Cutback

It is interesting to note that if there was an across-the-board reduction of 20 per cent in barley acreage that the total reduction for the 8-state area would amount to 2,167,000 acres, where-

as the malting barley feature results in a net reduction of only 305,606 acres.

Since California is generally considered a feed grain deficit area, the question could be raised as to the amount of compliance by California producers, perhaps further reducing this decrease.

If the values in the table were based on bushels of barley rather than acreage, the net effect of the program would probably be even less because of the generally higher yields in such states as North Dakota and Minnesota as compared to Montana. Even in Montana, the malting barley variety Betzes is more generally raised under conditions that result in higher yields than the conditions under which the feed variety Compans is raised.

Those who have grown malting barley realize it is not only the variety grown, but also the quality of the barley that will determine the malting premium. Only 20 to 25 per cent of the annual U.S. production is used by maltsters and the remainder is used as feed.

Careful examination of the table, and considerations previously set forth, might lead one to believe that the net effect of the program could be small on total barley production but would result in a shift of feed barley production from Montana to North Dakota and Minnesota.

MGGA Joins National Wheat Growers Assn.

THE MONTANA GRAIN Growers Association was admitted to membership in the National Association of Wheat Growers at the national convention held in Boise, Idaho, Dec. 6-8.

The convention was attended by a delegation of 13 members of the MGGA headed by Larry Erpelding, Forsyth, president.

Headquartered in Washington, D. C., the National Association of Wheat Growers is the legislative policy arm of the grower groups and wheat commissions in the states of Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Colorado, Oklahoma, Texas, Wyoming, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and now, Montana.

The projected effect of the Feed Grain Program of the barley acreage in eight states. Averages for 1959-60 and percentage acreage is used as a base.

State	Average acreage— all barley	Per cent of total production and planted acreage, avg. 1959-60		Estimated 1962 acreage based on 1959-60 averages				
		Malting Varieties Per cent	Acres	Feed Varieties Per cent	Acres	10% Increased* Acreage	20% Decreased** Acreage**	Net Increase or Decrease Acres
North Dakota	3,811,000	86.3	3,288,893	13.7	522,107	328,889	-104,421	224,468
Montana	1,936,500	24.5	474,442	75.5	1,462,058	47,444	-292,412	-244,967
California	1,739,500	21.7	377,472	78.3	1,362,028	37,747	-272,406	-234,659
Minnesota	987,000	99.0	977,130	1.0	9,870	97,713	-1,974	95,739
Washington	710,500	38.2	271,411	61.5	439,089	27,141	-87,818	-60,677
Idaho	542,000	28.0	151,760	72.0	390,240	15,176	-78,048	-62,872
South Dakota	558,000	74.5	415,710	25.5	142,290	41,571	-28,458	13,113
Oregon	550,000	45.0	247,500	55.0	302,500	24,750	-60,500	-35,705
8-state total	10,834,500		6,204,318		4,630,182	620,431	-926,037	-305,606
U.S. total	16,218,000							

* This is assuming that malting barley producers can and will take advantage of the 20 per cent increase provision in the 1962 barley program. These values could be larger as the grower need only to have grown a malting barley variety in one of the last five years.

** This is assuming that the average barley acreage reduction by farmers is 20 per cent.

Data compiled by the U.S.D.A. Marketing Service and cooperating state agencies served as a basis for the above calculations.



Members of the Montana delegation to the 40th annual 4-H Club Congress at Chicago were, 1st row, left to right, Judy Lohr, Devon; Cliff Balzer, Worden; Vangie Stenslie, Winifred; Boyd Iverson, Townsend; Gloria Boe, McLeod; Clarence Dornire, Rudyard, and Linda Crow, Roberts. Second row, JoAnn Staff, Chinook; Caroline Hermes, Paradise; Charlotte Webb, Polson; Carolyn Gibson, Helena; Kathleen Holmes, Fishtail; Rose Swigart, Sidney, and Charlotte Klein, Sunburst. Third row, Donna Udem, Terry; Sandra Fink, Forsyth; Shirley Minear, Paradise; Robert Banfill, Columbus; Eddie Green, Chester; Coral Powell, Caldwell; Alice Pierce, Glendive and Gloria Spain, Bozeman. Fourth row, Ken Ross, Fergus county agent; Mrs. J. C. Wilson, Billings, past president of leaders Assn.; John Baber, Miles City; Lloyd Petersen, Collings; Harlan McKechnie, Shelby; Larry McGill, Powderville; Mary Jane Stangel, 4-H home economics specialist, and C. W. Vaughn, acting state 4-H leader. Three of the youths received national 4-H awards, Vangie Stenslie, for her project work in home beautification; Robert Banfill, entomology, and Betty Medvit, home economics. Dorothy Spain, Bozeman, represented Montana in the National 4-H dress review.