

# Lancaster Farming

VOL. 26 No. 24

Lancaster Farming, Saturday, April 11, 1981

\$7.50 Per Year



James Garber, left, explains the operation of the automatic egg crating equipment to members of the Lancaster Chamber of Commerce and Industry. The tour, coordinated by Ag Committee Chairman Darwin Boyd, right, gave industry leaders a chance to inspect Lancaster County's farm businesses.

## Chamber of Commerce ag day

## Area businessmen tour County farms

BY CURT HARLER

**BIRD-IN-HAND** — The Lancaster Chamber of Commerce and Industry Thursday took a close look at several of Lancaster County's better farms.

What the industry, political and banking leaders saw surprised a number of them, including a few who are well versed in farming.

The five farms visited included the diversified family farm of Roy H. Charles, Millersville; Barley Brothers' dairy operation near at R2 Conestoga; James M. Garber's layer house and steer operation at R3 Mount Joy; Elmer Fisher's dairy at Bird-in-Hand; and Harlan Keener's confinement hog operation south of Lancaster.

At each stop financial and business data were exchanged

between the urban and rural businessmen.

Admittedly, these were no ordinary farming operations.

Charles's farm last month was named Outstanding Conservation Cooperator by the County Conservation District.

Barley's 1400 acre Star Rock Farms produces 34,000 glasses of milk per day from roughly 400 milkers, John Barley told the group.

The Garbers have about \$3 million invested in the farm operation, including four poultry houses.

As at the other stops, automation was obvious. At Garbers', a \$12,000 machine does the work of six people in cationing the eggs.

Garbers are looking at a break-even point between 52 and 55 cents per dozen. Current price, due to a

(Turn to Page A38)

## USDA denies petition

## for reconstituted milk hearing

WASHINGTON, D.C. — The U.S. Department of Agriculture has denied a petition requesting USDA to hold a hearing on the pricing of reconstituted milk under all federal milk marketing orders, according to Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block.

The petition was from the Community Nutrition Institute, a Washington-based nonprofit organization which specializes in food and nutrition issues; and from a milk processor and three consumers.

Reconstituted milk may be made by adding water and butterfat to nonfat dry milk. Under federal milk marketing orders, it is priced as a Class I fluid milk product, the highest price category under the orders.

The petitioners had requested that reconstituted milk processed by handlers be placed in a lower price classification under the orders. They claimed the current pricing removes the incentive for processor to make available to consumers what petitioners believe could be an equally nutritious but lower-cost alternative to other fluid milk.

In a letter to the petitioners, Block cited the following reasons for his action:

—Adopting the reconstituted milk proposal would seriously undermine classified milk pricing

national flock to sustain a market that permits a profit.

—Higher production costs and the lower number of hens will eventually send prices through the psychological barrier of a dollar a dozen.

“The last half of this year, feed costs will go up significantly and possibly dramatically,” Chestnutt said.

Taking a longer look down the road, Chestnutt said it's possible that the price of feed grains during the next 10 to 15 years could escalate in the same way that oil prices have soared in recent years.

The Hy-Line sales executive said his figures are based on a survey of 12 organizations and individuals in the industry, who have been remarkably accurate in past forecasts.

He gave a month-by-month price forecast as determined from the survey for the rest of the year. It showed: April, average of 71.7 cents with a range of 65-76; May, 69.4 with a range of 63.5-78; June, 71.1 with a range of 64-82; July 75.2 with a range of 67-84; August, 78.5 with a range of 71-85; Sept., 80.4

(Turn to Page A30)

## Penn's Agri-Women hold spring meeting

BY DEBBIE KOONTZ

**HERSHEY** — Penn's Agri-Women, a growing force behind agriculture in Pennsylvania, held their annual spring meeting Tuesday at the Hershey Lodge and Convention Center.

On the agenda were speakers from DuPont, Poorbaugh Grain and the York County Planning Commission, the president's report by Gail McPherson, and a

re-vamping of Agri-Women's resolutions in conjunction with American Agri-Women's Resolutions Committee.

Speaking out on “People vs. Pests,” Donald Rosen from the Agrichemicals Marketing Division at DuPont offered the Agri-Women “insight on who the critics of pesticides are and why they're saying.”

Rosen presented two filmstrips on the pesticide controversy in California entitled “Tinkering or

Tuning” and “People vs. Pests.” He then offered the members a challenge to use the films at schools, meetings and workshops in order to better educate the public on the necessity of pesticides.

“The thing to remember is to ask yourself what you can do to promote the use of pesticides for crop protection,” he advised. “Show the film to organizations as a representative of Agri-Women,

(Turn to Page A25)

News and features

Asst. U.S. Secretary visits county, A17; 1981 Support prices, A23; Clearview Hatchery, A32; Dwarf apples; B2; No-till planter available, C24; Her world's spinning, C26; Berks SCD, C28; Hog stress, C33; Chester-Del. farmers, D9; Soil saving recipe, D11; Livestock guarding dogs, D18.

Home and Youth

Homestead notes, C2; Home on the range, C6; Kids' Korner, C10; 4-H news, C13; Easter candy ideas, C14; Warwick FFA, C15; Octorara FFA, C16; Tulpehocken FFA, C17; 6300 4-H subs, C39; Little Dutchman FFA, D10.

Dairy reports

Shooting cattle, C30; Berks dairy princess contestants, C32; Bradford DHIA, D2; Cumberland DHIA, D4; Blair DHIA, D7; Somerset DE.A, D8; Dairy protein testing, D26.

Regular columns

Editorials, A10; Farm calendar, A12; The Milk Check, A24; Joyce Bupp, C4; Have you heard, C9; Ida's notebook, C12; Sheila's shorts, C19; Farm talk, D13; Ask the VMD, D14

under the orders and thus not carry out the mandate of Congress in authorizing milk orders.

—The competitive problems that would result from non-uniform pricing of fluid milk products would lead to pressures to lower Class I prices for fresh milk. This would result in a substantial decline in the income of dairy farmers and precipitate major changes in the dairy industry.

—The expected benefits to consumers from the proposal would be much less than the loss of income to dairy farmers.

—Consumers already have a low-cost alternative to fresh milk because they can buy nonfat dry milk at grocery stores and reconstitute it themselves.

—The public would not be assured of having a commercially reconstituted milk product that is as nutritious as fresh milk.

After receiving the petition, USDA invited comments from the dairy industry and the public. Over 8000 comments were received by the time the comment period ended in February 1980.

In addition, the USDA prepared a comprehensive impact analysis of the proposed change in the pricing of reconstituted milk, which was published in the November 17, 1980, Federal Register.

USDA received about 500 comments during a recently-ended comment period on the impact statement.