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INTRODUCTION

## Method of Study

The Divisions of Agricultural Economics anci of Animal Husbandry of the Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station cooperated with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture in a three-year accounting study of twenty-four farms in Rock and Nobles Counties in Southwestern Minnesota. This study was started March 1, 1929 and was continued through 1931. The farms were selected in cooperation with the county agricultural agents in the respective counties,- Mr. C. G. Gaylord in Rock County and Mr. C. J. Gilbert in Nobles County. Farms on wich some type of beef production was a major enterprise were chosen. The farmers cooperating in this work kept complete records of cash receipts and cash experditures, a daily recond of the labor used on each crop and cach class of livestock, a record of the farm produce used in the house and other detailed information regarding their busincss. These records were checked at Ieast twice a month by the route man and suplemented with inventories, livostock feed records, reports of crop yiclds and practices and other significant facts about the farm operations. The livestock inventories were taken by a conmittee of three, consisting of Professor Peters, in charge of the Animal Husbandry jivision at University Farm, the county agent and the farmer. Professor Peters also assisted in outlining and conducting the study. The data collected were sent to the central office at University Form, St. Paul, whore a dctailed sct of records for each farm was kept. From these records, the costs presented in this report have been computed. This prcliminary report presents the average costs and returns in 1929, 1930, and 1931 for the different classcs of livestock kept and the crops grown on these farms, and also n partial analysis of the data securod.

Rock and Nobles Counties are located in the southwestern corncr of Ninnesota. The soil in Rock County and the mostorn edge of Noblcs County is a wind-blown loess. This is one of the most fertile soil types in the state. The balsnce of Nobles County is covered with a glacial till, tho proveiling soil type of the southerm and centrel part of the state. This, too, is a productive type well supplied with lime.

Both counties are level to gently rolling with practically all of the land tillable. There are some sections, especielly in southern Nobles County, that need drainage to insure regular cropping. In Rock County, there are limited areas of rock outcrop end al so limited areas where the surface soil is shallow and underlain by a gravelly subsoil. These lattor soils are inclined to be droughty in a dry season. The annual rainfoll svereges between 26 and 2 inches and the average growing senson is from 130 to 140 days. According to the 1930 census, the 0 verage size of Parms in Rock County was 220 and in Noblos County 208 acres. Forms betreen 100 and 174 acres in size are the most common in these counties, with those between 260 and 499 acres the second in number. In 1930 the average value of fram land per acre, including buildings, was $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{j}} 103$ in Nobles County and \$l07 in Fock County. Only eight counties in the state reported a higher value per acre and seven of these are located close to Pinneapolis and st. Paul. The avernge value of all farm land in tho state wns $\$ 69$ per acre. According to the 1930 census, $67 \%$ of all farm lend in Nobles County end $70 \%$ of the 1 nd in Rock County was operated by tenants. Both cash ane shere leases are employed. Beef cattle and hogs are the principal classes of livestock ruised. Corn, onts, and barley are the principal grain crops. They are raised primerily for feed altho there is a considersble surplus available for sile on many forms. The landlord's share of the crop is usuelly sold off the form. Alfolf= and wild hay are the principal roughrges grown.

## Description of the Farms Studied

The average size of the farms studied in 1931 was 346 acres, in 1929 323, and in 1930,360 scres. This is approximately $62 \%$, $51 \%$ and $68 \% 1$ arger r"spectively than the average size of the ferms in these two counties as reported in the 1930 census.

Corn, oats, barley, flax, alfalfa hay, and wild hay were the principal crops grown on the farms studied. Most of the feed raised on these firms, wi th the exception of the landlord's shere of the crop, was fed on the fram. only two of the froms studied in 1931 were owned entirely by the operotor. Eleven farms were partly on ned and partly rented by the operator. Only $34 \%$ of the land opereted was owned by the operator. Both share and cash rental lecses wore employed. More facts about tioc organizetion of the forms are presented on page 17.

## Crop Rotation and Cropping Practices

With the high percentrge of tenency, the two yerr rotrion of corn and small grain has persisted. Hither landords have not seen any benofit to be derived from a rotrtion which tonds to consorve soil fertility, or sotisfactory lease arrangements permitting the adoption of a more diversified cropping progrem have not becn worked out. Approximetely $45 \%$ of the crop acreage on these farms was in corn, $36 \%$ in outs asd barley, $5 \%$ in wild hay, and $6 \%$ in flax, a totral of $92 \%$. This leaves a possible maximum of $8 \%$ in legume crops. The proportion of the ecreage in legume crops mes actually much less then tais. These proportions
agree closely with the figures for all farms in these counties as given in the 1930 census. According to the census, $43 \%$ of the crop land in these two counties was in corn, $40 \%$ in small grain, and $5 \%$ in wild hay.

On all of the farms stuaded in 1931, cattle, hogs, and chickens were kept and on five, small flocks of sheep also. In 1931 an average of approximately 18,200 pounds of cattle and 34,500 pounds of hozs per farm was produced. Highteen cows and a flock of 214 chickens were kept. On two of the five farms having sheep, feeder lambs were bought. In 1931, $40 \%$ of the cash receipts 7as from cattle sold, $4 \%$ from dairy products, $32 \%$ from hogs, $2 \%$ from sheep and $4 \%$ from poultry, a total of $82 \%$ from livestock and livestock products. Fourteen per cent of the receipts was from crops, chiefly corn, oats, and flax. The corresponding percenteges in 1930 were, respectively, $40,5,30,3$, and 3 , a . total of $81 \%$ from livestock and livestock products; in 1929 the percentages were, respectively, $35,7,32,3$, and 4 , a total of 81 . The receipts from crops were $13 \%$ of the total in 1930 and $15 \%$ in 1929.

## Weather

The weather in 1929 mas very favorable to crop production and yields were above average. The 1930 crops were seeded under very favorable conditions but the unusually hot and dry summer that followed resulted in a considerable reduction in yields of harvested crops and a shortage of pasture. Oats and flax escaped with relatively less damage than corn and barley. The drouth was even more pronounced in 1931, and as a result pastures were very poor and crop yields were generally the lorest for ten ycars. The disadvantage of poor summer pastures in 1930 was partly offset by the unusually good fall pasture and mild open winter which follozed. The effect of the weather on crop yields is indicated in Table 1.

Table 1
Crop Yields in Rock and Nobles Counties

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { iverage } \\ & \text { 1922-31* } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Route hverage |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |
| Corn, bu. | 30.3 | 38.0 | 31.9 | 23.8 |
| oats, bu. | 35,8 | 50.7 | 53.7 | 32.1 |
| Barley, bu. | 29.8 | 33.0 | 29.0 | 21.9 |
| Flax, bu. | 10.6 | 11.2 | 13.0 | 6.0 |
| Wild hay, ton | . 9 | 1.1 | 1.2 | . 6 |
| Alfalfa, ton | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 1.1 |
| Corn silage, ton | 6.0 | 7.3 | 5.1 | 6.2 |
| Corn fodder, ton | 2.2 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 1.6 |

*alculated from reports of the State Department of igricul-
ture, except in the case of alfalfa, corn silage, and corn
fodder, for which the State Qepartment gives no date. Aver-
age yields for these crops estimated from their relation to
the other crops.
From the standpoint of tho livestock enterprises, the hot dry weather in the summers of 1930 and 1931 was very fivorable to the control of diseases, especially diserses of swine and poultry. The mild open winter of 193C-31 resulted in a lower feed consumption and a better condition of the livestock. The decreased yields of crops also resulted in a decrease in the amount of livestock fed.

## Price Conditions

Generally speaking, price conditions were very favorable for livestock production in 1929, less favorable in 1930 and very unfavorable in 1931. The average price received for livestock and livestock products sold by these farmers is presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Average Price Received for Livestock and Livestock Products Rock and Nobles Counties

|  | 1929 |  | 1930 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| All cattle, per cwt. | $\$ 11.50$ | $\$ 8.70$ | $\$ 5.79$ |
| Hogs, per cwt. | 9.53 | 7.81 | 4.42 |
| Sheep, per cwt. | 11.91 | 7.42 | 5.30 |
| All chickens, per lb. | .19 | .14 | .14 |
| Butterfat, per lb. | .43 | .35 | .25 |
| Eggs, per doz. | .28 | .20 | .16 |
| Wool, per lb. | .28 | .16 | .10 |

The severe decline in prices extending over the three-year period has resulted in decreasing cash incomes from the same physical amount of roduction.
prices for the crops commonly grown in these counties became increasingly unfavorable during the three-year period. The December l crop prices are presented in Tablc 3.

Table 3
December 1 Form Price of Crops - Rock and Nobles Counties

| Crop | County Average 1922-31* | Route Farms |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |
| Corn, bu. | \$. 58 | \$. 56 | \$. 48 | \$. 41 |
| Oats, bu. | . 32 | . 36 | . 24 | . 22 |
| Barley, bu. | . 50 | . 49 | . 38 | . 38 |
| Flax, bu. | 2.05 | 2.83 | 1.48 | 1.23 |

*Compiled from publications of the State Department of hgriculture.

METMODS OF COMPUTING AND FRESENTING DITTA

## Financial Statement

Most of the farms studied wore either partly or en tirely rented, with the rental contracts varying from farm to farm. In order to have the data for these farms comparable, all the farms have been adjusted to a streight ownership basis. The inventories include all of the farm property regardless of owership and the receipts and expenses include the share of the landlord as well as that of the tenant. For purposes of these statements, the 1930 value of the bare land was placed at $86 \%$ of its value in 1929 and for 1930 its value was placed at $66 \%$ of the 1929 value. The decrease in the value of land is not included in the inventary decrease in the financial stetement. The only effect on the earnings as
cilculated here is in the decrecsed interest charge. The vilue of the house the operator lives in was excluded from the value of the farm buildings and all repairs and expenses on the house were omitted from the firm expenses. These expenses on the house are listed in the household account.
 month in 1930, and 20 in 1931. Unpaid family labor was estimatod at 25 cents per hour in 1929, 20 cents in 1930, and 15 conts in 1931. L.ll cash rent and interest actunlly paid have been omitted and interost st $5 \%$ chargod on the average total investrient.

Iivestock
The comparative costs and returns for eich of the different classes of livestock produced are presented in this preliminar\# report. Insofar as possible, local priees viere used in detemining the costs and returns. lifreetable feeds mere charged at local prices and non-marketable feeds on a corpapa-tive-feoding-value basis. Man labor was figured st 30 cents per hour in 1929 and 1930 and 20 cents in 1931. Horse work was charged to the individual farm at the rate determined for that farm. The sholter cherge alas besed on the sanual cost of the bujldings housing livestock, prorated on the besis of space occupied. The equipment charge is based on the annuel cost of the particul 2 r class of equipment used by that elass of livestock. Miscellaneous casin costs include veterinary fees, medicine, solt, minerals, etc. The manure credit is based on $a$ value of 75 cents per ton in the bernyard. Only the amount of the manure actually spresd on the fields $\begin{aligned} & \text { as } \\ & \text { creditcd to the livestock. }\end{aligned}$

In studying the tables and in considering the income from livestock, one should keep in mind that these sre comprative figures and represent charges which are not all actu: cash expenses. All man lobor and horse work, interest on the investment, and the use of the buildings and equipment, as mell ss the feed have been charged to the enterprise. Therefore, a minus return means that the particular elass of livestock his failed to pay the prices chorged for the different factors. There may be no other more profitable alternative use for the buildings, much of the lnbor, or for the non-marketrble feeds. is return above the price of marketable feeds and cash expenses mas justify continued production although these figures fail to show a net return.

All tables have been computed on the basis of one hundred pounds gain in weight, or of one animel, or on some similsr basis, hll cem has been reduced to a shelled corn basis. The roturns have been expressed in several ways. The gain or return over all costs is the arount left after deducting all the cherges listed in the table. The return over feed cost is what is left after deducting fecd from the total inccme; or in other words, it is what is loft to pay for the labcr, shelter, equipment, interest, and miscellaneous cash costs. The return per hour represents what the enterprise returned for ench hour of ran labor used in it, after allowance had been made for all charges except labor. The return per 56 pounds of mrain represents what was left to pay for onch 56 pounds of farm grain $f \in d$ after raking allowance for all other feed and all of the othor charges. The unit of 56 pound.s of grain was used because thet corresponds to the weight of one bushel of corm.

Feeder Cattle. This class of cattle includes ell cattle being fattened far market and covers cnly the feeding period. The return per 56 pounds of farr grain is obtained by deducting from the selling price all cherges except whet for form grains fed. The result is then dirided by the number of pounds of frors grains fed and multiplied by 56. Due to the impossibility of determining the pork credit for the feed picked up behind cattle, this item mas omitted
fror. all calculations. This fact should be kept in mind when studying the statements both for cattle and for hogs.

Breeding Herd. The breeding herd includes the bull as well as all of the cows. Insofar as was possible, decreases in inventory values due to changes in the price level have been eliminated for the cows which were listed on both the opening and closing invontory. The cost per calf mas obtained by dividing the total cost of the herd by the number of calves raised. The calves raised per cow was obtained by dividing the number of calves raised by the average number of cows in the herd for the year. An average of more than one calf per cow may be obtained either by raising twin calves or by raising calves from cows which remain in the herd less than a full year.
$\hat{i}$ is presented in this statement, the cost per calf is only the share of the cost of maintaining the breeding herd chargeable to the calf. It does not include any supplementary grain or pasture the calf may have received. On the farms with beef herds, the calves were allowed to mun with the cows for six or seven months and they received sll the milk the cows gavc. On the fams with dual-purpose herds, the calves were weaned from wholerilk riithin two or three weeks after birth and from skimmilk at from one to two montins of age. For this reason, the contribution of the beef cows was larger than that of the dual purpose cows. However, the relative contribution could not be definitely determinod because the arount of whole milk the calves receired while nursing could not be deternined.

Generally speaking, only the cows that vere being rilked received any grain. As no division was made on the individual farms between the cows being milked and those not being milked, the feeds reported fed to the beef herds includes some grain. The cows in the dual purpose herds quite generally received grain.
all Cattle. Threc more or less distinct types of beef production mere found on the farms studied and everages are presented for each type. Group $A$ is composed of the farms on which dairy and beef production were combined. Group $B$ is composed of the farms on wich more cattle mere fattened than were raised in one year. The additional nurber was obtained either by purchase or by accurulation from past years. Group $C$ is composed of the fams on which breeding herds were maintained for raising calves. They are primarily baby beef producers. The "value of animal product" mas obtained by deducting the value of the purchases and opening inventory from the ralue of the sales, products used in the house, and tine closing inrentory. The low talue of aniral product (in some cases a rinus) is largely due to the decline in the price of cattle. The average value per hundrod pounds of cattle on these fams March l, 1931 was $\$ 7.09$ and on March 1 , 1932 it was $\$ 4.79$, a drop of $\$ 2.30$. In 1931, the average inventory weight vas approximately twice the weight produced whici rieans that each 100 pounds of cattle produced was chsrged with a loss in inventory value of $\$ 4.60$. The deta for the individual farms varied from these avereges. No attempt ras mede to eliminate the decrease in inventory values due to the price declinc, as was done with the breeding herd, because of varistions in kind and quility of stocir on hand at the end of the year as compared with the beginning.

Hogs. It is a common practice on these famis to heve hogs following the cattle. However, due to the methods of handing the cattle and the practice of supplementary feeding, it was impracticable to obtain any estimate of the feed salvaged in this way. The anounts amd the costs of feed presented are in addition to any salvaged behind cattle. The number of pigs rnised per litter was calculcted by dividing the number of piss raised to msrket jeight by the number of farrovings. The return per 56 pounds of grain was calculated in the sane manner as for fecder cattle.

Sheep. The galue of the product in snoep was calculated in the siric maner as for all cottle, nariely, by dedueting the jrlue of the purchascs ind becianing inventory from the value of the sheep and lambs sold, butchered, and on the ending inventory. The number of lambs per ewe was obteinod by dividing the nurber of lribs reised by the number of ewes in the flock. The per cent of death loss of l:mbs is for laribs up to six months of age. after six rionths of ake, they were considered as steep. The large decline in larib and Fool prices resulted in losses.

Poultry. In the dets presented, the number of ducks, geese, and turkeys are reported on a "chicken-equivalent" basis. One duck ris considered equnl to one hen, one goose equal to two hens, end one turkey equal to three hens. Two birds under six months of age were considered equal to one rature bird.

Work Horses. The farrs were divided into two groups for the presentation of work horse costs. One group corprises the farms on ahich trsctors mere used for drawbar work and the other group comprises the farris on wich tractors were not used for drawbar work.

Tractor. Tractor costs arc prosented for both two-plon and turee-plow tractors. In these stetenents, gasoline is charged st a price which did not include the three cent state tax, even though sorie faracrs did not clairi the tax refund.

Auto. Luto costs are presented for 1930 nd 1931. These costs do not include o charge for shelter.

Crops. Comparative costs and returns for the eifht principal crops grown on the famis studied are presented in this report. The physical quantities of ran labor and horsc and tractor work used per acre for ench of the crops are also presented. The man labor mite of 30 cents per hour in 1929 and 1930, and of 25 cents in 1931 is besed on vinges paid to hired men. It includes an allowance for boerd. Horse work wis chnrged at 12 cents per hour in 1929, $10 \frac{1}{2}$ cents in 1930 , and $8 \frac{1}{2}$ cents in 1931. Two-plov tractors mere charged at 75 cents per hour in 1929 and 1930, and 65 cents in 1931; three-plow tractors mere charged nt ${ }_{6} \mathrm{il} .00$ per hour in 1929 and 1930 and 85 cents in 1931. The sced charge for hay is based on the cost of seeding dirided by the expected lifo of the strad. Nonure mas charged at 75 conts per ton plus the cost of hauling and spreading. Fifty per cent of this wes charged agninst the crop to which the monure was applica and the brlanco ras prorated to the other crops in the rotation on an acre basis. Machinery was chared at a flet rete which includes an alownce for interest, depreciation, reprirs, and other costs. The land charge was based upon the prevailiñ cash rental rates paid by the cooperetors. The local market price on Deceiber l was user in corlputing the returns from the various crops. fil costs, except those for flax, are figured at the farm, Marketing charges for flax, when it was heulod airect to maket at threshing tinc, have been inclured. The costs do not incluke any labor for hauling hay fror: the stack nor focer frori the shock since hauling practices and size of loais vary so muck. The credits inclu?e stubble or stalk pesture, and com picked up bohine the binder.

The returns have been computed on the basis of the return per acre and return per hour of man labor used in producing the crop. Tho net return is the gain or loss left after subtracting from the value of the crop the itoms of cost that are presented. The retum per man hour is tho amount left to pay for the labor used ofter all charges excopt labor have been met. The returns are not calculsted for the hay crops, corn fodder, and silage es these crops are fed, ond the farr.
as $\because i$ ith livestock, the costs presented are reletive rothor than absolute costs and incluce other than "out-of-pocket" cosh expenses. Uniform cash rental rates ire useci for each crop, since the varicarcntal systems on the different farms, including cash rentea, share rented nad cancd land, woula tend to obscure these comperisons. Uniform machinery, labor and horse and tractor wrk rates have nls been usec. hll crops have beon credited at uniform prices, except rs they vary in quality. Some farmers uncoubtedly recei ved different prices and alsc had Inbor end machinery costs differing from thase usod. The rooner, in interpreting these fiwures, rust make such odjustraonts in the returns as are necessury to fit the prorying concitions.

## FARII EiLRNINGS

sis a rosult of the drnstic decline in the prices of form products, farm eamings declined rapidly. Cosh receipts fell from $\$ 9339$ in 1929 to 1930 and $\$ 5328$ in 1931, a decrease, respectively, 0113 and 34 per cent. Cash expenscs declined from 5134 in 1929 to ${ }_{\$} 4833$ in 1930 , and $\$ 3306$ in 1931, a decrease, respectively, of 6 and 31 per cent. Tw vory dofinite steps were taken to adjust the farm business to the low income. The first of these mas a reduction in machinery and equipment expense of over 70 per cent, effected largely through the oliminction of purchases of new inploments. The second was a reduction in buildings and fence expense of over 60 per cont, also effected largely through the pestponerent of the erection of now buildings or fences and other than the absolutely neccssary repeirs, Other exponses, except texes, were also roduced, but to a lesscr degree. The amount of taxes peid increased. ialtho expenses were roduced, they were not reducod in proportion th the reduction in ruceipts.

The severe decline in prices also reduced the eamings on these famis through the roiuction in inventrry values. This reduction arnounted to an average of 1844 in 1930 and 22810 in 1931. Part of this ras cue to a smaller amount of feeds ond livestock on hand but the major portion was due to the docline in prices.

## SECURING MEXIPUR REITURNS

Two things are nocessary in order to secure raxirum returns fron a farm. These are (l) the selection of the most profitable entorprisos, and (2) the arrption of prefitable practices in tho honding of the entorprises chesen.

## Stilection of Profitoble Entcrprises

No two farms or femers see exactly alike. Frmas viry in soil type, fertility, and draindge, in the omount of pasture availsble, in the manunt and kince of crops grown, in the amrunt of sholter ar:ilrblo fre livestock, in the water supply, nnd in the adequecy rf the fencing. Further, formers vary in their likes and aislikes sà in their nbility to hom'le the sifforent kinds of livestock ond crops. Fir these reasens, the best selecticn of tho particuler kinds ond combinations of kinảs nf crop and livestock enterprises will vary with the indiviounl forr and form oper tor. However, the rosults of this three-yerr study will give inforration uscful in the orgenizing and operating of any incivicunl form.

Selection of Livestock. In genercl, these recoris indicnte that the hog enterprise mas crnsistently the most prrfitable rajor livestock enterprise; that the baby-beef type of production was the roost profitable type of becf production; that the combination of rilk ond beef prociuction found on these f:mss Wes consistently the leest profitable type of beef production; und that poultry proporly hamied are a profitable part of the frar. busincss. altho the fatten-
ing of purchased cattle was the most profitable type of beef production in 1931 and the second in profitableness in 1929 and 1930 , the skill in buying and selling which it requires and its highly speculative nature are such as not to recommend this type of beef production for general adoption on any very large scale. However, farmers who are particularly capable in buying and selling and who are good feeders may find the feeding of purchased cattle very profitable.

Selection of crops. In selecting the crops and in planning the cropping prosram, it is woll to considel whether the erops are to be for feed or for sale, or for both. If the crops are to be fed, the selection should be based on the gmount and quality of di gestible nutrients producod per acre. The rocords secured in this study furnish the basis for such a selection. The production per acre and the relative cost per hundred pounds of digestible nutricnts for Rock and Nobles Countios, bascd on ten year avelage yields and avorace routc costs are presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Production per iscre and Relative Cost per 100 Pounds of Digestible Nutrients - Kock and Nobles Counties

|  | nverage | Total | Protein | Cost per |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crop | yield | digestible $\%$ of | loo lbs. |  |
|  | l922-31 | nutrients | total | of total |
|  | bu. | lbs. | nutricnts nutrients |  |


| Grains |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Corn | 30.3 | 1386 | 8.7 | 31.18 |
| Barloy | 29.8 | 1135 | 11.4 | 1.19 |
| Oats | 35.8 | 806 | 13.8 | 1.73 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Roughagos | tons |  |  |  |
| Lilfalfa | 1.8 | 1836 | 20.8 | .78 |
| Corn foddor | $2.2^{*}$ | 1924 | 7.7 | .94 |
| Hild hay | .9 | 868 | 6.2 | .94 |
| Silage | 6.0 | 2021 | 7.2 | 1.16 |

*Nutrients are calculatod on the basis of 2.0 tons yield since there is considerable shrink and waste under the usual methods of fceding fodder.

The above data shows that the lowest cost feed crain crop is corn. It produces more nutrients per acre and at a loricr cost than either outs or barley. Barley is next to corn in cost but produces less feed per ecre. Oats produces decidedly less nutrients per scre thon the other tion creps and has the further disadvantage of 2 much higher ccst.
slfilfa, on the basis of the bove datit, is the cheapost source of reughege, A?falf: has n nditinnai odvantage in that it is high in protein, the element most likely to be lacking in the retion and most expensive to buy. Its cheapness end its high protein crntent make alfalfa the most desirable roughage. fithnugh corn f-dder produces slightly morefeed por acre then alfalfe, it h \% s the disadvantago of $\sim$ hishor cost and a docidedly loner pretein content. Wild hay has the disヨdvonteges of both $a$ low yield of food nutrionts and a hisher unit cost. Honever, aild hay is usually gromin n land not suitable for othor crops and honce the cutting of wild hay is a metter of securing some feed frm what wuld cthurwiso be Faste land. Silage has trio disadventrges, nomcly, high cost and low protein content. The fret that silnge is used as cxtensively as it is indiontos that foeders heve felt that it has roluc groater thon that indicated by its nutrient content. It offers a method of saving tho ontiro corm crop.

The profitableness of raising cash crnps dopends to a larkc extont upnn the pricesreceived. int this time it is impcssible to predict, with any assurance, what the prices of the crops will be in the future. It is possible, h Never, to indicate the relative profitableness of these crops in the past years. The ccriparctive returns from tho various grain crops computed upon the basis of ton year avorage Rock and Nobles Ccunties yields and prices ind three year average costs adjusted to the ten year average yields are presented in Table 5.

Trble 5
Comparative Returms per Acre of Crops
Rock and Mnbles Ccunties

|  | $\mathrm{C} \cap \mathrm{rn}$ | Oats | Barley | Flax |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost ner scre | \$16. 39 | K13.92 | \$13.46 | 算16.12 |
| Yield, apersge 1922-31 | 30.3 | 35.8 | 29.8 | 10.6 |
| Cost per bushel | 3. 54 | \%.39 | \$. 45 | \$1.52 |
| Dec.l price, averafe 1922-31 | 1.58 | . 32 | . 50 | 2.05 |
| Net return per acre | 1.18 | -2.46* | 1.44 | 5.62 |

*it minus (-) indicutes a inss.
As an average of the past ten years, barley and flax have been the most profitable cash crops, with corn next. Oats was the leest profitablo. One rould expect corn to continue to be cne of the high profit crops sind ats to be one of the lowest profit crops.
adopting Grod Practices
The second thing necessary for obtaining high returns is the acoption of rrofitable practices. s study of the records indicate the follrwing results of cifferent practicos.

## Iivestock Practices

Cnttle: 1. Broeaing strek rf. Eona boef confomation and type required no rore feed than los erade broeding strock but at sale time the calves from the well bred stock commanded on appreciable premiun cver the calres from the low grade stock.
2. There was $c$ wice wariation betweon fomis in the arcount of grain and hiny fed to breeding stock. The dota would indicate thot feed in oxcess of exrugh to keen the breeding stock in fair flesh, but not fat, brought little or no return.
3. The fomors wh: fed cilmeal tw fattening cattle secured more economical fains than those not feedins rilmeal. A compris on of the feed exponditures is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

*Only farms producing over 5000 pounds gain in weight included in this comperison.
\&t 1931 prices, the difference in total feed cost per one hundred pounds gain in meight is $\$ 1.34$ in favor of those feeding oilmenl.

Hogs: l. Where cimplete swine sanitation was preperly corried out, unit costs were materinily reduced. The data for one farm illustrates what is possible in some cases (Table 7). Sanitation, to be successful, must be carries out completely.

Table 7
Expencitures por 100 Pounds Goin in Weight for Hogs, Farm A
Man Grain Skim- Pus- Feed Pigs hrs. lbs. milk ture cost* raised lbs. days per litter

1929, , Fithout sanitation | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 646 | 50 | -3.48 | 3.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

1930, complete saritation $1 \frac{1}{2} \quad 485131 \quad 28 \quad 5.14 \quad 6.7$
*it average prices for 1930.
2. Hogs raised under a one-littor a year syster used less feed and labor per one hundred pounds gain in weight than hogs raised under a system involving both spring and fall farrowing. (See Table 8.)

Table 8
Feed and Labor Used per 100 Pounds Gain in Teight for Hogs
Raised under One-Litter and Two-Litter per Year Systems 1929, 1930, 1931

|  | No. Of | Total | Skim- Pasture Man |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| System | farm concen- milk | dnys | hours |  |
|  | yoars trites lbs. |  |  |  |
|  |  | lbs. |  |  |


| One-litter per year | 42 | 457 | 46 | 26 | $2 \frac{1}{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Two-litter per year | 23 | 490 | 59 | 25 | 2 |

3. When the pigs were pusined along, thereby securing more rapid gains, less feed was used for a hundred pounds gain in weight than where coins were slower (Table 9).

Table 9

*Two pigs undor 6 inonths equel to 1 mature hog.
4. Less feed and labor per pound of gain rias used when from 5 to 6.9 pigs were raised per litter than when less than 5 were roised (Table lo).

Teble 10

Pigs Raised per Litter and Feed Consamption per 100 Pounds Gein in Weight for Hogs 1929, 1930, 1931

| Pigs raised per litter | No. of farn. yerrs* | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pigs } \\ & \text { ner } \\ & \text { litter } \end{aligned}$ | Total grain lbs. | Skir- <br> milk <br> lbs. | posture doys | Mrn hours |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 to 4.9 | 23 | 4.2 | 492 | 70 | 27 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 5 to 6.9 | 27 | 6.0 | 456 | 39 | $2^{7}$ | 2 |

*Farms on which feeder pigs rere bought were excluded from this comparison.

Sheep: l. The lergest returns from sheep wero received from srall flocks which obtained a large part of their feed from the yards, rosd, ind other places where this feed mould not, heve otherwise becr utilized.
2. Flocks that rere culled regulerly and the ewos sold before they becnre aged grve the grertest returns. High deeth loss due to old ege resulted in large losses on sone fnmis.

Poultry: 1. «high denth rate due to disense, largely as a result of lack of sanitation, was an important ceuse of low returms.
2. The raising of chickens aded to the profit from the poultry enterprise. The fraers raising e lerge numbor of chickens relative to the number of laying hens hed largor net returns frof: the poultry enterprise than those raisine relatively fever chickons.
3. High egs production per hen was an irportant cause of high returns from the poultry enterprise. Good breeding, careful culling, and hocuy feeding of mash and skimilk are necessary for high ogg production.

## Crop Practices

One of the most importent factors affocting the returns fron any crop is the yield. Costs are also important but do not vary as much as yiclds and hence have less influence on retums. The relationship between yield and cost and return per acre is indicated by the dats for onts presented in Trble 11.

Table ll
Relation between Yield and Cost and Returm per icre of onts, 1931

| Yield | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { farres } \end{aligned}$ | ivercge yield | Total cost | Cost per bu. | Net return |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 26 bu . | 6 | $21 \frac{3}{4}$ | \$12.18 | \%. 56 | -\$7.39 |
| 26 and uncter 36 | 9 | 32 | 11.82 | . 37 | -4.78 |
| 36 and undor 46 | 4 | $38 \frac{3}{3}$ | 13.12 | . 34 | -4.59 |
| 46 and over | 3 | 48 委 | 13.75 | . 28 | -3.02 |

As the yield per acre increased, the cost per bushel decres:sod and the loss per acre decreased. Of course, yielc per acre can not be increased indefinite$l_{\text {. without evontually involving sen expense which is reater then the value of the }}$ increrse in yield. However, fer, if any of the farr:sstuileà have reached this point.

Practices Influencing Yields. Since yield por nere has such an irportant bearing on cost an returns, further study was rado in order to determino some of the inportent factors affectine yields. The factors stucied are selection of variety of seel, time of seading, and rate of seeding.

In studyine the offect of variety on yield, it wes founc that Gopher oats outyieldec the other verieties by a consicerable mrain. The lowest yields were secured fron comon sced of unknown veriety. The comon seed generily represented onts thet hed been from on the farm solong that the variety had been forgotten, or thet hre been purchased as secc without any kno:rledgo of the variety it represented. Velvet barley geve the highest yields of barley over the three yesr perioa. Here achin comon seert gave lofer yields. There were somy varieties of flex anc corn crom thet it rins impossible to et enouch fields of chy two varieties to make comprisons. There were ten different vorieties of corn grown on these farms and most as many warieties of flex as there wore farms groving flax. It would seem plausible that the yiells of corn and flax, as woll as of oats an? barley, could be materisily increaser by the seeding of the veriety best aidapted to this aren.

Tho records on these ferrs derionstrate thet one is not civeys able to judee the relative yielainc ebility of two varieties merely by their apporance in the rield. Just onc illustration to emphasize this point, a field of Groen Russinn onts and a ficld of Gophor octs fere grown side by side on the save form. The reen Russion field he? nore nd much larger shocks and looked as though it would yicld much more than the ficld of Gopher onts. However, when the tro ficlels Were threshed, the Gopher oets yiclded 13 bushols more to the acre than the Grcen Russion. The point of this is that in comyring nny two varictios of any crop, it is absolutely necossary to mensure the aren and carefully veigh the yiold. The difference in yield between varieties is enougt to justify consicerable attention to securing goor. seed on high yielding varieties.

Time of secding is also important in securine geod yields. The recorls obtained on these forms indinte that the formors. who procticer early seering wero the ones who roceivec the higher yields. Spice will not porrit the presentation of tables for all crors. It is not possible to set ary definite seeding dates becruse sensons vary from year to year. In nny seeson, eener:aly speaking, the early seeding and hieh yielde have gone together.

The recorls incicate a vide rage in the amount of seed plenter per ocre. The variations, the verage for the three yens, and the riount wich the recoris would indicate as acirrble are presented in Table l2. If the sect is goon clen seed, there is nothing to be eained by plenting more than tho mamum indiceted as esiruble.

$$
\text { T:ble } 12 .
$$

amount of Seed Plonted nor acre
Rock anc Nobles Counties, 1929-31

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Husker? } \\ & \text { corn, } 1 \text { bs. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Oats } \\ & \text { bu. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Brrley } \\ & \text { bu. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Flax } \\ & \text { lbs. } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Least seed | 4.6 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 21 |
| Most sced | 17.4 | 7.0 | 4.1 | 75 |
| averace | 8.0 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 41 |
| Desirrble | $7-9$ | 3-3.5 | 2-2.2 | 36-44 |

The records indicate that the farms with the most legumes and livestock arc the ones with highost yields. hlfolfa, clower, and swoet clover desorve $n$ lereer plece in tho cropine plen of those ferms than they hove been occupyine.

## LIBOR ND HORK STIND: RDS FOR CBOPS

L-bor is onc of the lergest itoms of cost in raising crops, nen hence any saving in labor will be reflecter in lnaer costs. There are tho ways of reducing lobor costs, novely, by eliminatine unnocessary crop oporations and by perforning the necessary opretions moro efficiontly. The cron cieretions are foirly well standardized matherefore soving rust zenc relly come through incrocser efficioney in the indivicual operations.

The range in the hours of min labor and horse ence trector work used por acre for each of the corron crop oper tions, the rvorage for three vers, and a standnce for each operation are presonter? in Table 13. The stacerals represcnt auproxiztoly the occomplishment of the farracs who were 25 per cent bove the avtrace in the scole of efficioncy as measured by lov Iedor oxpmitures. They assume vorage sail, wonther conlitions, and yields. With higher yiclds, rore time by bequired for horvestine an with lofur yields, less
time. These standards are suggested as a basis which tho individual farmer may use in determining the effectiveness with which he is utilizing his labor and power.

Teble 13
Hours of Nan Labor and Horse and Tractor Work Used per Lace for Crop Oporations Rock and Nobles Counties, 1929-1931

|  | Range 1929-31 |  | i-verage |  | Standard |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Man | Horse | Mn | Horse | Min | Horse |
| Scedbed preparation: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plowing:- 4 horses | 1.9 to 4.1 | 7.5 to 16.4 | 2.8 | 11.2 | 2.1 | 8.4 |
| 5 horses | 1.8 to 3.2 | 8.8 to 15.7 | 2.3 | 11.5 | 2.0 | 10.0 |
| 6 horses | 1.3 to 5.5 | 7.9 to 31.6 | 2.3 | 13.3 | 1.7 | 10.2 |
| 2-plow tractor | 1.2 to 2.1 | * | 1.7 | * | 1.6 | * |
| 3 -plow tractor | . 8 to 1.9 | * | 1.2 | * | 1.0 | * |
| Disking: 4 horses | .3 to . 8 | 1.2 to 3.3 | . 5 | 2.0 | . 4 | 1.6 |
| 5 horses | .3 to . 6 | 1.3 to 2.8 | . 5 | 2.2 | . 4 | 2.0 |
| Harrowins: 4 horses | . 1 to . 5 | . 6 to 2.1 | . 2 | 1.0 | . 2 | . 8 |
| 6 horses | .2 to . 3 | . 8 to 1.6 | . 2 | 1.1 | . 2 | 1.2 |
| Deeding \& harvesting grain: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drilling | .3 to . 8 | 1.2 to 3.0 | . 5 | 2.0 | . 5 | 2.0 |
| Broadcasting | .2 to . 6 | .2 to 1.6 | . 3 | . 7 | . 2 | . 4 |
| Oats: Cutting | . 5 to 1.2 | 2.0 to 4.8 | . 7 | 2.7 | . 6 | 2.4 |
| Shocking | . 4 to 2.2 | - | 1.1 | - | . 8 | - |
| Threshing | 1.2 to 5.7 | 2.5 to 11.3 | 2.8 | 5.3 | 2.5 | 4.5 |
| Barley: Cutting | . 4 to 1.4 | 1.6 to 5.2 | . 8 | 3.0 | . 6 | 2.4 |
| Shocking | . 6 to 2.3 | - | 1.2 | - | . 9 | - |
| Threshing | 1.0 to 6.3 | 1.8 to 11.6 | 2.9 | 5.4 | 2.4 | 4.7 |
| Flax: Cutting | .3 to 1.6 | 1.2 to 6.2 | . 9 | 3.6 | . 7 | 2.8 |
| Shocking | .4 to 2.0 | - | 1.1 | - | . 8 | - |
| Threshing | 1.3 to 5.0 | 2.6 to 8.4 | 3.2 | 5.6 | 2.9 | 4.6 |
| Pl: ting \& harvesting corn: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Planting | .5 to 1.0 | . 9 to 2.0 | . 7 | 1.4 | . 6 | 1.2 |
| Cultivating (2-rom) | . 6 to 1.2 | 2.4 to 3.9 | . 8 | 3.1 | . 8 | 3.2 |
| Cutting | . 9 to 3.7 | 2.8 to 11.0 | 1.8 | 5.3 | 1.5 | 4.5 |
| Shocking | 1.2 to 9.4 | - | 3.5 | - | 2.5 | - |
| Filline silo | 3.9 to 14.9 | 4.9 to 23.6 | 8.1 | 11.9 | 7.8 | 12.7 |
| Husking - hand | 2.8 to 9.2 | 5.1 to 17.4 | 6.1 | 11.1 | 4.7 | 9.4 |
| m:chine | 2.5 to 7.4 | 6.0 to 20.8 | 4.2 | 12.9 | 3.7 | 11.4 |
| HFy horvesting: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| clfolfa (lst cutting) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cutting | . 5 to 2.3 | 1.1 to 4.6 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| Reking | . 3 to 1.8 | . 6 to 3.6 | . 7 | 1.4 | . 5 | 1.0 |
| Haculing to barn | . 9 to 8.0 | 1.2 to 16.2 | 3.4 | 5.0 | 2.3 | 3.1 |
| Stacking | . 5 to 5.4 | 1.0 to 6.2 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 1.8 | 2.1 |
| Alir.lfa (2nd cutting) 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cutting | . 5 to 2.5 | . 9 to 5.0 | 1.1 | 2.1 | . 9 | 1.8 |
| Raking | . 1 to 2.9 | . 2 to 5.5 | . 7 | 1.3 | . 4 | . 8 |
| Hauling to barn | .3 to 9.3 | .3 to 13.7 | 2.4 | 3,2 | 1.4 | 2.0 |
| Stacking | .4 to 4.4 | . 5 to 7.5 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.1 |
| Wild hay (l cutting) 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cutting | .7 to 2.7 | 1.4 to 5.4 | 1.3 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| Raking | . 2 to loz | . 5 to 2.4 | . 7 | 1.3 | . 9 | 1.8 |
| Hawline to barn | .8 to 6.7 | 1.2 to 11.1 | 3.0 | 4.4 | 2.0 | 2.8 |
| Utacking | 1.2 to 5.0 | 1.8 to 11.8 | 2.8 | 4.2 | 2.3 | 2.8 |

as summary of the stondard lubor and power expenditurcs by operstions for each of the oight common crops is presented in Table 14. The cperations are those gencrally performed and the hours ero based on the standords for the size of implowents and power units most of ten used. The expunditures for other combinations of operations and sizes of power units may be computed from the deta presconted in Table 13.

Teble 14
Standards for Field Operetions Performece with Horse Puwer in Rock inf Noulos Counties

Corn Crops

| Operction | Husked Com |  |  | Focaor Corm |  |  | Silage Corn |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Times cuer | Hrs. per Acre |  | Tiries over | Mrs.per Acre |  | Timesover | Hrs por acre |  |
|  |  | Man | Horse |  | Pn | Finse |  | Man | Horse |
| Plowing | 1 | 1.7 | 10.2 | 1 | 1.7 | 10.2 | 1 | 1.7 | 10.2 |
| Disking | 1 | . 4 | 1.6 | 1 | . 4 | 1.6 | 1 | . 4 | 1.6 |
| Hirrowing | 1 | . 2 | . 8 | 1 | . 2 | . 8 | 1 | . 2 | . 8 |
| Plonting | 1 | . 6 | 1.2 | 1 | . 6 | 1.2 | 1 | . 6 | 1.2 |
| Hrreming | 1 | . 2 | . 8 | 1 | . 2 | . 8 | 1 | . 2 | . 8 |
| Cultivating | 4 | 3.2 | 12.8 | 4 | 3.2 | 12.8 | 4 | 3.2 | 12.8 |
| Cutting | - | - | - | 1 | 1.5 | 4.5 | 1 | 1.5 | 4.5 |
| Shoeking | - | - | - | 1 | 2.5 | - | - | - | - |
| Eilling silo | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 7.8 | 12.7 |
| Hand huskine | 1 | 4.7 | 9.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Totnl |  | 11.0 | 36.8 |  | 10.3 | 31.9 |  | 15.6 | 44.6 |

Small Grains and Flax

| Operation | Onts |  |  | Briley |  |  | Fim |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Times | Frs.per Acre |  | Times | Hrs.per ncre |  | Tines ower | $\frac{\text { Hrs per ncre }}{\text { Hen Horse }}$ |  |
|  | aver | rn | Horse | OTEr | Man | Herse |  |  |  |
| Diskine | 2 | . 8 | 3.2 | 2 | . 8 | 3.2 | 2 | . 8 | 3.2 |
| Sceding - brondcast | 1 | . 2 | . 4 | 1 | . 2 | . 4 | (1) | (.2) | (.4) |
| drill | (1) | (.5) | (2.C) | (1) | (.5) | (2.0) | 1 | . 5 | 2.0 |
| Herroning | 1 | . 2 | . 8 | 1 | . 2 | . 8 | 2 | . 4 | 1.6 |
| Cutting | 1 | . 6 | 2.4 | 1 | . 6 | 2.4 | 1 | . 7 | 2.8 |
| Shockine | 1 | . 8 | - | 1 | 1.0 | - | 1 | . 8 | - |
| Threshing* | 1 | 2.5 | 4.5 | 1 | 2.4 | 4.7 | 1 | 2.9 | 4.6 |
| Totill |  | 5.1 | 11.3 |  | 5.2 | 11.5 |  | 6.1 | 14.2 |
| Totri** |  | (5.4) | (13.3) |  | (5.7) | (13.5) |  | (5.8) | (12.6) |

Hay Crops

| Operstion | Hay Crcps |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Alfalfa(lst Cutting) | ilfrlfn (2nd Cuttinc) | Wilc Foy |
|  | Hours per Acre | Erurs per Acre | Hours per Acre |
|  | Men Hrrse | Man Horse | Pran firse |
| Nowing | $1.0 \quad 2.0$ | .91 .8 | 1.02 .0 |
| Roking | . 51.0 | .4 . 8 | . 91.8 |
| Putting in barn | 2.3 3.1 | $1.4 \quad 2.0$ | 2.02 .8 |
| Stackine | 1.82 .1 | 1.52 .1 | 2.32 .8 |
| Total (bern) | 3.86 .1 | 2.74 .6 | 3.96 .6 |
| Total (stack) | 3.35 .1 | 2.8 4.7 | 4.26 .6 |

[^0]FACTS ABOUT THE ORGANIZGTION OF THE FARMS

| meres in corn | 105.7 | 116.3 | 122.1 | 195.7 | 38.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| acres in oats | 56.5 | 61.3 | 59.3 | 120.1 | 21.5 |
| acres in barley | 20.3 | 21.9 | 21.5 | 89.2 | - |
| Acres in flax | 9.5 | 15.2 | 18.0 | 59.4 | - |
| Lcres in other grains \& grain mixtures | 1.1 .3 | 14.3 | 4.5 | 91.8 | - |
| acres in alfalfa | 11.6 | 12.2 | 11.7 | 39.3 | - |
| Acres in tame hay | 4.1 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 40.4 | - |
| Acres in wild hay | 14.2 | 14.6 | 12.8 | 53.3 | - |
| Acres in miscellaneous hay | 6.2 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 10.1 | - |
| Acres in miscellaneous crops | 1.8 | 4.4 | 2.8 | 18.7 | - |
| Total crop acres | 241.2 | 268.8 | 260.8 | 423.8 | 95.1 |
| hcres in pasture | 63.8 | 69.7 | 62.7 | 161.4 | 13.1. |
| Acres in farmstead, roads, waste, etc. | 17.8 | 21.5 | 20.9 | 66.9 | 8.3 |
| Total acres per farm | 322.8 | 360.0 | 344:4 | 652.0 | 155.6 |
| Number of cows | 19 | 19 | 18 | 36 | 4 |
| Number of pounds cattle produced | 18683 | 22416 | 18179 | 89520 | 2955 |
| Number of pounds pork produced | 28414 | 31288 | 36165 | 86750 | 9210 |
| Number of sheep | 31 | 24 | 23 | 181 | - |
| Number of chickens | 255 | 261 | 21.4 | 419 | 39 |
| Number of laying hens | 132 | 139 | 125 | 276 | 36 |
| Total hours man labor | 8456 | 7747 | 7218 | 12585 | 4569 |
| Total hours livestock labor | 3866 | 3348 | 3291 | 6868 | 1990 |
| Total hours crop labor | 3138 | 2946 | 2754 | 5674 | 1180 |
| Total hours miscellaneous labor | 1452 | 1463 | 2173 | 2359 | 236 |
| Total hours hired labor | 2656 | 2807 | 2870 | 7590 | - |
| Total hours unpaid family labor | 1492 | 2166 | 1498 | 4743 | 180 |
| Total hours proprietor labor | 2882 | 3128 | 2806 | 4176 | 1338 |
| Hours per man per work day | 9.8 | 9.4 | 8.9 | 12.1 | 6.0 |
| Hours per man per Sunday | 3.3 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 7.4 | 3.5 |
| Tractor farms: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of farms using tractors | 10 | 12 | 11 |  |  |
| Total crop acres | 276 | 287 | 285 | 424 | 180 |
| Number work horses per farm | 9.7 | 10.0 | 9.6 | 19.4 | 5.4 |
| ivarage hours worked per horse | 885 | 815 | 753 | 945 | 513 |
| Number of crop acres per horse | 28.9 | 28.7 | 31.2 | 40.8 | 21.8 |
| Non-tractor farms: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of farms using horses only | 11 | 11 | 11 |  |  |
| Total crop acres | 222 | 249 | 237 | 376 | 95 |
| Number of work horses per farm | 8.5 | 8.9 | 8.5 | 11.8 | 4.0 |
| Arerage hours worked per horse | 945 | 917 | 825 | 1102 | 538 |
| Number of crop acres worked per horse | 28.2 | 28.2 | 28.0 | 41.2 | 15.8 |


|  | 1929 | 1930 |  | 1931 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All farms | All <br> farms | All <br> farms | Five <br> highest | Five lowest |
| RECESIETS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cattle \$ | \$3278 | \$3250 | \$2127 | \$164 | \$2302 |
| Hogs | 3017 | 2444 | 1714 | 933 | 3261 |
| Sheep and wool | 252 | 243 | 101 | 220 | - |
| Poul try and eggs | 350 | 239 | 195 | 165 | 268 |
| Dairy products | 623 | 377 | 229 | 186 | 356 |
| Horses | 46 | 47 | 36 | - | 127 |
| Corn | 492 | 409 | 215 | 298 | 177 |
| Oats | 335 | 230 | 94 | 33 | 193 |
| Barlwy | 199 | 72 | 113 | 132 | 20 |
| Flax | 375 | 287 | 258 | 424 | 139 |
| Hay | 27 | 16 | 14 | 15 | 1 |
| Other crops | 31 | 185 | 29 | 25 | 74 |
| Outside | 92 | 132 | 130 | 166 | 153 |
| "iscellaneous | 222 | 157 | 73 | $4]$. | 53 |
| (1) Total Cash Farm Receipts | 9339 | 8088 | 5328 | 2802 | 7124 |
| (2) Earm Produce Used in House | 432 | 391 | 295 | 256 | 341 |
| (3) Increase in Farm Inventory | 132 | - | - | - | $\rightarrow$ |
| (4) TOTAL RECEIPIS | 9903 | 8479 | 5623 | 3058 | 7465 |
| EXP ENSES |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hired labor | 468 | 567 | 392 | 142 | 673 |
| Cattle bought | 1052 | 959 | 727 | 74 | 1026 |
| Hogs bought | 314 | 266 | 122 | 36 | 211 |
| Sheep bought | 350 | 20 | 14 | 39 | - |
| Poultry bought | 48 | 50 | 22 | 22 | 29 |
| Horses bought | 73 | 32 | 24 | 36 | - |
| Other livestock expense | 121 | 103 | 85 | 47 | 133 |
| Feed bought | 777 | 1078 | 821 | 215 | 1286 |
| Crop expense (twine, threshing,etc.) | .) 288 | 327 | 200 | 131 | 248 |
| Real estate | 320 | 227 | 77 | 89 | 93 |
| Machinery | 588 | 494 | 133 | 95 | 172 |
| Auto (farm expense shere) | 97 | 62 | 66 | 12 | 71 |
| Gas, kerosene, oil, etc. (farm share) | 158 | 145 | 123 | 105 | J. 87 |
| Taxes | 400 | 423 | 427 | 321 | 560 |
| Insurance | 33 | 26 | 35 | 17 | 55 |
| Miscellaneous | 47 | 54 | 38 | 19 | 75 |
| (5) Total Cash Farm Expense | 5134 | 4833 | 3306 | 1400 | 4819 |
| (6) Decrease in Farm Inventory | - | 1844 | 2810 | 1194 | 4122 |
| (7) Board of Hired Labor | 206 | 210 | 135 | 65 | 157 |
| (8) TOTAL FARN EXPENSES(sum of 5 , 6 and 7) | 5340 | 6887 | 6251 | 2659 | 9098 |
| (9) Returns to Capital \& Fa Labor (4-8) | 4563 | 1592 | -628 | 399 | -1633 |
| (10) Interest on Farm Inven. 5\% | 2374 | 2023 | 1570 | 1031 | 2105 |
| (11) Family Labor Earnings (9-10) | 2189 | -431 | -2198 | -632 | -3738 |
| (12) Est. Value of Unpaid Family Labor | 588 | 43'2 | 226 | - 283 | 1.66 |
| (13) OPYRATOR'S LimBOR EARNINGS (11-12) | 1601 | -863 | -2424 | -915 | -3904 |

## AVERAGE FARN INVENTORIES

Land
Buildings
Work horses
Other horses
Cattie
Hogs
Sheep
poul try
Machinery
suto (farm share)
Feeds

Totgl

\#32182.95 \$26587 00 3620.66
$918.01 \quad 853.58$
94.77

壬177.35
$1503.79 \quad 1310.03 \quad 814.44 \quad 616.34 \quad 1519.09$
$277.50 \quad 264.13 \quad 118.02 \quad 213.30$
$204.28 \quad 175.15 \quad 131.14 \quad 112.22 \quad 205.77$
$\begin{array}{rrrrr}1811.21 & 1943.55 & 1911.09 & 1783.57 & 2570.50 \\ 155.82 & 85.38 & 72.88 & 66.17 & 742.28\end{array}$
$\underline{2543.52} \underline{2091.41 ~ 1570.74}$ 1275.95 2481.97
$47489.86 \quad 40452.50 \quad 31397.45 \quad 21479.05 \quad 42100.64$

FinR PRODUCE USED IN THE HOUSE

|  |  |  | 1931 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 411 | Five | Fjve |
|  |  |  | farms | highest | lovest |
| Cream | \$47.10 | \$30.78 | \$26.59 | \%23.50 | 16.54 |
| Farm churned butter | 29.57 | 20.43 | 20.49 | 33.10 | 13.71 |
| Whole mijk | 34.96 | 33.07 | 23.23 | 24.68 | 30.33 |
| Skirmilk | . 83 | . 39 | . 36 | . 90 | . 07 |
| Hogs | 107.68 | 73.14 | 43.48 | 27.1 .9 | 46.98 |
| Cattle | 21.71 | 29.88 | 1主.82 | 9.05 | 17.50 |
| Sheep | . 47 | . 63 | . 66 | - | - |
| Poul try | 25.75 | 28.66 | 24.46 | 15,68 | 31.61 |
| Eggs | 45.65 | 36.8 ? | 28.97 | 24.30 | 33.12 |
| Potatoes | 25.20 | 28.08 | 16.21 | 14.07 | 18.39 |
| Fruits, vegetables | 31.23 | 31.23 | 12.32 | 7.20 | 17.40 |
| Value of fuel saved | 61.70* | 61.70 | 78.55 | 76.60 | 97.00 |
| Total | \%31.85 | 374.86 | 291.24 | 256.27 | 322.65 |
| Size of Family (man equiralent) | 4.41 | 4.80 | 4.67 | 4.18 | 4.33 |

*Same as for 1930. Not summarized for 1929.

Cost and Return for $\mathrm{F} \in \in \mathrm{C}$ er Cattle
(Per 100 pounds gain in weight)

|  | iverage |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Range for each } \\ & \text { item- } 1931 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 year | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |  |
| Number of farms |  | 22 | 19 |  |  |  |
| Pounds produced | 11890 | 11608 | 12172 | 680 | to | 80405 |
| Man labor, hours | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | $3 \frac{1}{4}$ | $3 \frac{3}{4}$ | $1 \frac{1}{4}$ | to | 7 |
| Horse work, hours | 1 1 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | $1 \frac{3}{4}$ | 0 | to | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fsod | \$10.47 | \$12.8C | \$8.14 | 44.25 | to | 10.66 |
| Lan labor and horse work | 1.00 | 1.12 | . 89 | . 41 | to | 1.75 |
| Shelter | . 41 | . 25 | . 57 | c | to | 3.14 |
| Equipment | . 19 | . 15 | . 23 | c | to | 1.77 |
| Interest ${ }_{\text {a }} 5$ | . 82 | 1.13 | . 50 | . 04 | to | 1.14 |
| Miscellaneous cash | . 06 | . 07 | . $\mathrm{C4}$ | . | to | . 20 |
| Total cost | 12.95 | 15.52 | 10.37 | 6.10 | to | 16.71 |
| Minure credit | . 50 | . 64 | . 35 | 0 | to | 1.41 |
| Net cost | 12.45 | 14.88 | 10.C2 | 5.27 | to | 16.31 |
| Average solling price, per cont. | 7.66 | 8.82 | 6.50 | 4.015 | to | 8.45 |
| Koturn per 56 lbs . grain | . 24 | . 32 | . 16 | 0 | to | .37 |
| Feeds: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn, lb. | 858 | 889 | 828 | 467 | to | 1430 |
| Small grain, lb. | 159 | 186 | 132 | 0 | to | 474 |
| Protein feeds, lb. | 10 | 12 | 9 | c | to | 43 |
| Hay and fodder, it. | 311 | 373 | 249 | 66 | to | 541 |
| Silage, ib. | 128 | 91 | 166 | 0 | to | 1324 |
| Pasture, days | 6 | 5 | 6 | 0 | to | 34 |

Cost per Head for Breeding Herd

|  | Beef Herds |  |  |  |  |  | Beef and Dairy Herds |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | *-vcr are |  |  | Range for each item - 1931 |  |  | . VCr:gC |  |  | Range for each item - 19'31 |  |
|  | 2 yoar | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |  | 2 year | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |
| Number of farms |  | 9 | 9 |  |  |  | 1 | 15 | 14 |  |  |
| Man labor, hours | 41 | $39 \frac{1}{2}$ | $42^{3}$ |  |  | $60 \frac{3}{4}$ | $116 \frac{1}{4}$ | 113 | $119 \frac{1}{2}$ | 62 to | $178 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Horse work, hours | 5 | 4 | 6 | $\frac{3}{4}$ |  | 9 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ | $6 \frac{1}{4}$ | 7 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ to | $12 \frac{1}{4}$ |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feed | ふ23.88 | 22.35 | \%25.s1 | .9.96 | to | \%34.70 | 33.76 | 34.64 | ¢32.89 | $\therefore 16.37$ to | $\therefore 50.37$ |
| Tan labor and horse mork | 10.66 | 12.21 | 9.10 | 4.40 | to | 12.74 | 29.50 | 34.52 | 24.48 | 13.33 to | 38.74 |
| Shelter | 2.29 | 1.52 | 3.06 | 1.16 | to | 6.34 | 5.50 | 4.64 | 6.36 | 1.30 to | 12.29 |
| Squipment | . 49 | . 59 | . 39 | . $\mathrm{C9}$ | to | . 75 | 1.28 | 1.41 | 1.14 | . 45 to | 2.57 |
| Interest @ 5\% | 3.75 | 4.30 | 3.2C | 2.48 | to | 3.86 | 3.19 | 3.5? | 2.81 | 2.15 to | 4.17 |
| Piiscellaneous cash | . 30 | . 34 | . 27 | . 01 | to | . 84 | . 75 | . 79 | . 72 | 0 to | 3.87 |
| Depreciation | 5.75 | 7.00 | 4.49 | 0 | to | 8.59 | 7.74 | 8.89 | 6.58 | 0 to | 25.97 |
| Total cost | 47.12 | 48.31 | 45.92 | 34.63 | to | 02.67 | 81.72 | 88.46 | 74.98 | 44.97 to | 112.07 |
| Credits: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cream sold | 5.12 | C. 79 | 3.44 | 0 | to | 6.89 | 27.56 | 32.28 | 22.85 | 3.65 to | 35.10 |
| Dairy products used | 2.82 | 2.64 | 2.60 | . 86 | to | 4.74 | 7.41 | 7.77 | 7.05 | 1.20 to | 32.53 |
| Skimmilk fed | 1.10 | 1.14 | 1.19 | . 05 | to | 2. 59 | 4.52 | 5.28 | 3.70 | 1.03 to | 6.73 |
| Manure | 1.81 | 2.10 | 1.52 | . 49 | to | 2.69 | 2.92 | 3.05 | 2.79 | . 58 to | 10.81 |
| Total credit | 10.71 | 12.67 | 8.75 | 4.62 | to | 14.20 | 42.41 | 48.38 | 36.45 | 17.4E to | 51.83 |
| Net cost | 36.41 | 35.64 | 37.17 | 25.21 | to | 53.78 | 39.31 | 40.08 | 38.53 | 17.28 to | 76.22 |
| Cost per calf | 45.8 C | 45.83 | 45.89 | 34.66 | to | 58.46 | 51.48 | 59.66 | 43.29 | 14.90 to | 124.95 |
| Calves raised per cow | . 82 | . 80 | . 84 | .65 | to | . 99 | . 85 | . 74 | . 95 | . 04 to | 1.23 |
| Fceds: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corm, lb. | 140 | 118 | 101 | 0 | to | 434 | 456 | 442 | 459 | 143 to | 851 |
| Small grain, lb. | 284 | 268 | 299 | 0 | to | 912 | 932 | 964 | 900 | 38 to | $2 \leq \Sigma 1$ |
| Hay and fodder, 1 b . | 2078 | 2017 | 21.38 | 309 | to | 3950 | 2830 | 2656 | 3017 | 805 to | 4892 |
| Silage, lb. | 2320 | 1212 | 3407 | 0 | to | 11039 | 1020 | 715 | 1324 | 0 to | 9829 |
| Pristure, daws | 235 | 240 | 230 | 168 | to | 248 | 242 | 247 | 237 | 214 to | 269 |

Cost and Return for All Cattle
(Per 100 pounds gain in weigint)

|  | +.11 Farms |  |  |  | Group is* |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 year | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 | 3 year | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |
| Number of ferms |  | 22 | 24 | 23 |  | 11 | 9 | 11 |
| Pounds produced | 19759 | 18683 | 22416 | 18179 | 11438 | 14359 | 12803 | 7152 |
| Man labor, hours | 15 $\frac{3}{4}$ | $14 \frac{1}{5}$ | 14 | 171 $\frac{1}{5}$ | $21 \frac{1}{4}$ | 1912 | $18 \frac{1}{2}$ | 26 $\frac{1}{4}$ |
| Horse wark, iours | $1 \frac{3}{4}$ | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 1 | $2 \frac{1}{4}$ |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feed | \$10.58 | 311.58 | \$9.67 | \$10.49 | \$11.41 | \%12.28 | 410.01 | yil. 93 |
| Van labor and horse work | 4.07 | 4.67 | 3.90 | 3.64 | 5.78 | 6.08 | 5.79 | 5.46 |
| Shel ter | . 99 | . 90 | . 80 | 1.27 | 1.25 | . 96 | 1.00 | 1.80 |
| Equipment | . 17 | . 14 | . 16 | . 20 | . 19 | . 16 | . 15 | . 26 |
| Interest (10) 5\% | . 99 | 1.20 | . 93 | . 85 | 1.03 | 1.23 | . 93 | . 94 |
| Miscellaneous cash | . 16 | . 12 | . 15 | . 20 | . 16 | . 12 | . 10 | . 25 |
| Total cost | 16.96 | 18. 61 | 15.61 | 16.65 | 19.81 | 20.83 | 17.98 | 20.63 |
| Credits: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manure | . 76 | . 88 | . 69 | . 70 | . 95 | 1.12 | . 85 | . 89 |
| Dairy products | 4.30 | 5.26 | 3.87 | 3.77 | 7.17 | 7.94 | 6.95 | 6.62 |
| Total aredit | 5.06 | 6.14 | 4, 56 | 4.47 | 8.12 | 9.06 | 7.80 | 7.51 |
| Net cost | 11.90 | 12.47 | 11.05 | 12. 18 | 11.69 | 11.77 | 10.18 | 13.12 |
| Value of animal product** | 4.99 | 11.15 | 4.37 | -. 54 | 3.24 | 9.11 | 3.35 | $-2.73$ |
| Returm over all costs*** | -6.91 | $-1.32$ | -6.68 | -12.72 | -8.45 | -2.66 | -6.83 | $-15.85$ |
| mverage selling price, per cwt. | 8.66 | 11.50 | 8.70 | 5.79 | 7.55 | 10.95 | 7.18 | 4.51 |
| Fecds: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn, lb. | 369 | 332 | 375 | 4 Cl | 334 | 318 | 355 | 329 |
| Small grain, lb. | 202 | 175 | 206 | 226 | 235 | 200 | 211 | 293 |
| Commercial feed, lb. | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Hay and fodder, lb. | 519 | 438 | 466 | 652 | 665 | 513 | 587 | 894 |
| Silage, lb. | 262 | 234 | 137 | 414 | 190 | 203 | 141 | 225 |
| Pasture, days | 61 | 44 | 64 | 76 | 79 | 52 | 86 | 99 |

[^1]Costs and Returns for ill Cattle (cont.)
(Per 100 pounds giin in weight)

|  | Group $B^{*}$ |  |  |  | Group C* |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 year | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 | 3 year | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |
| Number of farms |  | 6 | 8 | 5 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Pounds produced | 33048 | 28045 | 29262 | 41838 | 20047 | 17423 | 23437 | 19282 |
| Man labor, hours | $10 \frac{3}{4}$ | 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ | 11 | 8 | $9 \frac{3}{4}$ | 12 | 7 | 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ |
| Horse work, hours | $1 \frac{3}{ \pm}$ | $1 \frac{3}{4}$ | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | $1: \frac{3}{-1}$ | $1 \frac{1}{4}$ | $1 \frac{1}{4}$ | 1 | $1 \frac{3}{4}$ |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feed | \$10.64 | \$12.36 | \$10.50 | 99.07 | $\pi 8.82$ | $\$_{\pi}^{\$ 9.52}$ | \%8.11 | \$8.82 |
| Mar labor and horse work | 3.16 | 4.28 | 3.43 | 1.76 | 2.50 | 3.15 | 2.19 | 2.18 |
| Shelter | . 67 | . 75 | . 74 | . 51 | . 79 | . 71 | . 67 | . 98 |
| Equipment | . 16 | . 13 | . 18 | . 16 | . 14 | . 13 | . 16 | . 12 |
| Interest (1) 5\% | . 88 | 1.17 | . 92 | . 56 | . 93 | 1.04 | . 89 | . 86 |
| Miscel laneous cash | . 1.4 | . 13 | . 19 | . 11 | . 09 | . 07 | . 10 | . 11 |
| Total cost | 15.65 | 18.82 | 15.96 | 12.17 | 13.27 | 14.62 | 12.12 | 13.07 |
| Credits: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| fimure | . 68 | . 89 | . 62 | . 52 | . 62 | . 78 | . 55 | . 54 |
| Dairy products | 3.05 | 4.88 | 2.89 | 1.39 | 1.59 | 2. 47 | 1.21 | 1.08 |
| Total credit | 3.73 | 5.77 | 3.51 | 1.91 | 2.21 | 3.25 | 1.76 | 1.62 |
| Net cost | 11.92 | 13.05 | 12.45 | 10.26 | 11.06 | 11.37 | 10.36 | 11.45 |
| Value of animal product** | 5.35 | 12.89 | 3.84 | 2.31 | 6.56 | 11.76 | 6.44 | 1.47 |
| Return over all costs*** | -5.57 | -. 16 | -8.61 | $-7.95$ | $-4.50$ | . 39 | -3.92 | -9.98 |
| iverage selling price, per cwt. Feeds. | 9.00 | 11.65 | 9.28 | 6.08 | 9.74 | 11.91 | 9.86 | 7.44 |
| Corn, lb. | 456 | 408 | 423 | 537 | 353 | 287 | 344 | 428 |
| Small grain, lb. | 189 | 174 | 255 | 169 | 158 | 147 | 166 | 160 |
| Commercial feed, lb. | 15 | 14 | 11 | 19 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 5 |
| Hay and fodder, lb. | 406 | 423 | 388 | 407 | 402 | 379 | 382 | 444 |
| Silage, lb. | 338 | 377 | 173 | 463 | 187 | 0 | 0 | 560 |
| Pasture, days | 43 | 32 | 54 | 44 | 82 | 52 | 47 | 57 |

*Group B - Farmers feeding more cattle than are raised on their farms; Group C - Farmers specielizing on baby-beef production.
**Value of animal products is the net value of animals produced after allowing for differences in inventory values.
*** i minus ( - ) indicates a failure to cover the expenses charged.

Cost and Return per 100 Pounds Pork Produced

|  | liver"!ge |  |  |  | Range for eech$\text { item - } 1931$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\overline{3}$ yeir | 1829 | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |  |
| Number of farms |  | 22 | 24 | 23 |  |  |  |
| Pounds produced | 31414 | 28414 | 31288 | 34541 | 9210 | to | 86750 |
| Man labor, hours |  | 23 |  |  | $0^{\frac{3}{4}}$ |  | $3 \frac{3}{1}$ |
| Horse work, hours | $\frac{1}{8}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{4}$ |  |  | $\frac{1}{8}$ |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feed | \$5.20 | 87.14 | \% 5.18 | $\pi 3.27$ | $\therefore 1.38$ | to | 34.42 |
| l'an labor and horse work | . 62 | . 84 | . 62 | . 40 | . 19 | to | . 79 |
| Shelter | . 22 | . 24 | . 21 | . 20 | . 03 | to | . 62 |
| Eouipment | . 08 | . 09 | . 08 | . 06 | 0 | to | . 20 |
| Interest @ 5\% | . 21 | . 32 | . 20 | . 11 | . 04 | to | . 18 |
| Miscellanecus cash | . 21 | . 27 | . 20 | . 15 | 0 | to | . 61 |
| Total cost | 6.52 | 8.90 | 6.49 | 4.19 | 1.87 | tc | 5.15 |
| Nanure credit | . 08 | . 09 | . 07 | . 09 | 0 | to | . 62 |
| Net cost | 6.44 | 8.81 | 6.42 | 4.10 | 1.84 | to | 5.05 |
| average selling price, per cwt. | 7.25 | 9.53 | 7.81 | $\therefore 42$ | 3.48 | to | 5.49 |
| Return $p$ er 56 lbs. farm grain fed | . 67 | . 74 | .71 | . 40 | . 22 | to | . 66 |
| average weight of hogs sold | 270 | 274 | 275 | 260 | 216 | to | 342 |
| Pigs raised per litter | 5.4 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 5.7 | 3.4 | to | 7.5 |
| Feeds: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn, lb. | 374 | 445 | 339 | 338 | 99 | to | 522 |
| Smell grain, lb. | 116 | 106 | 142 | 101 | 21 | to | 208 |
| Commercial feed, lb, | 4 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 0 | to | 11 |
| Tankage, lb. | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 0 | to | 19 |
| Skimmilk, lb. | 50 | 41 | 52 | 57 | 0 | to | 188 |
| Pasture, days | 27 | 23 | 31 | 26 | 8 | to | 46 |


|  | Average |  |  |  | Range for each itemi - 1931 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3. year | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |  |
| Number of farms |  | 7 | 7 | 5 |  |  |  |
| ivumber of sheep ( 2 lambs equal to one sheep) | 90 | 106 | 80 | 84 | - | to | 181 |
| Nan labor, hours | $1 \frac{3}{4}$ | 2 | $1 \frac{1}{\text { 星 }}$ | $2 \frac{1}{4}$ |  |  | 4 |
| Horse mork, hours | $\frac{3}{4}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 |  | to | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feed | \$2.81 | \$3.49 | \%2.43 | \$2. 50 | K2. 15 | to | 3.36 |
| Man labor and horse mork | . 55 | . 66 | . 45 | . 54 | . 40 | to | . 84 |
| Shelter | . 26 | . 21 | . 14 | . 42 | . 02 | to | 1.63 |
| Equipment | . 11 | . 26 | . 02 | . 07 | 0 | to | . 25 |
| Interest © 5\% | . 43 | . 50 | . 48 | . 31 | . 27 | to | . 35 |
| Miscellaneous cash | . 19 | . 16 | . 20 | . 20 | . 03 | to | . 54 |
| Total expense | 4.35 | 5.28 | 3.72 | 4.04 | 3.05 | to | 5.49 |
| Credits: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lianure | . 13 | . 03 | . 18 | . 16 | 0 | to | . 46 |
| Breeding fees | . 01 | . 03 | . 01 | 0 | 0 | to | 0 |
| Total credit | . 14 | . 06 | . 19 | . 16 | 0 | to | 1.47 |
| Net expense | 4.21 | 5.22 | 3.53 | 3.88 | 2.98 | to | 5.03 |
| Value produced: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sheep | 1.27 | 3.22 | . 50 | . 04 | -1.60 | to | . 81 |
| Wool | 1.05 | 1.34 | . 96 | . 85 | . 60 | to | 1.38 |
| Total product | 2.32 | 4.56 | 1.52 | . 89 | -. 22 | to | 1.49 |
| Return ower all costs* | -1. 89 | -. 66 | $-2.01$ | -2.99 | -3.61 | to | $-2.04$ |
| Return over feed cost* | -. 49 | 1.07 | -. 91 | -1.61 | -2.56 | to | 2.32 |
| riverage selling price of sheep, per ext. | 8.21 | 11.91 | 7.42 | 5.30 | 4.20 | to | 6.44 |
| Average selling price of wool, per lb. | . 18 | . 28 | .16 | . 10 | . 09 | to | . 11 |
| Lambs raised per ewe | 1.0 | 1.0 | . 9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | to | 1.1 |
| Per cent death loss, lambs | 13.1 | 12.0 | 17.6 | 10.4 | 5.6 | to | 21.3 |
| Per cent death loss, sheep | 12.0 | 16.C | 11.0 | 9.0 | C | to | 18.C |
| Feeds: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grain, lb. | 76 | 120 | 58 | 50 | 0 | to | 83 |
| Hay and fodder, lb. | 140 | 113 | 1 Cl | 205 | 14 | to | 457 |
| Silage, ${ }^{\text {l }}$. | 38 | 29 | 35 | 51 | C | to | 252 |
| Pasture, days | 242 | 251 | 227 | 247 | 226 | to | 266 |

$*_{s h}$ minus (-) indicates failure to cover the costs chargea.

*Traue of poultry is net value of the poultry produced after allowing for differences in inventory velues.


Cost of Horse Work per Horse

|  | Average |  |  |  | Range for each item - 1931 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 year | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |  |
| Farms Using Tractors for Drawbar Work |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of farms |  | 10 | 12 | 11 |  |  |  |
| Nan labor, hours | $49 \frac{1}{4}$ | $57 \frac{3}{4}$ | 48 | 41.3 | 23 | to | 60 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feed | 耍44.94 | \$59.55 | \$41.03 | \$34.24 | \%20.74 | to | \$46.91 |
| Man labor | 13.36 | 17.32 | 14.40 | 8.35 | 4.59 | to | 12.01 |
| Shelter | 5.93 | 5.48 | 6.00 | 6.31 | 1.60 | to | 1 C .36 |
| Equipment | 4.35 | 5.25 | 3.73 | 4.07 | 2.08 | to | 9.32 |
| Interest (2) 5\% | 4.62 | 4.82 | 4.73 | 4.31 | 2.69 | to | 6.18 |
| Miscellaneous cash | . 43 | . 49 | . 47 | . 34 | 0 | to | 1.84 |
| Depreciation | 8.87 | 8.67 | 8.18 | 9.76 | 2.51 | to | 1.9 .00 |
| Total cost | 82. 50 | $1 \overline{01.58}$ | $\overline{78.54}$ | 67.38 | 54.55 | to | 88.80 |
| Credits: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manure | 3.60 | 4.41 | 3.75 | 2.63 | 1.29 | to | 5.02 |
| Niiscellaneous | . 50 | . 22 | 1.12 | . 18 | 0 | to | 2.06 |
| Total credit | 4.10 | 4.63 | 4.87 | 2.81 | 1.29 | to | 5.02 |
| Net cost | 78.40 | 96.95 | 73.67 | 64.57 | 51.33 | to | 86.23 |
| Hours worked | $817 \frac{1}{2}$ | $884 \frac{1}{2}$ | $814 \frac{3}{4}$ | $753 \frac{1}{4}$ | $513 \frac{1}{4}$ | to | $944 \frac{3}{4}$ |
| Cost per riour, cents | 9.6 | 11.0 | 9.1 | 8.6 | 6.2 | to | 12.3 |
| Crop acres per horse | 29.6 | 28.9 | 28.7 | 31.2 | 21.8 | to | 40.8 |
| Feeds: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grain, lb. | 2993 | 3382 | 3115 | 2483 | 622 | to | 4695 |
| Hay, lb. | 2994 | 3229 | 2642 | 3111 | 1.999 | to | 4832 |
| Pasture, days | 1.58 | 139 | 162 | 172 | 129 | to | 220 |

Farms not Using Tractors for Drawbar Work

Number of farms
Man labor, hours
Costs:
Feed
Man labor
Shelter
Equipment
Interest (0) 5
Miscellaneous cash
Depreciation
Total cost
Credits:
Manure
Miscellaneous
Total credit
Net cost
Hours worked
Cost per hour, cents
Crop acres per horse
Feeds:
Grain, lb.
Hay, lb.
Pasture, days

| $49 \frac{1}{4}$ | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 47 | $53 \frac{1}{2}$ | $47 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |


| \$51.96 | \$67.61 | 449.47 | 338.81 | \$27.18 | to | 349.29 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14.30 | 17.38 | 16.02 | 9.49 | 6.63 | to | 13.70 |
| 7.83 | 7.95 | 6.75 | 8.78 | 3.07 | to | 19.22 |
| 4.75 | 6.73 | 3.75 | 3.77 . | 1.84 | to | 7.66 |
| 5.02 | 5.50 | 4.92 | 4.64 | 3.14 | to | 5.71 |
| . 56 | . 67 | . 38 | . 64 | . 05 | to | 4.07 |
| 9.44 | 11.67 | 7.97 | 8.68 | 2.53 | to | 25.77 |
| 93.86 | 117.51 | 89.26 | $\overline{74.81}$ | 53.64 | to | 101. 56 |
| 4.98 | 5.05 | 4.64 | 5.24 | . 84 | to | 12.39 |
| . 77 | 1.52 | . 48 | . 31 | 0 | to | 2\%22 |
| 5.75 | 6.57 | 5.12 | 5.55 | . 84 | to | 12.39 |

88.11 110.94 8
84.1.
$916 \frac{1}{2}$
9.2
28.2

3766
3504
148
69.

82
8.
28.

3862
3235

33 to
$68 \frac{7}{2}$
\$27.18 to $\underset{\$ 2}{3} 49.29$
6.63 to 13.70
3.07 to 19.22
3.14 to 5.71
.05 to 4.07
2.53 to 25.77
.84 to 12.39
.84 to 12.39
51.64 to 100.72

537 弪 10 1101 $\frac{1}{2}$
6.3 to 10.5
15.8 to sl. 2

2417 to 5702
2316 to 4315

Cost of Tractor Work

| year Average |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1930 | Range for each <br> item -1931 |

## Two-Plow Tractors

Mumber of farms
Costs:
lian labor
Auto use
Fuel and oil
Miscellaneous cash
Interest @ $5 \%$
Depreciation
Total cost

Hours worked:
Drawbar
Belt
Total hours
Cost per hour
Fuel per 10 hours, gal.
Oil per 10 hours, gal.
Fuel and oil:
Gasoline, gal.
Kerosene, gal.
Distillate, gal.
Oil, gal.

|  | 6 |
| ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 4.94$ | $\$ 6.88$ |
| .28 | .48 |
| 99.1 .1 | 115.61 |
| 5.26 | 4.68 |
| 23.83 | 20.23 |
| 91.34 | 81.67 |
| 224.76 | 229.55 |
| $306 \frac{1}{4}$ | $309 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $57 \frac{1}{4}$ | $-53 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $363 \frac{1}{2}$ | 363 |
| .62 | 4.63 |
| 17.0 | 18.0 |
| .8 | .9 |
| 547 | 530 |
| 34 | 45 |
| 37 | 75 |
| $30 \frac{3}{4}$ | 34 |

5
$\begin{array}{r}\$ 3.01 \\ .07 \\ 82.61 \\ 5.84 \\ 27.43 \\ 101.00 \\ \hline 219.96 \\ 303 \\ -60 \frac{3}{4} \\ \hline 363 \frac{3}{4}\end{array}$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
4.60 \\
16.0 \\
.8
\end{array}
$$

564
22
0
$27 \frac{1}{2}$

| $\$ 1.20$ | to | $\$ 8.00$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | to | .37 |
| 55.50 | to | 109.73 |
| 0 | to | 14.60 |
| 15.88 | to | 36.25 |
| 150.00 | to | 50.00 |
| 153.07 | to 292.48 |  |
| $129 \frac{3}{\frac{1}{4}}$ | to | $426 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $40 \frac{3}{4}$ | to | $90 \frac{1}{4}$ |
| 190 | to | $472 \frac{1}{4}$ |
|  |  |  |
| $\$ .39$ | to | 3.85 |
| 14.0 | to | 20.0 |
| .4 | to | 1.0 |
| 480 | to | 761 |
| 0 | to | 70 |
| 0 | to | 0 |
| 14 | to | 45 |

Three-Plow Tractors
Number of Parms
Costs:
Man labor
Auto use
Fuel and oil
Miscellaneous cash
Interest @ 5\%
Depreciation
Total cost
Hours worked:
Drawbar
Belt
Total hours
Cost per hour
Fuel per 10 hours, gal. Oil per 10 hours, gal. Fuel and oil:

| Gasoline, gal. | 520 | 396 | 645 | 33 | to | 1622 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kerosene, gal. | 339 | 324 | 354 | 0 | to | 789 |
| Distillate, gal. | 312 | 322 | 302 | 0 | to | 886 |
| Oil, gal. | $62 \frac{3}{4}$ | 75 | $50 \frac{1}{2}$ | 16 | to | $80 \frac{1}{4}$ |

Cost of Auto Operation

|  | Hverage |  |  | Range for each$\text { itern - } 1931$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 yerr | 1930 | 1931 |  |
| Number of farms |  | 22 | 21 |  |
| Milcs driven | 6667 | 6812 | 6522 | 817 to 14465 |
| Gesoline, gal. | 482 | 490 | 474 | 106 to ll01 |
| Oil, gal. | 16 | 15 | 16 | 4 to 45 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |
| Man labor | \% 5.03 | ज5.06 | S5.00 | 40 to ${ }^{2} 4.69$ |
| Gasoline | 81.66 | 88.74 | 74.57 | 16.25 to 158.09 |
| Oil | 12.05 | 13.03 | 11.07 | 3.14 to 25.29 |
| Miscellaneous cash | 73.43 | 83.64 | 63.22 | 13.00 to 159.61 |
| Intercst @ $5 \%$ | 20.74 | 23.07 | 18.41 | 2.50 to 41. 25 |
| Depreciation | 131.05 | 12.34 | 119.76 | 0 to 275.00 |
| Total cost | 323.96 | 355.88 | 292.03 | 91.89 to 652.59 |
| Cost per mile, cents | $\dot{4} 9$ | 5.2 | 4.5 | 3.0 to : 11.2 |
| Miles nor gal. of gasoline | 13.7 | 13.9 | 13.4 | 6.9 to 17.5 |

Cost per racre of Producing Husked Corn

|  | ivcrage |  |  |  | Range for each item in 1931 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Threc years | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |  |
| Number of farms | 24 | 24 | 24 | 23 |  |  |  |
| Licres per ferm | 90 | 96 | 97 | 78 | 38 | to | 182 |
| All work up to harvest: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man hours | 7.7 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 4.8 | to | 11.8 |
| Horse hours | 25.8 | 28.0 | 25.0 | 24.5 | 9.7 | to | 37.4 |
| Tractor hours | . 6 | . 4 | . 8 | . 7 | - | to | 2.1 |
| Harvosting: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men hours | 5.0 | 5.7 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 2.3 | to | 6.8 |
| Horso hours | 11.0 | 12.9 | 10.2 | 9.8 | 2.0 | to | 15.0 |
| Tractor hours | . 1 | . 1 | . 1 | . 1 | - | to | 1.0 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nen, horse end tractor | 8.06 | 9.45 | 8.27 | 6.46 | . 4.79 | to | 8. 86 |
| Seed | . 40 | . 42 | . 42 | . 37 | . 27 | to | . 52 |
| ranure | . 38 | 1.75 | 1.90 | 1.40 | . 55 | to | 2.92 |
| Mechenical picker | 1.68 | . 37 | . 47 | . 30 | - | to | . 70 |
| Other machinery | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | to | . 95 |
| Lend | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | to | 6.00 |
| Total | 17.47 | 18.94 | 18.01 | 15.48 | 13.66 | to | 19.18 |
| Crodit (pasture \& insurence) | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.06 | 1.00 | to | 1.46 |
| Net cost | $\overline{16.45}$ | $\overline{17.94}$ | 17.01 | 14.42 | 11.42 | to | 18.18 |
| Yield, bu. | 31.2 | 38.0 | 31.9 | 23.8 | 1.6 .5 | to | 37.9 |
| Cost per bu. | . 53 | . 47 | . 54 | \%. 61 | $\therefore 43$ | to | $\therefore .99$ |
| December 1 price | . 48 | . 56 | . 48 | . 51 | . 41 | to | . 41 |
| Crop value at December l price | 14.98 | 21.28 | 15.31 | 9.76 | 6.76 | to | 15.54 |
| Net return | $-1.47$ | 3.34 | -1.70 | -4.66 | -10.64 | to | . 71 |
| Return per man hour | . 17 | . 54 | . 17 | mone | none | to | . 31 |

## Cost per .ecre of Producing Oats

| Number of farms | 22 | 22 | 22 | 23 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| icres per form | 62 | 65 | 63 | 57 | 21 | to | 120 |
| ill nork up to hervest: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men hours | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.4 | .7 | to | 2.0 |
| Horse hours | 6.1 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 5.2 | . 6 | to | 7.9 |
| Tractor hours | . 1 | . 1 | . 1 | . 1 | - | to | . 4 |
| Rervesting: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Won hours | 4.6 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 3.7 | 2.8 | to | 6.7 |
| Horse hours | 7.8 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 6.3 | 3.4 | to | 11.3 |
| Tractor hours | . 1 | . 1 | . 1 | . 1 | - | to | . ${ }_{5}$ |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non, horse and tractor | . 3.43 | $\cdots 4.12$ | 3.79 | 2. 2.37 | 1.89 | to | \%3.87 |
| Sced | 1.36 | 1.58 | 1.21 | 1.31 | 1.03 | to | 2.11 |
| Trine | . 34 | . 34 | . 40 | . 27 | . 19 | to | . 39 |
| Threshing | . 99 | 1.21 | 1.11 | . 64 | . 39 | to | . 98 |
| Manure | . 85 | . 89 | . 78 | . 91 | - | to | 3.22 |
| Mrchinery | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | to | . 95 |
| Land | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | to | 6.00 |
| Total | 13.92 | $\overline{15.09}$ | $\overline{14.22}$ | $\overline{12.45}$ | 11.10 | to | 16.78 |
| Yield, bu. | 45.4 | 50.7 | 53.5 | 32.1 | 17.8 | to | 51.0 |
| Cust per bu. | - 31 | \%. 29 | \%. 27 | \%. 39 | . 24 | to | . 71 |
| December 1 price | . 27 | . 36 | . 24 | . 22 | . 22 | to | . 22 |
| Crop value at December l price | 12.26 | 18.25 | 12.84 | 7.06 | 3.91 | to | 11.22 |
| Not retum | -1.66 | 3.16 | -1.38 | -5.39 | -9.20 | to | -1.04 |
| Return per men hour | none | . 74 | . 10 | none | none | to | . 02 |

Cost per acre of Producing Barley

|  | iverage |  |  |  | Range for cach item in 1931 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Thrge years | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |  |
| Number of farms |  | 16 | 15 | 15 |  |  |  |
| ricres per farm | 31 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 15 | to | 89 |
| $\therefore 11$ work up to harvest: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man hours | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.5 | . 7 | to | 2.3 |
| Horse hours | 5.8 | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.9 | 1.8 | to | 7.5 |
| Tractor hours | . 2 | . 1 | . 2 | . 2 | - | to | 1.7 |
| Harvesting: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men hours | 4. 8 | 5.4 | 4.8 | 4.2 | 2.5 | $\pm 0$ | 5.5 |
| Horse hours | 8.1 | 9.0 | 8.4 | 7.0 | 4.5 | to | 9.6 |
| Tractor hours | - | - | - | . 1 | - | to | . 5 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vian, horse and tractor | $\therefore 3.42$ | 34.04 | 33.53 | \%2.65 | $\because 1.74$ | to | $\$ 4.08$ |
| Seed | 1.19 | 1. 47 | 1.06 | 1.04 | . 67 | to | 1.34 |
| Twine | . 32 | . 34 | . 34 | . 29 | . 18 | to | .37 |
| Thresking | . 81 | 1.03 | . 80 | . 60 | . 24 | to | . 97 |
| Namure | . 77 | . 94 | . 73 | . 65 | . 27 | to | 1.27 |
| Machirery | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | . 96 | . 95 | to | 1.07 |
| Land | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | to | 6.00 |
| Total | $\overline{13.46}$ | 14.77 | 13.41 | 12.19 | 10. 52 | to | 13.58 |
| iseld, bu. | 28.0 | 33.0 | 29.0 | 21.9 | 8.2 | to | 35.8 |
| Cost per bu. | \%. 48 | ri. 45 | -46 | \%. 56 | ¢. 36 | to | 㫦. 39 |
| December l price | . 42 | . 49 | . 38 | . 38 | . 38 | to | . 38 |
| Crop value at December 1 price | 11.76 | 16.17 | . 21.02 | 8.32 | 3.14 | to | 13.59 |
| Net return | $-1.70$ | 1.40 | -2.39 | -3.87 | -8.36 | to | . 65 |
| Return per man hour | . 02 | . 50 | mone | none | none | to | . 35 |

Cost per Acre of Producing Flax

| Number of farms |  | 8 | 13 | 14 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| acres per farm | 29 | 28 | 30 | 28 | 14 | to | 59 |
| isll work up to harvest: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man hours | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 1.3 | to | 10.1 |
| Horse hours | 11.1 | 12.8 | 10.0 | 10.4 | 3.6 | to | 46.8 |
| Tractor hours | . 3 | . 1 | . 6 | . 2 | - | $\pm 0$ | 1.7 |
| Harvesting: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man hours | 5.1 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 4.7 | 2.7 | to | 6.1 |
| Horse hours | 8.9 | 10.2 | 8.7 | 7.8 | 3.9 | to | 10.6 |
| Tractor hours | . 1 | - | - | . . 2 | - | to | . 7 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nan, horse and tractor | 34.57 | ¢ 5.16 | \%4.85 | 3.71 | 2.23 | to | 8.69 |
| Seed | 2.18 | 2.21 | 2.57 | 1.75 | 1.19 | to | 2.85 |
| Twine | . 22 | . 22 | . 25 | .17 | - | to | . 38 |
| Thresting | 1.33 | 1.64 | 1.65 | . 71 | . 21 | to | 1. 40 |
| Nianure | . 87 | . 77 | . 72 | 1.11 | .30 | to | 4.79 |
| Machinery | -. 97 | . 99 | . 94 | . 98 | . 93 | to | 1.26 |
| Lend | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | to | 6.00 |
| Totnl | 16.14 | 16.99 | 16.99 | 14.43 | 1.1 .69 | to | 18.55 |
| Yisld, bu. | 10.1 | 11.2 | 13.0 | 6.0 | 1.6 | to | 8.5 |
| Cost per bu. | \$1.60 | \%1.50 | \%1.31 | \$2.40 | 1. 57 | to | 1.2 .50 |
| İecember l price | 1.85 | 2.83 | 1.48 | 1.23 | 1.23 | to | 1.23 |
| Crop value et December 1 price | 18.68 | 31.74 | 19.24 | 7.38 | 1.97 | to | 10.46 |
| Net return | 2.54 | 14.71 | 2.25 | -7.05 | $-17.58$ | to | $-2.79$ |
| Return per man hour | . 61 | 2.09 | . 58 | nono | none | to | none |

Cost per icre of Producing ilfalfa Hay

| Number of farms |  | 17 | 17 | 17 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| acres per farm | 14 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 2 | to 39 |
| Men hours | 9.3 | 11.5 | 9.5 | 6.8 | 3.1 | to 12.1 |
| Horse hours | 14.9 | 17.5 | 15.7 | 11.5 | 5.1 | to 23.7 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man and horse | \$4. 26 | \$5.55 | \$4.55 | \$2.68 | \$1.21 | to \$5.03 |
| Seed | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | to 1.00 |
| Manure | 1.14 | 1.52 | 1.01 | . 89 | . 06 | to 2.48 |
| Machinery | 1.46 | 1.62 | 1.53 | 1.24 | . 85 | to 1.75 |
| Land | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | to 6.00 |
| Total | 13.68 | 15.69 | 14.09 | 11.81 | 9.61 | to 14.09 |
| Yield, tons | 1.6 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 0.6 | to 2.4 |
| Cost per ton | \%8.66 | 87.85 | \%8.80 | \$10.74 | 6, 87 | to 18.77 |

Cost per icre of Producing Wild Hgy

| Number of farms |  | 15 | 12 | 14 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| acres per farm | 23 | 22 | 27 | 20 | 3 | to 44 |
| Men hours | 4.8 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 3.9 | 2.3 | to 5.4 |
| Horse hours | 8.2 | 9.2 | 8.8 | 6.6 | 4.2 | to 10.6 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man and horse | \$2.28 | \%2. 79 | \$2.49 | \$1.55 | ¢. 93 | to 32. 26 |
| Machinery | . 86 | . 89 | . 85 | . 85 | . 85 | to .95 |
| Land | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | to 5.00 |
| Total | 8.14 | 8.68 | 8.34 | 7.40 | 6.78 | to 8.11 |
| Yield, tons | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.2 | . 6 |  | to 1.1 |
| Cost per ton | \%8.14 | 64.89 | \$6.95 | 12.33 | 87.10 | to 35.05 |

Cost per icre of Producing Corn Fodder

|  | sverage |  |  |  | Range for each item 1931 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Three <br> years | 1928 | 1930 | 1931 |  |
| Number of farms |  | 12 | 18 | 18 |  |
| Leres per farm | 12 | 8 | 13 | 16 | 3 to 46 |
| isll work up to horvost: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men hours | 7.7 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 7.5 | 3.3 to 12.2 |
| Horse hours | 25.9 | 28.0 | 24.4 | 25.2 | 6.3 to 37.3 |
| Tractor hours | . 7 | . 4 | . 9 | . 7 | - to 2.9 |
| H rvesting: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man hours | 5.6 | 6.5 | 5.6 | 4.6 | 2.8 to 7.4 |
| Horse hours | 5.8 | 5.2 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 3.5 to 10.9 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man, horse and tractor | \$7.46 | \$8.36 | \$7.88 | \$6.13 | $\$ 3.63$ to 9.08 |
| Seed | . 74 | 1.01 | . 63 | . 57 | . 29 to 2.31 |
| Twine | . 49 | . 63 | . 50 | . 34 | .17 to . 55 |
| Manure | 1.81 | 1.58 | 1.69 | 2.17 | . 20 to 8.77 |
| Nachine | 1.65 | 1.65 | 1.65 | 1.65 | 1.65 to 1.65 |
| Land | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 to 6.00 |
| Total cost | $\overline{18.15}$ | 19.23 | 18.35 | 16.86 | 13.04 to 23.01 |
| Credit* | . 05 | $\underline{-}$ | . 08 | . 05 | - to . 86 |
| Net cost | 18.10 | 19.23 | 18.26 | 16.81 | 13.04 to 23.01 |
| Yield, tons | 2.3 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 1.6 | . $9^{-}$to 3.2 |
| Cost per ton | \$7.87 | \$5.83 | \$10.52 | \$10.50 | \$5.00 to 20.40 |

Cost per Acre of Producing Corn Silage

| Number of farms Acres per farm |  | 8 | 6 | 7 | - |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 21 | 16 | 21 | 25 | 9 | to | 53 |
| All work up to harvest: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man hours | 8.0 | 7.8 | 8.5 | 7.7 | 4.0 | to | 10.5 |
| Horse hours | 27.6 | 27.8 | 28.3 | 26.7 | 11.5 | to | 36.2 |
| Tractor hours | . 6 | . 5 | . 8 | . 6 | - | to | 1.9 |
| Harvesting: ${ }^{\text {H }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man hours | 7.4 | 13.1 | 9.0 | 10.1 | 7.5 | to | 13.1 |
| Horse hours | 18.0 | 21.8 | 15.5 | 16.7 | 11.6 | to | '21.6 |
| Tractor hours | . 1 | . 2 | - | . 2 | - | to | 1.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man, horse and tractor | \$10.69 | \$12.82 | \$10.49 | \$8.75 | \$6.84 | to | \$9.91 |
| Seed | . 61 | . 69 | . 60 | . 55 | . 34 | to | . 77 |
| Twine | . 41 | . 51 | . 40 | . 33 | - | to | . 57 |
| Manure | 2.01 | 2.15 | 1.72 | 2.15 | . 40 | to | 3.76 |
| Silo filling | 8.31 | 2.52 | 1.95 | 2.46 | 1.88 | to | 3.47 |
| Machinery | 1.55 | 1.56 | 1.53 | 1.55 | . 95 | to | 1.65 |
| Land | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | to | 6.00 |
| Total | 23.58 | 26.25 | 22.69 | $\overline{21.79}$ | 19.19 | to | 23.72 |
| Credit* | $\frac{.23}{23.35}$ | . 14 | . 54 | ? |  |  | - |
| Net cost | $\overline{23.35}$ | $\overline{26.11}$ | $\overline{22.15}$ | $\overline{21.79}$ | 19.19 | to | 23.72 |
| Yield, tons | 6.2 | 7.3 | 5.1 | 6.2 | 4.5 | to | 8.4 |
| Cost per ton | \$3.77 | \$3.58 | \$4.34 | \$3.51 | \$2.46 | to | \$5.16 |

*Credit for corn picked up after binder.


[^0]:    *Threshing hours for onts and barlcy include tho hours hauling erain to the bin. The threshing hours on flax do not include hours for hadinf to the bin or to market because mast of the flax was trucked direct from the machine to market.
    **Total if alternative method ef sceding is used.

[^1]:    *Group iz - Farmers combining dairying and beef production.
    **Value of animal product is the net value of animsls produced after allowing for differences in inventary values. *** $i_{i}$ minus (-) indicates a failure to cover the expenses charged.

