

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
http://ageconsearch.umn.edu
aesearch@umn.edu

Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA Department of Agriculture and UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE Bureau of Agricultural Economics Cooperating

-- 0 --

A Preliminary Report of Data Secured in 1929, 1930, and 1931 on the

FARM ACCOUNTING ROUTE

in

ROCK & NOBLES COUNTIES - MINNESOTA

Вy

G. A. Sallee - G. A. Pond R. H. Loreaux - Routeman

-- 0 --

Mimeographed Report No.54
Division of Agricultural Aconomics
University Farm
St. Paul, Minnesota
May 1932

INDEX

Page
1
4
8
8
14
17
18
19
20
21
22
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
30
31
31
32
32
33
33

INTRODUCTION

Method of Study

The Divisions of Agricultural Economics and of Animal Husbandry of the Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station cooperated with the Bureau of Agricul→ tural 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 which 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 expenditures, a daily record of the labor used on each crop and each class of livestock, a record of the farm produce used in the house and other detailed information regarding their business. These records were checked at least twice a month by the route man and supplemented with inventories, livestock feed records, reports of crop yields and practices and other significant facts about the farm operations. The livestock inventories were taken by a committee of three, consisting of Professor Peters, in charge of the Animal Husbandry Division 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 Farm, St. Paul, whore a detailed set of records for each farm was kept. From these records, the costs presented in this report have been computed. This preliminary report presents the average costs and returns in 1929, 1930, and 1931 for the different classes of livestock kept and the crops grown on these farms, and also a partial analysis of the data secured.

Description of Area

Rock and Nobles Counties are located in the southwestern corner of Minnesota. The soil in Rock County and the western edge of Nobles County is a wind-blown loess. This is one of the most fertile soil types in the state. The balance of Nobles County is covered with a glacial till, the prevailing soil type of the southern and central 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, especially in southern Nobles County, that need drainage to insure regular cropping. In Rock County, there are limited areas of rock outcrop and also limited areas where the surface soil is shallow and underlain by a gravelly subsoil. These latter soils are inclined to be droughty in a dry season. The annual rainfall averages between 26 and 28 inches and the average growing season is from 130 to 140 days. According to the 1930 census, the average size of farms in Rock County was 220 and in Nobles County 208 acres. Farms between 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 farm land per acre, including buildings, was \$103 in Nobles County and \$107 in Rock County. Only eight counties in the state reported a higher value per acre and seven of these are located close to Minneapolis and St. Paul. The average value of all farm land in the state was \$69 per acre. According to the 1930 census, 67% of all farm land in Nobles County and 70% of the land in Rock County was operated by tenants. Both cash and share leases are employed. Beef cattle and hogs are the principal classes of livestock raised. Corn, oats, and barley are the principal grain crops. They are raised primarily for feed altho there is a considerable surplus available for sale on many farms. The landlord's share of the crop is usually sold off the farm. Alfalfa and wild hay are the principal roughages 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 acres. This is approximately 62%, 51% and 68% larger respectively than the average size of the farms 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 farms, with the exception of the landlord's share of the crop, was fed on the farm. Only two of the farms studied in 1931 were owned entirely by the operator. Eleven farms were partly owned and partly rented by the operator. Only 34% of the land operated was owned by the operator. Both share and cash rental leases were employed. More facts about the organization of the farms are presented on page 17.

Crop Rotation and Cropping Practices

With the high percentage of tenancy, the two year rotation of corn and small grain has persisted. Either landlords have not seen any benefit to be derived from a rotation which tends to conserve soil fertility, or satisfactory lease arrangements permitting the adoption of a more diversified cropping program have not been worked out. Approximately 45% of the crop acreage on these farms was in corn, 36% in outs and barley, 5% in wild hay, and 6% in flax, a total of 92%. This leaves a possible maximum of 8% in legume crops. The proportion of the acreage in legume crops was actually much less than this. 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 studied 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 hogs per farm was produced. Eighteen 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 was 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 corm, oats, and flax. The corresponding percentages 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 was 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 lowest for ten years. The disadvantage of poor summer pastures in 1930 was partly offset by the unusually good fall pasture and mild open winter which followed. The effect of the weather on crop yields is indicated in Table 1.

Table 1

Crop Yields in Rock and Nobles Counties Average Route Average 1922-31* 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 2.0 1.8 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

From the standpoint of the livestock enterprises, the hot dry weather in the summers of 1930 and 1931 was very favorable to the control of diseases, especially diseases of swine and poultry. The mild open winter of 1930-31 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.

^{*}Calculated from reports of the State Department of Agriculture, except in the case of alfalfa, corn silage, and corn fodder, for which the State Department gives no data. Average yields for these crops estimated from their relation to the other crops.

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.

Tuble 2

Average Price Received for Livestock and Livestock Products

Rock and Nobles Counties

1929 1930 1931

All cattle, per cwt. \$11.50 \$8.70 \$5.79

Hogs, per cwt. 9.53 7.81 4.42

Sheep nonewat 11.91 7.42 5.30

4.42 Hogs, per cwt. 5.30 7.42 Sheep, per cwt. 11.91 All chickens, per lb. .14 .14 .19 Butterfat, per 1b. .43 .35 . 25 .20 .16 Eggs, per doz. .28 .10 Wool, per 1b. .28 .16

The severe decline in prices extending over the three-year period has resulted in decreasing cash incomes from the same physical amount of production.

Prices for the crops commonly grown in these counties became increasingly unfavorable during the three-year period. The December 1 crop prices are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

December 1 Farm	Price of Crops - Re	ock and I	Nobles Cou	ınti es
	Coun ty	Ro	oute Farms	3
Crop	Average	1929	1930	1931
	1922-31*			
			100	
Corn, bu.	\$. 58	\$.56	\$.4 8	\$.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 Agriculture.

METHODS OF COMPUTING AND PRESENTING DATA

Financial Statement

Most of the farms studied were either partly or entirely 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 straight ownership basis. The inventories include all of the farm property regardless of ownership 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 inventory decrease in the financial statement. The only effect on the earnings as

calculated here is in the decreased interest charge. The value 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 farm expenses. These expenses on the house are listed in the household account.

Board for hired labor was charged at \$28 per month in 1929, \$25 per month in 1930, and \$20 in 1931. Unpaid family labor was estimated at 25 cents per hour in 1929, 20 cents in 1930, and 15 cents in 1931. All cash rent and interest actually paid have been omitted and interest at 5% charged on the average total investment.

Livestock

The comparative costs and returns for each of the different classes of livestock produced are presented in this preliminary report. Insofar as possible, local prices were used in determining the costs and returns. Marketable feeds were charged at local prices and non-marketable feeds on a compatative-feeding-value basis. Man labor was figured at 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 shelter charge was based on the annual cost of the buildings housing livestock, prorated on the basis of space occupied. The equipment charge is based on the annual cost of the particular class of equipment used by that class of livestock. Miscellaneous cash costs include veterinary fees, medicine, salt, minerals, etc. The manure credit is based on a value of 75 cents per ton in the barnyard. Only the amount of the manure actually spread on the fields was credited to the livestock.

In studying the tables and in considering the income from livestock, one should keep in mind that these are comparative figures and represent charges which are not all actual cash expenses. All man labor and horse work, interest on the investment, and the use of the buildings and equipment, as well as the feed have been charged to the enterprise. Therefore, a minus return means that the particular class of livestock has failed to pay the prices charged for the different factors. There may be no other more profitable alternative use for the buildings, much of the labor, or for the non-marketable feeds. A return above the price of marketable feeds and cash expenses may 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 animal, or on some similar basis. All corn has been reduced to a shelled corn basis. The returns have been expressed in several ways. The gain or return over all costs is the amount left after deducting all the charges listed in the table. The return over feed cost is what is left after deducting feed from the total income; or in other words, it is what is left to pay for the labor, shelter, equipment, interest, and miscellaneous cash costs. The return per hour represents what the enterprise returned for each hour of ran labor used in it, after allowance had been made for all charges except labor. The return per 56 pounds of grain represents what was left to pay for each 56 pounds of farm grain fed after making allowance for all other feed and all of the other charges. The unit of 56 pounds of grain was used because that corresponds to the weight of one bushel of corn.

Feeder Cattle. This class of cattle includes all cattle being fattened for market and covers only the feeding period. The return per 56 pounds of farm grain is obtained by deducting from the selling price all charges except that for farm grains fed. The result is then divided by the number of pounds of farm grains fed and multiplied by 56. Due to the impossibility of determining the pork credit for the feed picked up behind cattle, this item was emitted

from 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 inventory. The cost per calf was 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.

As 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 run with the cows for six or seven months and they received all the milk the cows gave. On the farms with dual-purpose herds, the calves were weaned from wholenilk within two or three weeks after birth and from skimmilk at from one to two months 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 determined because the amount of whole milk the calves received while nursing could not be determined.

Generally speaking, only the cows that were being milked 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. Three more or less distinct types of beef production were found on the farms studied and averages 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 which more cattle were fattened than were raised in one year. The additional number was obtained either by purchase or by accumulation from past years. Group C is composed of the farms on which breeding herds were maintained for raising calves. They are primarily baby beef producers. The "value of animal product" was obtained by deducting the value of the purchases and opening inventory from the value of the sales, products used in the house, and the closing inventory. The low value of animal product (in some cases a minus) is largely due to the decline in the price of cattle. The average value per hundred pounds of cattle on these farms March 1, 1931 was \$7.09 and on March 1, 1932 it was \$4.79, a drop of \$2.30. In 1931, the average inventory weight was approximately twice the weight produced which means that each 100 pounds of cattle produced was charged with a loss in inventory value of \$4.60. The data for the individual farms varied from these averages. No attempt was made to eliminate the decrease in inventory values due to the price decline, as was done with the breeding herd. because of variations in kind and quality of stock on hand at the end of the year as compared with the beginning.

Hogs. It is a common practice on these farms to have hogs following the cattle. However, due to the methods of handling the cattle and the practice of supplementary feeding, it was impracticable to obtain any estimate of the feed salvaged in this way. The amounts and the costs of feed presented are in addition to any salvaged behind cattle. The number of pigs raised per litter was calculated by dividing the number of pigs raised to market weight by the number of farrowings. The return per 56 pounds of grain was calculated in the same manner as for feeder cattle.

Sheep. The value of the product in sheep was calculated in the same manner as for all cattle, namely, by deducting the value of the purchases and beginning inventory from the value of the sheep and lambs sold, butchered, and on the ending inventory. The number of lambs per ewe was obtained by dividing the number of lambs raised by the number of ewes in the flock. The per cent of death loss of lambs is for lambs up to six months of age. After six months of age, they were considered as sheep. The large decline in lamb and wool prices resulted in losses.

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

Work Horses. The farms were divided into two groups for the presentation of work horse costs. One group comprises the farms on which tractors were used for drawbar work and the other group comprises the farms on which tractors were not used for drawbar work.

Tractor. Tractor costs are presented for both two-plow and three-plow tractors. In these statements, gasoline is charged at a price which did not include the three cent state tax, even though some farmers did not claim the tax refund.

Auto. Auto costs are presented for 1930 and 1931. These costs do not include a charge for shelter.

Crops. Comparative costs and returns for the eight principal crops grown on the fams studied are presented in this report. The physical quantities of man labor and horse and tractor work used per acre for each of the crops are also presented. The man labor rate of 30 cents per hour in 1929 and 1930, and of 25 cents in 1931 is based on wages paid to hired men. It includes an allowance for board. Horse work was charged at 12 cents per hour in 1929, $10\frac{1}{2}$ cents in 1930, and $8\frac{1}{2}$ cents in 1931. Two-plow tractors were charged at 75 cents per hour in 1929 and 1930, and 65 cents in 1931; three-plow tractors were charged at \$1.00 per hour in 1929 and 1930 and 85 cents in 1931. The seed charge for hay is based on the cost of seeding divided by the expected life of the stand. Menure was charged at 75 cents per ton plus the cost of hauling and spreading. Fifty per cent of this was charged against the crop to which the manure was applied and the balance was prorated to the other crops in the rotation on am acre basis. Machinery was charged at a flat rate which includes an allowance for interest, depreciation, repairs, and other costs. The land charge was based upon the prevailing cash rental rates paid by the cooperators. The local market price on December 1 was used in computing the returns from the various crops. All costs, except those for flax, are figured at the farm. Marketing charges for flax, when it was hauled direct to market at threshing time, have been included. The costs do not include any labor for hauling hay from the stack nor folder from the shock since hauling practices and size of loads vary so much. The credits include stubble or stalk pasture, and corn picked up behind 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. The net return is the gain or loss left after subtracting from the value of the crop the items of cost that are presented. The return per man hour is the amount left to pay for the labor used after all charges except labor have been met. The returns are not calculated for the hay crops, corn fodder, and silage as these crops are fed on the farm.

As with livestock, the costs presented are relative rather than absolute costs and include other than "out-of-pocket" cash expenses. Uniform cash rental rates are used for each crop, since the varied rental systems on the different farms, including cash rented, share rented and owned land, would tend to obscure these comparisons. Uniform machinery, labor and herse and tractor work rates have also been used. All crops have been credited at uniform prices, except as they vary in quality. Some farmers uncoubtedly received different prices and also had labor and machinery costs differing from those used. The reader, in interpreting these figures, must make such adjustments in the returns as are necessary to fit the warying conditions.

FARM EARNINGS

As a result of the drastic decline in the prices of farm products, farm earnings declined rapidly. Cash receipts fell from \$9339 in 1929 to \$8088 in 1930 and \$5328 in 1931, a decrease, respectively, of 13 and 34 per cent. Cash expenses declined from \$5134 in 1929 to \$4833 in 1930, and \$3306 in 1931, a decrease, respectively, of 6 and 31 per cent. Two very definite steps were taken to adjust the farm business to the low income. The first of these was a reduction in machinery and equipment expense of over 70 per cent, effected largely through the elimination of purchases of new implements. The second was a reduction in buildings and fence expense of over 60 per cent, also effected largely through the postponement of the erection of new buildings or fences and other than the absolutely necessary repairs. Other expenses, except taxes, were also reduced, but to a lesser degree. The amount of taxes paid increased. Altho expenses were reduced, they were not reduced in proportion to the reduction in receipts.

The severe decline in prices also reduced the earnings on these farms through the reduction in inventory values. This reduction amounted to an average of \$1844 in 1930 and \$2810 in 1931. Part of this was due to a smaller amount of feeds and livestock on hand but the major portion was due to the decline in prices.

SECURING MAXIMUM RETURNS

Two things are necessary in order to secure maximum returns from a farm. These are (1) the selection of the most profitable enterprises, and (2) the adoption of profitable practices in the handling of the enterprises chosen.

Selection of Profitable Enterprises

No two forms or farmers are exactly alike. Farms vary in soil type, fertility, and drainage, in the amount of pasture available, in the amount and kind of crops grown, in the amount of shelter available for livestock, in the water supply, and in the adequacy of the fencing. Further, farmers vary in their likes and dislikes and in their ability to handle the different kinds of livestock and crops. For these reasons, the best selection of the particular kinds and combinations of kinds of crop and livestock enterprises will vary with the individual farm and farm operator. However, the results of this three-year study will give information useful in the organizing and operating of any individual farm.

Selection of Livestock. In general, these records indicate that the hog enterprise was consistently the most profitable major livestock enterprise; that the baby-beef type of production was the most profitable type of beef production; that the combination of milk and beef production found on these farms was consistently the least profitable type of beef production; and that poultry properly handled are a profitable part of the farm business. Although 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 program, it is well to consider whether the crops 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 amount and quality of digestible nutrients produced per acre. The records secured in this study furnish the basis for such a selection. The production per acre and the relative cost per hundred pounds of digestible nutrients for Rock and Nobles Counties, based on ten year average yields and average route costs are presented in Table 4.

Production per Acre and Relative Cost per 100 Pounds of

Table 4

Production per	rect o and	TICTED TAC OOD	o por roo r	Canas of
Digestible	Nutrients	- Rock and	Nobles Coun	ties
	Average	Total	Protein	Cost per
Crop	yield	digestible	% of	100 lbs.
	1922-31	nutrients	total	of total
	bu.	lbs.	nutrients	nutrients
Grains				
Corn	30.3	1386	8.7	\$1.18
Barley	29.8	1135	11.4	1.19
Oats	35.8	806	13.8	1.73
Roughages	tons			
Alfalfa	1.8	1836	20.8	.78
Corn fodder	2.2*	1924	7.7	.94
Wild hay	.9	868	6.2	.94
Silage	6.0	2021	7.2	1.16

^{*}Nutrients are calculated on the basis of 2.0 tens yield since there is considerable shrink and waste under the usual methods of feeding fodder.

The above data shows that the lowest cost feed grain crop is corn. It produces more nutrients per acre and at a lower cost than either oats or barley. Barley is next to corn in cost but produces less feed per acre. Oats produces decidedly less nutrients per acre than the other two crops and has the further disadvantage of a much higher cost.

Alfalfa, on the basis of the above data, is the cheapest source of roughage. Alfalfa has an additional advantage in that it is high in protein, the element most likely to be lacking in the ration and most expensive to buy. Its cheapness and its high protein content make alfalfa the most desirable roughage. Although corn fodder produces slightly more feed per acre than alfalfa, it has the disadvantage of a higher cost and a decidedly lower protein content. Wild hay has the disadvantages of both a low yield of food nutrients and a higher unit cost. However, wild hay is usually grown on land not suitable for other crops and hence the cutting of wild hay is a matter of securing some feed from what would otherwise be waste land. Silage has two disadvantages, namely, high cost and low protein content. The fact that silage is used as extensively as it is indicates that feeders have felt that it has a value greater than that indicated by its nutrient centent. It offers a method of saving the entire corn crop.

The profitableness of raising cash crops depends to a large extent upon the prices received. At this time it is impossible to predict, with any assurance, what the prices of the crops will be in the future. It is possible, however, to indicate the relative profitableness of these crops in the past years. The comparative returns from the various grain crops computed upon the basis of ten year average Rock and Nobles Counties yields and prices and three year average costs adjusted to the ten year average yields are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Comparative Returns per Acre of Crops
Rock and Nobles Counties

	Corn	Oats	Barley	Flax
Cost per acre	\$16.39	\$13,92	13.46	\$16.12
Yield, average 1922-31	30.3	35.8	29.8	10.6
Cost per bushel	\$.54	\$. 39	⇒.45	\$1.52
Dec.1 price, average 1922	-31 .58	.32	. 50	2.05
Net return per acro	1.18	-2.46*	1.44	5.62

^{*}A minus (-) indicates a loss.

As an average of the past ten years, barley and flax have been the most profitable cash crops, with corn next. Oats was the least profitable. One would expect corn to continue to be one of the high profit crops and oats to be one of the lowest profit crops.

Adopting Good Practices

The second thing necessary for obtaining high returns is the adeption of profitable practices. "study of the records indicate the following results of different practices.

Livestock Practices

- Cattle: 1. Breeding stock of good beef conformation and type required no more feed than low grade breeding stock but at sale time the calves from the well bred stock commanded an appreciable premium over the calves from the low grade stock.
 - 2. There was a wide variation between farms in the amount of grain and hay fed to breeding stock. The data would indicate that feed in excess of enough to keep the breeding stock in fair flesh, but not fat, brought little or no return.
 - 3. The farmers who fed cilmeal to fattening cattle secured more economical gains than those not feeding cilmeal. A comparison of the feed expenditures is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Relation between Am					
per 100 Pounds Gain	in Weig	ht for	Feeder	Cattle,* 19	930,1931
Amount of oilmeal	No.of	Oil-	Grain	Dry	Pasture
fed per 100 lbs.	farm	meal	lbs.	roughage	days
gain in weight	years	lbs.		lbs.	
v					
10 lbs. or less	14	3	986	3 7 0	10
Over 10 lbs.	13	27	824	266	2

^{*}Only farms producing over 5000 pounds gain in weight included in this comparison.

At 1931 prices, the difference in total feed cost per one hundred pounds gain in weight is \$1.34 in favor of those feeding oilmeal.

Hogs: 1. Where complete swine sanitation was properly carried out, unit costs were materially 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

Expenditures per	100 Pounds	s Gair	ı in W	eight:	for H	ogs, F	arm A
		Man	Grain	Skim-	Pas-	Feed	Pigs
		hrs.	lbs.	milk	ture	cost*	raised
				lbs.	days		per
							litter
1929, without sa 1930, complete s	nitation anitation	2 <u>1</u> 1 <u>2</u>	646 485	50 131		\$6.48 5.14	3.8 6.7

^{*}At average prices for 1930.

2. Hogs raised under a one-litter a year system 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 Weight for Hogs Raised under One-Litter and Two-Litter per Year Systems

	1929,	1930 <u>,</u> 19	31		
System	No.of farm years	Total concen- trates lbs.	Skim- milk lbs.	Pasture days	Man hours
One-litter per year Two-litter per year	42 23	457 490	4 6 59	26 25	$2\frac{1}{4}$ 2

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

Table 9

Rate of Gain in						Pounds
Gain in weight per mature*		Average	Total concen-		Pas- ture	Man hours
hog day	years .	lbs.	trates lbs.	lbs.	days	
Loss than .9 lb .9 to 1.20 lbs. 1.21 lbs.& over	21	.84 1.11 1.32	505 460 438	52 55 45	34 23 20	$2\frac{1}{2}$ 2 $1\frac{3}{4}$

^{*}Two pigs under 6 months equal to 1 mature hog.

4. Less feed and labor per pound of gain was used when from 5 to 6.9 pigs were raised per litter than when less than 5 were raised (Table 10).

Table 10

Pigs Raised per Litter and Feed Consumption per 100 Pounds
Gain in Weight for Hogs

	100 100	1929, 1	.930, 19	31	16	
Pigs raised per litter	No.of farm years*	Pigs per litter		Skim- milk lbs.	Pasture days	Man hours
3 to 4.9 5 to 6.9	23 27	4.2 6.0	492 456	70 39	27 27	$2\frac{1}{2}$ 2

^{*}Farms on which feeder pigs were bought were excluded from this comparison.

- Sheep: 1. The largest returns from sheep were received from small flocks which obtained a large part of their feed from the yards, road, and other places where this feed would not have otherwise been utilized.
 - 2. Flocks that were culled regularly and the ewes sold before they became aged gave the greatest returns. High death loss due to old age resulted in large losses on some farms.
- Poultry: 1. A high death rate due to disease, largely as a result of lack of samitation, was an important cause of low returns.

- 2. The raising of chickens added to the profit from the poultry enterprise. The formers raising a large number of chickens relative to the number of laying hens had larger net returns from the poultry enterprise than those raising relatively fewer chickens.
- 3. High egg production per hen was an important cause of high returns from the poultry enterprise. Good breeding, careful culling, and heavy feeding of mash and skinmilk are necessary for high egg production.

Crop Practices

One of the most important factors affecting the returns from any crop is the yield. Costs are also important but do not vary as much as yields and hence have less influence on returns. The relationship between yield and cost and return per acre is indicated by the data for oats presented in Table 11.

Table 11
Relation between Yield and Cost and Return

	per Ac	re of Oa	ts, 1931		
	No.of	hverage	Total	Cost	Net
Yield	farns	yield	cost	per bu.	return
Under 26 bu. 26 and under 36 36 and under 46 46 and over	6 9 4 3	21 <u>3</u> 32 38 <u>3</u> 48 <u>3</u>	\$12.18 11.82 13.12 13.75	.56 .37 .34 .28	-\$7.39 -4.78 -4.59 -3.02

As the yield per acre increased, the cost per bushel decreased and the loss per acre decreased. Of course, yield per acre can not be increased indefinitely without eventually involving an expense which is greater than the value of the increase in yield. However, few, if any of the farmsstudied have reached this point.

Practices Influencing Yields. Since yield per acre has such an important bearing on cost and returns, further study was made in order to determine some of the important factors affecting yields. The factors studied are selection of variety of seed, time of seeding, and rate of seeding.

In studying the effect of variety on yield, it was found that Gopher oats outyielded the other varieties by a considerable margin. The lowest yields were secured from common seed of unknown variety. The common seed generally represented onts that had been grown on the farm so long that the variety had been forgotten, or that had been purchased as seed without any knowledge of the variety it represented. Velvet barley gave the highest yields of barley over the three year period. Here again common seed gave lower yields. There were so many varieties of flax and corn grown that it was impossible to get enough fields of any two varieties to make comparisons. There were ten different varieties of corn grown on these farms and almost as many varieties of flax as there were farms growing flax. It would seem plausible that the yields of corn and flax, as well as of oats and barley, could be materially increased by the seeding of the variety best adapted to this area.

The records on these forms demonstrate that one is not always able to judge the relative yielding ability of two varieties merely by their appearance in the field. Just one illustration to emphasize this point. A field of Green Russian oats and a field of Gopher oats were grown side by side on the same farm. The green Russian field had more and much larger shocks and looked as though it would yield much more than the field of Gopher oats. However, when the two fields were threshed, the Gopher oats yielded 13 bushels more to the acre than the Green Russian. The point of this is that in comparing any two varieties of any crop, it is absolutely necessary to measure the area and carefully weigh the yield. difference in yield between varieties is enough to justify considerable attention to securing good seed on high yielding varieties.

Time of seeding is also important in securing good yields. The records obtained on these farms indicate that the farmers who practiced early seeding were the ones who received the higher yields. Space will not permit the presentation of tables for all crops. It is not possible to set any definite seeding dates because seasons vary from year to year. In any season, generally speaking, the early seeding and high yields have gone together.

The records indicate a wide range in the amount of seed planted per acre. The variations, the average for the three years, and the amount which the records would indicate as desirable are presented in Table 12. If the seed is good clean seed, there is nothing to be gained by planting more than the maximum indicated as desirable.

Table 12.

7 - 9

average

Desirable

Amount of Seed Planted per Acre Rock and Nobles Counties, 1929-31 Husked. Barley Flax Oats corn, lbs. bu. bu. lbs. Least seed 4.6 2.1 1.5 21 Most seed 17.4 7.0 4.1 75 8.0 3.7 2.2 41

3 - 3.5 2 - 2.2

36 - 44

The records indicate that the farms with the most legumes and livestock are the ones with highest yields. Alfalfa, clover, and sweet clover deserve a larger place in the cropping plan of these farms than they have been occupying.

LABOR AND WORK STANDARDS FOR CROPS

Labor is one of the largest items of cost in raising crops, and hence any saving in labor will be reflected in lower costs. There are two ways of reducing labor costs, namely, by eliminating unnecessary crop operations and by performing the necessary operations more efficiently. The crop operations are fairly well standardized and therefore saving must generally come through incrossed efficiency in the individual operations.

The range in the hours of man labor and horse and tractor work used per acre for each of the common crop openations, the average for three years. and a standard for each operation are presented in Table 13. The standards represent approximately the accomplishment of the farmers who were 25 per cent above the average in the scale of efficiency as measured by low labor expenditures. They assume average soil, weather conditions, and yields. yields, more time may be required for horvesting and with lower yields, less

time. These standards are suggested as a basis which the individual farmer may use in determining the effectiveness with which he is utilizing his labor and power.

Table 13

Hours of Man Labor and Horse and Tractor Work Used per Acre for Crop Operations

	Hock	and			Counti 1929-3		1929-		erage	Star	Standard	
		Ma	in	111 <u>6</u> 0		rse	- e	Man	Horse	Man	Horse	
						-				11111111		
Seedbed prep	aration:											
Plowing:		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	
Harrowing:	4 horses	.1	to	.5	.6	to	2.1	.2	1.0		.8	
_	6 horses		to			to		.2	1.1	.2	1.2	
Seeding & ha	rvesting grain:				-			-		•		
	Drilling	.3	to	.8	1.2	to	3.0	.5	2.0	.5	2.0	
	_	.2					1.6	.3	.7	.2	. 4	
Oats:	Cutting	.5	to	1.2			4.8	. 7	2,7	.6	2.4	
	Shocking			2.2	_	_		1.1	-	.8		
	Threshing			5.7	2.5	to	11.3	2.8	5.3	2.5	4.5	
Barley:	Cutting			1.4			5.2	.8	3.0	.6	2.4	
v _s	Shocking			2.3				1.2	-	. 9	_	
	Threshing			6.3		to	11.6	2.9			4.7	
Flax:	Cutting	.3					6.2	.9	3.6	.7	2.8	
	Shocking			2.0		-	• • •	1.1		.8	~	
	Threshing			5.0	2.6		8.4	3.2		2.9	4.6	
Pl: :ting & h	arvesting corn:	-		_				•	•••	~. 0	1.0	
Planting		.5	to	1.0	. 9	to	2.0	.7	1.4	.6	1.2	
Cultivatin	g (2-row)			1.2			3.9	.8	3.1	.8	3.2	
Cutting	0 (3.7			11.0	1.8	5.3	1.5	4.5	
Shocking				9.4				3.5	-	2,5	-	
Filling si	lo			14.9	4.9		23.6	8.1	11.9	7.8	12.7	
Husking -				9.2			17.4			4.7	9.4	
9	machine			7.4			20.8	4.2	12.9		11.4	
Hoy horvesti	ng:			1750	•			- •		•,		
	st cutting)											
Cutting	Ç.	.5	to	2.3	1.1	to	4.6	1.2	2.3	1.0	2,0	
Raking								.7	1.4	.5	1,0	
Hauling							16.2				3.1	
Stacking							6.2				2.1	
Alfalfa (2	nd cutting)										~, ±	
Cutting		.5	to	2.5	.9	to	5.0	1.1	2.1	.9	1.8	
Raking				2.9			5.5	. 7	1.3	.4	.8	
Hauling	to barn			9.3			13.7				2.0	
Stacking				4.4			7.5	2.1		1.5	2.1	
Wild ha y (_		,	-		-	o.a. ■0=0	~•0	_ 0	~• 1	
Cutting	<u>.</u>	. 7	to	2.7	1.4	to	5.4	1.3	2.6	1.0	2.0	
Raking							2.4		-	.9	1.8	
Hauling	to barn			6.7			11.1				2.8	
Stacking				5.0			11.8			2.3	2.8	
		-				_				~.0	~.0	

^{*}Tractor hours the same as man hours.

a summary of the standard lubor and power expenditures by operations for each of the eight common crops is presented in Table 14. The operations are those generally performed and the hours are based on the standards for the size of implements and power units most often used. The expenditures for other combinations of operations and sizes of power units may be computed from the data presented in Table 13.

Table 14
Standards for Field Operations Performed with Horse Power in Rock and Nobles Counties

			Corn	Crops			3:		
	Hu	sked Co	rn	Fo	äder Co	rn	Silage Corn		
Operation	Times	Hrs.	oer Acre	Times	Hrs.	er Acre	Times	Hrs.	oor Acre
	over	Man	Herse	over	Man	Horse	over	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
Harrowing	1	.2	.8	1	.2	.8	1	.2	.8
Planting	1	.6	1.2	1	.6	1.2	1	.6	1.2
Harrowing	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
Shocking	-	-		1	2.5	•	•		
Filling silo		_	-		-	·-	1	7.8	12.7
Hand husking	1	4.7	9.4	-	-		-	-	~
Total		11.0	36.8		10.3	31.9		15.6	44.6

		Onts			Barley	T		Flax	
Operation	Times	Hrs.p	er Acre	Times	Hrs.	er acre	Times	Hrs.p	er Acre
	over	Man	Horse	over	Man	Horse	over	Man	Horse
Disking	2	.8	3.2	2	.8	3.2	2	.8	3.2
Seeding - brondcast	1	.2	.4	1	.2	. 4	(1)	(.2)	(.4)
drill	(1)	(.5)	(2.6)	(1)	(.5)	(2.0)	1	. 5	2.0
Harrowing	1	.2	.8	1	. 2	.8	2	.4	1.6
Cutting	1	.6	2.4	1	.6	2.4	1	.7	2.8
Shocking	1	.8	_	1	1.0		1	.8	-
Threshing*	1	2.5	4.5	1	2.4	4.7	1	2,9	4.6
Total		5.1	11.3		5.2	11.5		6.1	14.2
Total**		(5.4)	(13.3)		(5.7)	(13.5)		(5.8)	(12.6)

	Hay Cro	ops		
	Alfalfa(lst Cutting)	Alfolfo (2nd Cutting)	Wil	ld Hay
Operation	Hours per Acre	Hours per Acre	Hours	per Acre
	Man Horse	Man Horse	Man	Horse
Mowing	1.0 2.0	.9 1.8	1.0	2.0
Raking	.5 1.0	•4 •8	.9	1.8
Putting in barn	2.3 3.1	1.4 2.0	2.0	2.8
Stacking	1.8 2.1	1.5 2.1	2.3	2,8
Total (barn) Total (stack)	3.8 6.1 3.3 5.1	2.7 4.6 2.8 4.7	3.9 4.2	6.6 6.6

^{*}Threshing hours for cats and barley include the hours hauling grain to the bin. The threshing hours on flax do not include hours for hauling to the bin or to market because most of the flax was trucked direct from the machine to market.

**Total if alternative method of seeding is used.

- 17 -

FACTS ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FARMS

Per Farm 1931 1930 1929 High Low Average Average Average 105.7 116.3 122.1 195.7 38.5 . Acres in corn 56.5 61.3 59.3 120.1 21.5 acres in oats 21.5 Acres in barley 20.3 21.9 89.2 15.2 18.0 59.4 Acres in flax 9.5 4.5 0 91.8 Acres in other grains & grain mixtures 11.3 12.2 acres in alfalfa 11.6 11.7 39.3 7.6 40.4 Acres in tame hay 4.1 6.9 Acres in wild hay 14.2 14.6 12.8 53.3 6.2 Acres in miscellaneous hay 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 95.1 161.4 Acres in pasture 63.8 69.7 62.7 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 255 261 214 419 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 1173 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 1.5 Tractor farms: Number of farms using tractors 10 12 11 Total crop acres 276 287 285 424 180 9.7 Number work horses per farm 10.0 9.6 19.4 5.4 Average 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 Average 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

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

		1929	1930		1931	
		All	All	All	Five	Five
	_	farms	farms	farms	highest	lowest
RECEIP		ф 7 070	857.0E0	60107	#1 <i>C</i> 4	6.9709
Catt		\$3278 3017	\$3250 2444	\$2127 1714	\$164 933	\$2302 3 2 61
Hogs	p and wool	252	243	101	220	ان -
	try and eggs	350	239	195	165	268
	y products	623	377	229	186	356
Hors		46	47	36	_	127
Corn		492	409	215	298	177
Oats		335	230	94	33	193
Barl	ЭУ	199	72	113	132	20
Flax		375	287	258	424	139
Hay		27	16	14	15	1
	r crops	31	185	29	25	74
Outs		92	132	130	166	153
\"isc	ellaneous	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	-		-	-
(4)	TOTAL RECEIP'IS	9903	8479	5623	30 58	7465
EXP ENS	TOTAL CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRA					
	d labor	468	567	. 392	142	673
	le bought	1052	959	727	74	1026
	bought	314	266	122	36	211
	p bought	350	20	14	39	-
	try bought	48	50	22	22	29
	es bought	73	32	24	36	-
	r livestock expense	121	103	85	47	133
	bought	777	1078	821	215	1286
	expense (twine, threshing, et estate	c.) 288 320	327	200 77	131	248
	inery	588	227 494	133	89 95	93
	(farm expense share)	97	62	66	12	172
	kerosene, oil, etc. (farm share)		145	123	105	7 1 187
Taxe		400	423	427	321	560
	rance	33	26	35	17	55
	ellaneous	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 FARM EXPENSES (sum of 5	ō.,				
,,	6 and 7)	.50	6887	6251	2659	9098
(9)	Returns to Capital & Family			500 pm 750		
1201	Labor (4-8)	4563	1592	-628	399	-1633
(10)	Interest on Farm Inven. @ 5%	2374	2023	1570	1031	2105
(11) (12)	Family Labor Earnings (9-10) Est. Value of Unpaid Family	2189	-431	-2198	-632	-3738
,	Labor	5 88	432	226	- 283	166
(13)	OPERATOR'S LABOR EARNINGS (11-12)	1601	-863	-2424	- 915	-3904

AVERAGE FARM INVENTORIES

	1929	1930		1931	
	All	All	411	₽'ive	Five
	farms	farms	farms	highest	lowest
Land	\$32182.95	\$26587.00	\$19786.00	\$12953.16	\$26548 . 63
Buildings	3620.66	3482.69	3718.42	2745.80	4178.55
Work horses	918.01	853.58	836.64	599.70	1192.00
Other horses	94.77	97.39	94.50	44.50	183,50
Cattle	4177.35	3562.19	2343.58	1168,34	3078.35
Hogs	1503.79	1310.03	814.44	616.34	1519.09
Sheep	277,50	264.13	118.02	213.30	
Poul try	204.28	175.15	131.14	112.22	205.77
Machinery	1811.21	1943.55	1911.09	1783.57	2570.50
Auto (farm share)	155.82	85.38	72.88	66.17	142.28
Feeds	2543.52	2091.41	1570.74	1175.95	2481.97
Total	47489.86	40452.50	31397.45	21479,05	42100.64

FARM PRODUCE USED IN THE HOUSE

	1929	1930		1931	_
	11	All	411	Five	${ m Fi}{f v}\epsilon$
	farms	farms	farms	highest	lowest
Cream	\$47.10	\$30,78	\$26.59	\$23,50	୍ବ16 . 54
Farm churned butter	29.57	20.43	20.49	33.10	13.71
Whole milk	34.96	33.07	23,23	24.68	30.33
Skimmilk	.83	.39	.36	. 90	.07
Hogs	107.68	73.14	43.48	27.19	46.98
Cattle	21.71	29.88	14.82	9.05	17.50
Sheep	.47	.63	.66	-	-
Poultry	25.75	28.66	24.46	15,68	31.61
Eggs	45.65	36.87	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	76.6C	97.00
Total	431 . 85	374.86	291.24	256.27	322.65
Size of Family (man equivalent)	4.41	4.80	4.67	4.18	4.33

^{*}Same as for 1930. Not summarized for 1929.

1889

Cost and Return for Feeder Cattle (Per 100 pounds gain in weight)

		Average		Range	for	each
	2 year	1930	1931	i tem	- 19	31
Number of farms		22	19			
Pounds produced	11890	11608	12172	6 80	to	80405
Man labor, hours	3 <u>1</u> 1 <u>1</u> 2	3 <u>1</u> 1 <u>1</u>	3 <u>3</u> 1 <u>3</u>	14	to	7
Horse work, hours	11/2	12	13/4	C	to	6 <u>1</u>
Costs:	*****					
Feed	\$10.47	\$12.8C	\$8 . 14			\$10.66
Man labor and horse work	1.00	1.12	.89	_	to	1.75
Shelter	.41	.25	. 57	C	to	
Equipment	.19	.15	. 23	C	to	1.77
Interest @ 5%	.82	1.13	. 50		to	1.14
Miscellaneous cash		.07	<u>.C4</u>	.C	ţ0	.20
Total cost	12.95	15.52	10.37	6.10		
Manure credit		64	35	0	to	1.41
Net cost	12.45	14.88	10.02	5.27	to	16.31
Average selling price, per cwt.	7.66	8.82	6.50	4.06	to	8.45
Return per 56 lbs. grain	.24	.32	.16	C	to	.37
Feeds:						
Corn, 1b.	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, 1b.	311	373	249	66	to	541
Silage, 1b.	128	91	166	0	to	1324
Pasture, days	6	5	6	0	to	34

1 20

Cost per Head for Breeding Herd

		Cost per			Hel	.·u						
_		B	Beef Herds					Beef	and Dairy			
		.ver ge		Range	for	each		Tacr./gc		Range	e fo	r each
	2 year	1930	1931	item	- 19	31	2 year	1930	1931	item	<u> </u>	931
Number of farms		9	9				1	15	14			
Man labor, hours	41	39 <u>1</u>	42 3	21	to	60 3	$116\frac{1}{4}$	113	$119\frac{1}{2}$			178 2
Horse work, hours	5	4	6	<u>3</u> 4	to	9	$6\frac{1}{2}$	$6\frac{1}{4}$	7	1	to	$12\frac{1}{4}$
·Costs:												
Feed	Ç23.88	\$22.35	\$25.41	.9.96	to	\$34.70	\$33.76	34.64	<i>4</i> 32.89	16.37	to	50.37
Man labor and horse work	10.66	12.21	9.10	4.40	to		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		12.29
Equipment	.49	. 59	.39	.09	to	.75	1.28	1.41	1.14	.46	to	2.57
Interest @ 5%	3.75	4.30	3,20	2.48	to	3.86	3.19	3.57	2.81	2.15	to	4.17
Miscellaneous cash	.30	.34	.27	.01	to	. 84	.75	.79	.72		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	62.67	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	2.52	2.64	2,60	.86	to	4.74	7.41	7.77	7.05	1.20	to	32.53
Skimmilk fed	1.16	1.14	1,19	.05	to	2,59	4.52	5.28	3.76	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	17.46	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	45.8C	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		to	.99	. 85	.74	. 95	.04	to	1.23
Fceds:												
Corn, 1b.	140	118	161	0	to	434	456	442	459	143	to	851
Small grain, lb.	284	268	299	0	to	912	932	964	900		to	2421
Hay and fodder, 1b.	2078	2017	2138	309	to	39 50	2836	2656	3017	805		4892
Silage, lb.	2320	1212	3407	0	to	11039	1020	715	1324		to	9829
Pasture, days	235	240	230	168	to	248	242	247	237	214		269

Cost and Return for All Cattle (Per 100 nounds gain in weight)

•			arms			Grou	p 4*	
	3 year	1929	1930	1931	3 year	1929	1930	1931
Number of farms		22	24	23		11	9	11
Pounds produced	19759	18683	22416	18179	11438	14359	12803	7152
Man labor, hours	15 <u>4</u> 1 <u>3</u>	$14\frac{1}{2}$	14	$17\frac{1}{4}$	$21\frac{1}{4}$	19 1	$18\frac{1}{2}$	26 <u>1</u> 24
Horse work, hours	1 <u>\$</u>	$14\frac{1}{2}$ $1\frac{1}{2}$	1 1	2	2	2~	$1\frac{\tilde{1}}{\tilde{z}}$	$2\frac{1}{4}$
Costs:	_		-					
Feed	\$10 . 58	\$11 . 58	\$9.67	\$10.49	11.41	\$12 . 28	w10.01	y11.93
Man labor and horse work	4.07	4.67	3.90	3,64	5.78	6.08	5.79	5.46
Shelter	.99	.90	.80	1.27	1,25	.96	1.00	1.80
Equipment	.17	.14	.16	.20	.19	.16	.15	.26
Interest @ 5%	.99	1.20	.93	.85	1.03	1.23	.93	. 94
Miscellaneous cash	16	12	15		.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 credit	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 arimal product**	4.99	11.15	4,37	54	3.24	9.11	3.35	-2.73
Return over all costs***	-6.91	-1.32	-6.68	-12.72	-8.45	-2.66	-6,83	-15.85
Average selling price, per cwt. Feeds:	8.66	11.50	8,70	5,79	7.55	10.95	7.18	4.51
Corn, 1b.	369	332	375	401	334	318	355	329
Small grain, 1b.	202	175	206	226	235	200	211	293
Commercial feed, 1b.	6	7	6	6	2	2	2	1
Hay and fodder, 1b.	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

^{*}Group A - Farmers combining dairying and beef production.

**Value of a nimal product is the net value of animals produced after allowing for differences in inventory values.

***A minus (-) indicates a failure to cover the expenses charged.

Costs and Returns for All Cattle (cont.)
(Per 100 pounds gain in weight)

Group C* Group B* 3 year 1929 1930 1931 3 vear 1930 1931 1929 6 8 5 6 5 Number of farms 33048 28045 29262 41838 20047 17423 23437 19282 Pounds produced $10\frac{3}{4}$ $10\frac{1}{4}$ $1\frac{3}{4}$ 13를 וו 12 Man labor, hours 8 $1\frac{\widetilde{3}}{2}$ 녆 1.3 $1\frac{1}{4}$ Horse work, hours 1 Costs: Feed 38.11 \$8.82 \$9.07 \$9.52 \$12.36 310.50 \$8.82 \$10.64 Man labor and horse work 2.50 3.15 2.19 2.18 3.16 4.28 3.43 1.76 Shelter . 67 .75 .74 .51 .79 .71 .67 .98 .12 .16 .13 .16 Equipment .13 .18 .16 .14 .88 .92 .56 . 93 1.04 .89 .86 Interest @ 5% 1.17 Miscellaneous cash .14 .13 .19 .11 .09 .07 .10 .11 Total cost 18.82 12.17 13.27 12.12 13.07 15.65 15.96 14.62 Credits: .89 .62 .52 .62 .78 .55 Manure .68 .54 1 Dairy products 1.08 3.05 4.88 2.89 1.39 1.59 1.21 2.47 1.62 Total credit 3.73 5.77 3.51 1.91 2.21 3.25 1.76 Net cost 11.92 13.05 12.45 10.26 11.06 11.45 11.37 10.36 Value of animal product** 5,35 12.89 6.56 1.47 3.84 2.31 11.76 6.44 Return over all costs*** -5.57 -.16 -8.61 -7.95 -4.50 .39 -3.92 -9.98 Average selling price, per cwt. 9.00 11.65 7.44 9.28 6.08 9.74 11.91 9.86 Feeds: Corn. 1b. 456 408 423 537 353 287 344 428 Small grain, 1b. 199 174 255 169 158 147 166 160 Commercial feed. lb. 15 14 19 6 8 5 5 וו Hay and fodder, 1b. 406 423 388 407 402 379 382 444 Silage, lb. 377 338 173 463 187 0 0 560 Pasture. days 57 43 32 54 44 82 52 47

^{*}Group B - Farmers feeding more cattle than are raised on their farms; Group C - Farmers specializing on baby-beef production.

^{**}Value of animal products is the net value of animals produced after allowing for differences in inventory values.

***A minus (-) indicates a failure to cover the expenses charged.

Cost ar		VAGI			Range	for	each
	3 year	1929	1930	1931	item -		
Number of farms		22	24	23			
Pounds produced	31414	28414	31288	34541	9210	to	86750
Man labor, hours	2 1	2 <u>3</u> 구	2	2	34	to	3 <u>3</u> <u>Ī</u>
Horse work, hours	1/2	<u>I</u>	1/2	1/4	0	to	<u> </u>
Costs:							
Feed	\$5.20	⁴ 7.14	\$5 . 18	₄ 3.27	. 1.38	to	4.42
Man labor and horse work	. 62	. 84	.62	. 40	.19	to	.79
Shelter	.22	.24	. 21	.20	.03	to	.62
Equipment	.08	.09	.08	.06	0	to	. 20
Interest @ 5%	.21	.32	.20	.11	.04	to	.18
Miscellaneous cash	21	. 27	20	15	0	to	.61
Total cost	6.52	8,90	6.49	4.19	1,87	tc	5,15
Manure credit	80,	.09	07		0	to	.62
Net cost	6.44	8,81	6.42	4.10	1.84	to	
Average selling price, per cwt.	7.25	9,53	7.81	4.42	3,48	to	VIII 1251
Return per 56 lbs. farm grain fed	.67	.74	.71	.40	.22	to	.66
Average weight of hogs sold	270	274	275	260	216	to	
Pigs raised per litter	5.4	4.9	5.5	5.7	3.4	to	7.5
Feeds:							
Corn, lb.	374	445	339	339	99	to	522
Small grain, 1b.	116	106	142	101	21	to	208
Commercial feed, 1b.	4	6	4	3	0	to	11
Tankage, 1b.	6	5	6	6	0	to	19
Skimmilk, 1b.	50	41	52	57	0	to	188
Pasture, days	27	23	31	26	8	to	46

	ta netan per	Avei	age		Rang	e fo	r each	_
	3 year	1929	1930	1931	item	ı 1	.931	
Number of farms		7	7	5				
Number of sheep (2 lambs equal to one sheep)	90	106	80	84		to	181	
Man labor, hours	1 <u>3</u> 호 설	2	1 <u>1</u> 12	$2\frac{1}{4}$	11/2	to to	4	
Horse work, hours	$\frac{3}{4}$	<u>1</u>	1/2	1	<u>1</u>	to	l≟	
Costs:								
Feed	\$2.81	\$3.49	\$2.43	\$2.50	\$2.15	to	3.36	
Man labor and horse work	.55	.66	.45	• 54	.40	to	.84	
Shelter	. 26	.21	.14	.42	.02	to	1.63	
Equipment	.11	. 26	.02	.07	O	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:								
Manure	.13	.03	.18	.16	O	to	.46	
Breeding fees	.01	.03	.01	C	0	to	0	
Total credit	.14	.06	<u>.01</u>	-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	.56	.04	-1.60	to	.81	
Wool	1.05	$\frac{1.34}{4.56}$.96	85	.60	to	1.38	
Total product	2.32	4.56	1.52	.89	22	to	1.49	
Return over 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	
Average selling price of sheep, per ewt.	8,21	11.91	7.42	5,30	4.29	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	17.0	10.4	5.6	to	21.3	
Per cent death loss, sheep	12.0	16.0	11.0	9.0	C	to	18.0	
Feeds:								
Grain, 1b.	76	120	58	50	0	to	83	
Hay and fodder, lb.	140	113	101	205	14	to	457	
Silage, 1b.	38	29	35	51	C	to	252	
Pasture, days	242	251	227	247	226	to	266	

^{*}A minus (-) indicates failure to cover the costs charged.

	Cost and Retur	n per 100	Chickens				
	N.			rage		_	for each
		3 year	1929	1930	1931	item	- 1931
Number of farms	Ø\$		22	23	22		
Number of chickens	1/80	242	250	261	214	39	to 419
Per cent laying hens		59	57	57	62	36	tc 89
140		143	19 F	150			
Man labor, hours		$136\frac{3}{4}$	$1.66\frac{1}{4}$	125	$119\frac{1}{4}$	49	to 227
Horse work, hours		$3\frac{1}{4}$	$4\frac{3}{4}$	14	3 1	0	to 43½
Costs:		_	_	_	~		
Feed	ž	\$44.80	\$59.67	\$45.27	\$29.45	\$7.72	to \$65.19
Man labor and horse work		37.42	50.46	37.66	24.15	9.98	to 47.73
Shel ter		16.34	16.92	14.78	17.31	O	to 82.91
Equipment		6.12	6.39	6,27	5.70	0	to 15.58
Interest © 5%		3,56	4.15	3.51	3.02	1.73	to 4.24
Miscellaneous cash		5.28	4.61	7.42	3.82	0	to 10.6
Total cost	9 -	113.52	142.20	114.91	83.45	29.99	to 145.49
Manure credit		3.35	3.96	2.40	3,69	0	to 14,53
Net cost		110.17	138.24	112,51	79.76	28.85	to 140.0
Value of product: Poultry*		00 07	10.10	61 10	10 40	200 45	4- 105 1
		29.03	46.40	21.19	19.49	-106.45	
Eggs		73.65	94.75	68.90	57.30	.26.05	to 108.3
Total product**		102.68	141.15	90.09	76.79	-36.16	to 159.5
Return over all costs**	/.3	-7.49	2.91	-22,42	-2,97	-176.20	to 80.41
Return per man hour		.22	.31	.12	.18	0	to 1.23
average selling price of eggs.	per doz.	.21	.28	.20	.16	.13	to .22
Eggs laid per hen Feeds:	1, - =	75	74	76	76	44	to 130
Grain, 1b.		3179	3700	30 60	2777	954	to 4819
Commercial feed, lb.		389	402	395	370	O	to 1315
Skimmilk, 1b.		904	479	1027	1207	0	to 3639

^{*}Volue of poultry is net value of the poultry produced after allowing for differences in inventory values.

25

^{**}A minus (-) indicates failure to cover all expenses charged.

Cost of Horse Work per Horse

-	Cost of	Horse Work	per Horse				
		ΨΛG	rage		Range	for	each
	3 year	1929	1930	1931	item ·		
	rms Using T						
Number of farms	1	10	12	11	0.0		••
Man labor, hours	$49\frac{1}{4}$	57 3	48	$41\frac{3}{4}$	23	to	60
Costs:	u	" —	h				P
Feed	\$44.94	\$59.55	\$41.03	\$34.24	\$20.74		\$46,91
Man labor	13.36	17.32	14.40	8.35	4.59	to	100000000 - 1000000
Shelter	5.93	5.48	6.00	6,31	1.60	to	
Equipment	4.35	5,25	3.73	4.07	2.08	to	
Interest @ 5%	4.62	4.82	4.73	4.31	2.69	to	-
Miscellaneous cash	.43	.49	.47	.34	0	to	SCH. 20 101 101
Depreciation	8.87	8.67	8.18	9.76	2.51	to	
Total cost	82.50	101.58	78.54	67.38	54.55	to	88.80
Credits:							
Manure	3.60	4.41	3.75	2.63	1.29	to	5.02
Miscellaneous	$\frac{.50}{4.10}$. 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	817를	884를	814 3	753 1	513 1	to	944
Cost per hour, cents	9.6	11.0~	9.1	8.6	6.2	to	
Crop acres per horse Feeds:	29.6	28.9	28.7	31.2	21.8	to	
Grain, 1b.	2993	3382	3115	2483	622	to	4695
Hay, ib.	2994	3229	2642	3111	1999	to	4832
Pasture, days	158	139	162	172	129	to	220
Farr	ms not Usin	g Tractors	for Drawba	ar Work			
Number of farms		11	11	11			
Man labor, hours	$49\frac{1}{4}$	47	$53\frac{1}{2}$	$47\frac{1}{2}$	33	to	68
Costs:	·		~	~			2
${ t F}_{ t eed}$	\$51 . 96	\$67.61	₩49.47	\$38.81	\$27.18	to	\$49.29
Man labor	14.30	17.38	16.02	9.49	6.63		13.70
Shelter	7.83	7.95	6.75	8.78	3.07		19.22
Equipment	4.75	6.73	3.75	3.77	1.84		
Interest @ 5%	5.02	5.50	4.92	4.64	3.14	to	5.71
Miscellaneous cash	. 56	- 67	38	64	05	+ 0	4 07
Depreciation Total cost	9.44	11.67	7.97	8.68	2.53	to	25.77
${ t Total}$ cost	93.86	117.51	89.26	74.81	53,64	to	101.56
Credits:							
Manure	4,98	5.05	4.64	5,24	. 84	to	12.39
Miscellaneous							25.22
Total credit	5.75	$\frac{1.52}{6.57}$	5.12	5,55	.84		12.39
Net cost		110,94		69.26	51.64	to	100.72
Hours worked	895 킬	945	916분	825			1101=
Cost per hour, cents	9.8~	11.7	9.2	8.4	6.3	to	10.5
	28.1		28.2	28.0	15.8		
Grain, lb.	3737	3582	3766	3862	9417	+ ~	E2700
Hay, lb.	3611	4094					5702
Pasture, days	139	125	148		2316	to	4315
in a contract of the contract	100	エかり	T.4.O	144	25	to	179

		ractor Work Average		Range i	or	each
	2 year	1930	1931	item -		
	Two-Plow	Tractors				
Number of farms		6	5			
Costs:	4.4 0.4	å.c. 00	87 O1	\$1. DO	1	<i>t</i> .o. oo
Man labor Auto use	\$4.94 .28	៉ុ6.88 .48	\$3.01 .07	\$1.20 0	to to	\$8.00
Fuel and oil	99.11	115.61	82.61	55,50		.37
Miscellaneous cash	5,26	4.68	5,84	0		14,60
Interest @ 5%	23.83	20.23	27.43	15.88		36.25
Depreciation	91.34	81.67	101.00	150.00	to	
Total cost Hours worked:	224.76	229,55	219,96	153.07	to	292,48
Drawbar	$306\frac{1}{4}$	309]	303	1293	to	426
Belt	57 <u>‡</u>	$53\frac{1}{2}$	60 3	403	to	90
Total hours	$363\frac{1}{2}$	363	$363\frac{3}{4}$	190	to	472
Cost per hour	3.62	₩.6 3	\$. 60	\$.39	to	៉ូ. 85
Fuel per 10 hours, gal.	17.0	18,0	16.0	14.C	to	
Oil per 10 hours, gal. Fuel and oil:	.8	. 9	.8	.4	to	1.0
Gasoline, gal.	547	530	564	480	to	76]
Kerosene, gal.	34	45	22	. 0	to	70
Distillate, gal.	37	75	0	0	to	C
Oil, gal.	30 <u>3</u>	34	27 <u>1</u>	14	to	45
	Three-Plo	w Tractors				
Number of farms Costs:		8	6			
Man labor	\$12 . 98	\$19.50	\$6.47	\$2.10	to	\$13,40
Auto use	3,65	5.64	1.65	0	to	4.16
Fuel and oil	166.16	173.48	158.84	77.38		
Miscellaneous cash	16.46	16.38	16.55	0		27.75
Interest @ 5% Depreciation	30.83	31.58	30.08	11.25		
-	126,15	125.63	126.67	50.00	to	200,00
Total cost Hours worked:	356.23	372.21	340,26	248.83	to	480.00
Drawbar	$205\frac{1}{2}$	218 1	1923	$36\frac{1}{2}$	to	403
Belt	256	253]	258 <u>3</u>	$14\frac{3}{4}$	to	417
Total hours	461 2	4713	$451\frac{1}{2}$	185 <u>‡</u>	to	748
Cost per hour	.77	Ų.79	Ģ.7 5	. 48	to	<i>\$</i> 1.38
Fuel per 10 hours, gal.	25.0	22.0	29.0	24.0		
Oil per 10 hours, gal. Fuel and oil:	1,4	1.6	1.1	. 6	to	2.8
Gasoline, gal.	520	396	645	33	to	1622
Kerosene, gal.	339	324	354	0	to	789
Distillate, gal.	31.2	322	302	0	to	886
Oil, gal.	$62\frac{3}{4}$	75	50 <mark>늹</mark>	16	to	80

Cost of Auto Operation

		Average	Range for each			
	2 year	1930	1931	i tem	- 1931	
Number of farms		22	21		·	
Miles driven	6667	6812	6522	817	to 14465	
Gasoline, gal.	482	490	474	106	to 1101	
Oil, gal.	16	15	16	4	to 45	
Costs:						
Man labor	\$5.03	\$5.06	\$5.00	ÇΟ	to 24.69	
Gasoline	81.66	88.74	74.57	16.25	to158.09	
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	
Interest @ 5%	20.74	23.07	18,41	2,50	to 41.25	
Depreciation	131,05	1.2.34	119.76	0	to275.00	
Total cost	2 23.96	355.88	292,03	91.89	to 6 52,59	
Cost per mile, cents	4.9	5.2	4.5	3,0	to :11.2	
Miles per gal. of gasoline	13.7	13,9	13.4	6.9	to 17.5	

Cost per acre of Producing Husked Corn

	Average				Range for		
	Three years	1929	1930	1931	each in 19	ite	
Number of Corne	0.4	24	9.4	27			
Number of farms	24 90	24 96	24 97	23 78	30	+ ~	162
Acres per farm All work up to harvest:	90	90	91	70	50	U	102
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			37.4
Tractor hours	.6	.4	.8	.7	-		2.1
Harvesting:	• •	• •	•0	• 1		00	~• ±
Man hours	5.0	5.7	5.0	4.5	2.3	to	6.8
Horse hours	11.0	12.9	10.2	9.8			15.0
Tractor hours	,1	.1	, .1	.1	_		1.0
Costs:		• -		. –			-,-
Man, horse and tractor	<i>;</i> 8.06	9.45	.8.27	6.46	.,4.79	to	Ü8.86
Seed	.40	.42	.42	.37	.27		
Manure	.38	1.75	1.90	1.40	. 55		
Mechanical picker	1.68	.37	.47	.30		to	.70
Other machinery	.95	.95	.95	. 95			
Land	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00			6.00
Total	17.47	18.94	18,01	15.48			19.18
Credit (pasture & insurance)	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.06	1.00		
Net cost	16,45	17.94	17.01	14.42			18.18
Yield, bu.	31.2	38.0		23.8			37.9
Cost per bu.	∍ . 53	.47	. 54	61 و			
December 1 price	. 48	. 56	. 48	.41	.41		.41
Crop value at December 1 price	14.98						15.54
Net return		3.34			-10.64		
Return per man hour	.17	.54	.17	mone			
Cost p	ercre of	Produci	ng Oats				
Number of farms	22	22	22	23			
Acres per farm	62	65	63	57	91	+-	120
All work up to hervest:	02	00	00	57	£1.	vo	120
Man 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
Harvesting:	•	• -	•	• -		00	• 1
Man hours	4.6	5,1	5.1	3.7	2.8	to	6.7
Horse hours	7.8	8.6	8.6	6.3			11.3
Trector hours	.1	.1	.1	.1	_	to	4
Costs:	: ~		•	•			• -
Man, horse and tractor	3.43	.4.12	.3.79	2.37	1.89	to	\$3.87
Seed	1.36	1.58	1.21	1.31			2.11
Twi ne	.34	.34	.40	. 27	.19		
Threshing	.99	1.21	1.11	.64			
Manure	.85	.89	.76	.91		to	
Machinery	.95	.95	. 95	.95	. 95	to	.95
Land	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00		6.00
Total	13,92	15.09	14.22	12.45			16.78
Yield, bu.	45.4	50.7	53.5	32.1	17.8		
Cost per bu.	្.31	\$.29	27	39	. 24		
December 1 price	. 27	.36	.24	. 22	,22		. 22
Crop value at December 1 price	12.26	18,25		7.06			11.22
Net return	-1.66	3.16	-1.38	-5, 39			-1.04
Return per man hour	none	.74	.10	none	none		.02

		,			Daniel Cam
		Averag		1071	Range for
	Three	1929	1930	1931	each item in
	years				1931
Number of farms		16	15	15	
Acres per farm	31	30	31	32	15 to 89
all 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	4.9	4.2	2.5 to 5.5
Horse hours	8.1	9.0		7.0	
Tractor hours	-	-	_		to .5
Costs:				• =	. ,,
Man, horse and tractor	3.42	Š4 04	\$3.63	52.65	1.74 to \$4.08
Seed	1.19			1.04	
Twine	.32	.34	.34	.29	
		1.03			.16 to .57
Threshing			.80	.65	.24 to .97
Manure		.94	.73		
Machinery	.95	.95	.95		.95 to 1.07
Land		6.00			6.00 to 6.00
Total		14.77			
Tield, bu.		33.0			8.2 to 35.8
Cost per bu.					36 to 1.39
December 1 price	.42				.38 to .38
Crop value at December 1 price	11.76	16.17	11.02	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 Ac	re of Pro	ducing F	lov		
OOST PET AC	IC OI FIO	duc IIIg I	TCIV		
Number of farms		8	13	14	
Acres per farm	29	28	30	28	14 to 59
All 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	- to 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	
Tractor hours	.1	10.2	_	. 2	
Costs:	• -		_	• • ~	- to .7
Man, horse and tractor	34.57	\$5.16	\$4.85	'·17 17 1	30 07 to 50 co
Seed	2.18	200		<i>3.71</i>	
		2.21	2.57	1.75	1.19 to 2.85
Twine	.22	.22	.26	.17	- to .38
Threshing	1.33		1.65	.71	
Manure	.87	.77	.72	1.11	
Machinery	97	.99	. 94	.98	21 N 18
Land	6.00	6.00	6.00	6,00	6.00 to 6.00
Total	16.14	16.99	16.99	14.43	
Yield, bu.	10.1	11.2	13.0	6.0	
Cost per bu.	\$1 . 60	\$1.50	\$1.31	\$2.40	\$1.57 to 12.50
December 1 price	1.85	2.83	1.48	1.23	1.23 to 1.23
Crop value at December 1 price	18.68			7.38	1.97 to 10.46
Net return	2.54		2.25		-17.58 to -2.79
Return per man hour	.61	2.09	.58	none	none to none
	•		,00	110110	mone of hone

Cost per Acre of Producing Alfalfa Hay

			Averag	Range for		
		Three years	1929	1930	1931	each item 1931
Number of farms		14	17 13	17 14	1 7 15	2 to 39
Men hours Horse hours		9.3 14.9	11.5 17.5	9.5 15.7		3.1 to 12.1 5.1 to 23.7
Costs: Man and horse Seed Manure Machinery Länd Total		1,46	\$5.55 1.00 1.52 1.62 6.00 15.69	1.00 1.01 1.53 6.00	\$2.68 1.00 .89 1.24 6.00 11.81	\$1.21 to \$5.03 1.00 to 1.00 .06 to 2.48 .85 to 1.75 6.00 to 6.00 9.61 to 14.09
Yield, tons Cost per ton		1.6 \$8.66	2.0 \$ 7. 85	1.6 \$8.80	1.1 \$10.74	
	Cost per Acr	e of Pro	ducing W	ild Hay		
Number of farms acres per farm		23	15 22	12 27	14 20	3 to 44
Man hours Horse hours		4.8 8.2	5.4 9.2	5.2 8.8	3.9 6.6	2.3 to 5.4 4.2 to 10.6
Costs: Man and horse Machinery Land Total		\$2.28 .86 5.00 8.14	\$2.79 .89 5.00 8.68	\$2.49 .85 5.00 8.34	\$1.55 .85 5.00 7.40	\$.93 to \$2.26 .85 to .95 5.00 to 5.00 6.78 to 8.11
Yield, tons Cost per ton		1.0 \$8.14	1.1 3 7. 89	1.2 \$6.95	.6 \$12.33	.2 to 1.1 \$7.10 to 35.05

Cost per Acre of Producing Corn Fodder

	_verage				Range for		
,	Three years	1929	1930	1931	each item 1931		
	AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTY OF						
Number of farms		12	. 18	18			
Acres per farm	12	8	13	16	3 to 46		
All work up to harvest:							
Man 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		
Harvesting:							
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		
Machine	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	18.15	19,23	18.35	16.86	13.04 to 23.01		
Credit*	05		.09	.05	<u>to .86</u>		
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 o	f Produci	ng Corn	Silage				
271		_		***			
Number of farms	0.3	8	6	7	•		
Acres per farm	21	16	21	25	9 to 53		
All work up to harvest:							
Man hours	8.0	7.9	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:							
Man hours	7.4		9.0		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		
Costs:	8-2-2-	u	и	e e			
Man, horse and tractor	\$10.69		\$10.49		•		
Seed	.61	.69	.60	.55	.34 to .77		
Twine	.41	.51		.33			
Manure	2,01		1.72	2,15			
Silo filling	8. 31	2.52	1.95		1.88 to 3.47		
Machinery	1.55	1,56			.95 to 1.65		
Land Total	6.00	6.00		6,00			
	23.58	26,25	22,69	21.79	19.19 to 23.72		
Credit*	.23	14	. 54				
Net cost	23.35	26.11	22.15	21,79	19.19 to 23.72		
Yield, tons	6,2 ბო თო	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.