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SOURCE OF DATA

## Method of Study

The Divisions of Agricultural Economics and of Animal Husbandry of the University of Minnesota are cooperating with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture in an accounting study of twenty-four farms in Rock and Nobles Counties in Southwestern Minnesota. This study was started liarch l, 1929. 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. Only farms on which some type of beef production is a major enterprise were chosen. The farmers cooperating in this work keep complete record 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 are 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 data collected is sent to the central office at University Farm, St. Paul, where a detailed set of records for each farm is kept. From these records the costs presented in this report have been computed. This preliminary report deals with the costs and returns in 1930 for the principal crops grown on these farms. The averages for the 1929 crop season are also included for comparison. The financial returns from these farms, the cost and income from livestock production and other significant facts will be presented in later reports as the information becomes available.

## Description of Area

Rock and Nobles Counties are located in the southwestern cormer 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 production type well supplied with lime. According to the 1925 census, only four counties in the state had higher land values per acre than Rock and Nobles and in three of these the high land values were due largely to their nearness to the Twin Cities. Both counties are level to gently rolling with practically all land tillable. There are some sections, especially is southern Nobles County that need drainage to insure regular cropping and in Rock County the re are limited areas of rock out-crop. The annual rainfall averages between 26 and 28 inches and the average growing season is from 130 to 140 days. 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 although there is a considerable surplus for sale on many farms. Alfalfa and wild hay are the principal roughages grown.

## Description of Farms

The average size of the farms studied in 1930 was 347 acres. This is approximately $66 \%$ larger than the average size of the farms in these two counties. €orn, oats, barley, alfalfa, wild hay and flax are the principal crops gromn. With the exception of the landlord's share of the crop which is usually sold, practically all of the grain and hay produced is fed on the farm.

Only two of the farms studied were owned entirely by the operators. Ten farms mere entirely ronted and 12 more partly o: ned and partly rented. Only thirty-five per cent of the land operated vas omed by the operator. Both share and cash rental leases vere cmployed. Nore than one-half of the farms in these tmo counties are operated by tenants.

METHODS OF COMPUTING AND PRESENTING DATA
Factors of Cost.
Comparative costs and returns for the sicht principal crops grown on the farms studied are presented in this report. The factors of cost are charged at the local market prices. The man labor rate, 30 cents per hour, is based on the aages to hired men on these farms and includes an allowance for board. Horse work is charged at $10 \frac{1}{2}$ cents per hour in 1930, at 12 cents in 1929 , 2 -plow tractors at 75 cents per hour and 3-plow tractors at $\$ 1.00$ per hour. Manure is charged at 75 cents per ton plus the cost of hauling. Fifty per cent of this is charged against the erop to which the manure is applied and the balance pro-rated to the other crops in the rotation on an acre basis. Machinery is charged at a flat rate which includes an allowance for interest, depreciation, repairs, and other costs. The land rent charge is based on prevailing cash rental rates in the community. The local market price on December l, is used in computing the returns from the various crops. The value of crops such as silage which have no regular market price is computed by comparing their feed value with other crops for which a local price is availablc. The costs for flax include marketing labor where the flax was marketed direct from the threshing mach ine. All other marketing costs are excluded from all crops and the costs are figured at the farm. The costs for corn fodder include the labor only through shocking. The labor for hauling it in is excluded from these tabulations. The hay costs do not include any labor for hauling stacked hay to the barns or feed lots.

## Methods of Presentation

The costs are shown both on an acre and a bushel on ton besis. The returns have been computed on the basis of the net return per acre over costs, the return for the use of the land, and tho return per hour the farmer received for the labor used on the crop, The not return is the gain or loss left after subtracting from the value of the crop the items of cost that are presonted. The return for the land is the amount of rent earned over and above the other cost items. The return for labor is the anount left to pay the labor after the other costs indicated have been met. A minus figure (-) ifldicates a loss.

The costs presented are relative rather than absolute costs. Since many of the cost items such as the farmers own labor and the use of his ovin land and his equipment do not represent actual "out-ofpocket" expense, it is necessary to estimate their vaiue. horiever, uniform rates have been used for all crops so that comparisons may be made between different crops and different farms, Uniform rental rates for land are used for each crop since the varied rontal systems and rates on the different farms and the inclusion of cash rented, share rented, and owned land would tend to obscure these comparisons, All crops have been credited at uniform prices excopt as thoy vary in quality. Some farmers undoubtedly reccive higher prices than these and others larer. The reader in interpreting these figures must make such adjustments in the returns that fit the prices he receives.

THE 1930 CROP SEASON

## Weather and Yields

The 1930 crop season was very favorable from the standpoint of seed-bed preparation, seeding and harvesting. Generally speaking, the crops were planted in good seas on and under favorablo soil conditions. However, the lack of moistwre later in the season greatly reduced the yield of a number of the common crops. The oat and flax crops escaped with relatively less damage than the others. The average yields on the farms studied in 1929 and 1930 , as well as the five year average yields for Rock and Nowles Counties are nresented in the following table. County averages are not availablc for several of the crops and hence only the route averages are given.

| YIELD OT CROPS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crop | Rock \& Nobles Co.* | 1929 | 1930 |
| Corm, bu. | 34 | 38 | 32 |
| Oats, bu. | 35 | 51 | 54 |
| Barley, bu. | 30 | 32 | 29 |
| Flax, bu. | $10 \frac{3}{4}$ | 11 | 13 |
| Alfalfa, ton | -- | 2.0 | 1.6 |
| Corn Silage, ton | -- | 7.3 | 5.1 |
| Corn Fodder, ton | -- | 3.3 | 1.9 |
| Wild Hay, ton | . 96 | 1.00 | 1.2 |

*From reports of state Department of Agriculture.

Since the farms studiod are better than the average of these counties and since they carry more than the average amount of livestock, the yields on these farms would normally be expected to be above the averages for the counties.

## Price

The 1930 crop seas on was further marked by lover prices. A comparison of the December 1 farm price for the important crops grovin on these farms with the seven year average for these two counties is prescnted in the following table.

DECEMBER lst FARM PRICES

|  | 7 yr.Average | Farms | Studied |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crop | Rock \& Nobles Co.* | 1929 | 1930 |
| Com, per bu. | \$ . 64 | $\$ .56$ | \$. ${ }^{\text {W }} 3$ |
| Oats, per bu. | . 35 | . 36 | , 24 |
| Barley, per bu | . 55 | . 49 | . 38 |
| Flax, per bu | 2.21 | 2.83 | 1.48 |
| Alfalfa hay, per ton | -- | 15.00 | 14.00 |
| Corn Silage, per ton | -- | 5.00 | 4.50 |
| Corn Fodder, per ton | -- | 10.00 | 8.00 |
| Wild Hay, per ton | 8.72 | 9.00 | 7.00 |

* Prices from reports of State Department of rgriculture. Alfalfa, corn silage, and corn fodder prices are not published.

The 1930 prices for all crops were lower than in 1929 and also lower than the seven year aver gege. Corn was approximately 17 per cent, oats, barley and flax 30 to 33 per cent, and wild hay 20 per cent below the seven year averages. Several farmers sold their flax at harvest time at a price 30 to 40 cents higher per bushel than the December l, 1930 price. To that extent flax was just that much more profitable to them.

With generally lower prices and in some cases lorer yields, the 1930 returns from the various crops vere considerably below those of 1929. A summary of the average cost and return por acre for each of the important crops is presented on page 9. Alfalfa and flax gave the greatest returns.

USING CROP RECORDS TO INCRE:SE CROP PRORTTG

## Variation in Production Costs

On the pages following the discussion are presented data on the cost and return por acre for each of the farms growing each of the important crops. The data in these tables show a wide range in cost per unit between the different farms. These variations for corn, oats, barley, flax, alfalfa hay and wild hay are summarized in the following table.

| Crop | Cost per unit |  | Low | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dec. }{ }^{1} \\ & \text { price } \end{aligned}$ | ```% producing at a cost above Dec. 1 price``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | nverage | High |  |  |  |
| Corn | 䓣. 54 | $\stackrel{4}{4} .77$ | \$. 43 | \%. 48 | 62 |
| Oats | . 27 | . 43 | . 20 | . 24 | 82 |
| Barley | . 48 | . 90 | . 36 | . 38 | 80 |
| Flax | 1.31 | 7.07 | . 87 | 1.48 | 23 |
| Alfalfa Hay | 8.80 | 21.08 | 4.66 | 14.00 | 18 |
| Wild Hay | 6.95 | 13.35 | 5.08 | 7.00 | 42 |

Alfalfa hay and flax mere the two most consistently profitable crops in 1930. This was also true in 1929. Only 18 per cent of those growing alfalfa hay and 23 per cent of those growing flax failed to produce these crops in 1930 at a cost which was lower than the December lst price. Corn was profitable on a greater per cent of the farms growing it than was either barley or oats. The ride variation in the cost per unit suggests tho possibility of increasing crop returns through changes in production methods and practices.

There are in general two ways in which the farmer may adjust his om business so as to make it more profitable. He may either (l) reduce his cost per unit of product or (2) select those crops or kinds of livestock or combinations of the two that bring in the largest returns.

## High Yiclds Reduce Unit Costs

One of the most important factors in reducing the cost per bushel or ton of crops produced is to increase yields. The relationship between yield and cost per unit is illustrated by the data on corn contained in the following table.

Relation Between Yield per sere and Cost and Returns for Corn
Rock \& Nobles Counties--1930

| Yield per icre | Number of Farms | $\begin{gathered} \text { iverage } \\ \text { Yield } \end{gathered}$ | Net Cost per $i_{2}$ cre | Cost Per Bushel | Return per hour of man l.:bor. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 30 bu. | 7 | 24 | \$16.12 | \$. 68 | \$-.11 |
| 30-35 | 9 | 33 | 16.63 | . 51 | . 24 |
| Over 35 | 8 | 37 | 18.22 | . 48 | . 31 |

is the yield increased the cost per bushel docreased and the return per man hour increased. The same relationship holds for the other crops. There are numerous causes for differences in yield, including differences in soils, seed-bed preparation, seed, and care of the crop. One of these factors, the importance of wich is orerlookod is thet of seed.

Increasing yields by the use of good seed,
The importance of planting good seed of a desirable variety is indicated by the data in the following table.

Variety and Yield
Rock and Nobles Counties--1930

| Crop | Variety | Total Acres | Yield per Acre |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Oats: | Gopher | 295 | 62 |
|  | Green Russian | 443 | 54 |
|  | Common* | 426 | 49 |
| Barley: | Velvet | 199 | 34 |
|  | Common* | 218 | 28 |

*Common includes the cases where the name of the variety was not definitely known. Other known varieties of both oats and barley were seeded but on too few acres and farms to justify inclusion in the table.

It will be noticed that Gopher Oats outyielded Green Russian Oats by 8 bushels and the common seed by 13 bushels. Velvet barley outyielded the common barley by 6 bushels per acre. This difference is certainly enough to justify giving careful attention to the selection of good seed. The use of good seed is one of the ways to increase profits through reducing costs that is demonstrated by the se cost records.

## Increasing Returns by Crop Selection

A second way in which farmers can make their business more profitable is through the selection of the most profitable crops. If crops arc to be Bold, the crops most profitable as a cash crop should be chosen. If the crops are to be fed, the crops producing the greatest quantity of desirable food per acre at a low cost should be chosen.

The comparative returns from the various grain crops computed on the basis of 10 year average yields and seven year average prices for Rock and Nobles Counties are presented in the following table.

Comparative Returns per Acre of Crops

|  | Corn | Oats | Barley | Flax |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost per acre | \$17.40 | 14.24 | \%14.33 | \$16.85 |
| Yield, 10 year average | 34 | 351 | 30 | $10 \frac{3}{4}$ |
| Cost per bushel | ¢ 4 | \$. 40 | \$. 48 | 薷 1.57 |
| Dec, 1 price, 7 year average | . 64 | . 35 | . 55 | 2.21 |
| Net return per acre | 4.36 | -1.81 | 2.17 | 6.91 |

On the basis of Rock and Nobles County Average yields and prices over a long period of years, flax is by a considerable margin the most profitable of these four crops as a cash crop. Corn is second and barley third. Oats failed by ${ }^{\circ} 1.81$ per acre to pay all charges.

Cash Crop Prospects for 1931
In planning cash crops for 1931, one must look ahead as to probable future prices. The price relation of the past seven years are not necessarily those of 1931. The Outlook Report of the United States Department of Agriculture just issued throws some light on this subject. In spite of the fact that the 1930 corn crop was the smallest in 29 years the price is 11 cents below the seven year average prices. With a normal crop in 1931 we may expect a still lower price for this years crop than for the 1930 crop unless an unexpected revival of business occurs. With normal yields barley prices will probably maintain about the same relation to corn prices as they have the past seven years. The same may be said of the price of oats, If anything oats will bring a relatively lower price. The price of flax this fall will de pend on the size of the crop. The acreage of flax in 1930 was the largest ever grown in the United States. With the same acreage in 1931, the usual abandonment and an average yield, the total production will be about $14 \%$ below the probable domestic requirements. Flax yields vary widely. A large yield or a material increase in acreage in 1931 may reduce the effectiveness of our flax tariff and depress prices. No considerable increase in flax acreage is justified except for those producers who yields are high enough to reduce cost to a point where they can still get a fair return with lower prices. Ho wever, those now growing flax in southwesterm Minnesota and getting satisfactory yields connot hope to increase their profits in 1931 by shifting out of flax into corn, barley, or oats. They may well distribute the ir risks by maintaining their present flax acreage, using good seed and planting early.

## Selecting most profitable feed crops

Where crops are raised for feed it is important to organize the crop rotation around the crops which produce the largest quantity of desirable feed at a low cost. The production of digestible crude protein, and other digestible nutrients per acre and the cost per hundred pounds of food nutrients, using 10 year average yields for these counties is presented in the following table.

Production per Acre and Relati"e Cost per Hundred Pounds of Digestible Nutrients

| Crop | $\begin{gathered} 10 \text { yr. av. } \\ \text { Yield } \end{gathered}$ | Digestible NutrientsProtein Other Total |  |  | Cost per 100 lbs. Total Nutrients |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grains | bu. | lbs. | lbs. | lbs. |  |
| Corn | 34 | 135 | 1769 | 1904 | \$1.12 |
| Barley | 30 | 130 | 1310 | 1440 | 1.25 |
| Oats | $35 \frac{1}{2}$ | 110 | 1026 | 1136 | 1.78 |
| Roughages | tons |  |  |  |  |
| Alfalfa | 2 | 424 | 1616 | 2040 | . 78 |
| Corn fodder | $2 \frac{3}{4}$ | 204 | 2442 | 2646 | . 70 |
| Wild Hay | 1 | 60 | 904 | 964 | . 87 |
| Silage | - | 156 | 2028 | 2184 | 1,10 |

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

Corn fodder, on the basis of the above date, is the cheapest source of roughage. Hovever, it has the disadvantage of containing a low amount of protein. Llfalfa, on the other hand, has a high percentago of protein. Since protein is most likely to be lacking in the retion, and since it is the most expensive element to buy, the higher amount of protein in the alfalfo hay wrould more than offset the difference in cost between corn fodder and alfalfa and make alfalfa the most desirable roughage. Wild hay has the disadvanteges of both a low yield of food nutrients and a higher cost. Honever, vild hay is usually not gronn on land suitable for other crops and hence the cutting of wild hay is generolly 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 recders have felt that it has a value greater than that indicatcd by its nutrient content.

Judging from the data presented above, flax and com have been the most profitable cash crops, corn and barley hare been the best grain crops to raise for feed and alfalfa has been the best source of raughage.

## Planning for the Future

The data in this report should prove useful in planning the cropping system for 1931 if one keeps in mind tie comparisons on the basis of lO-year arerage yields and pieces and the prospects for the coming year. Since these are livestock farms feed crops must be given first olace. Corn and alfalfa hay seem to deserve the most consideration. There must be small grain to balance up the cropping system. Borley seems to have the advantage as a feed crop. Hence it would seem mise to substitute barley for oats as far as possible. slfalfs promises the most economical roughage and unless there is an unusually large hay crop in 1931 any surplus should be saleable at a profitable price.

These crop cost studies Fill be continued thru 1931. Averages secured from the farms cooperating in this study rill furnish a better basis for planing the cropping systems for those farms than do county averages. It is therefore especislly important to tiose farmers who have kept records in 1929 and 1930 to continue the work thru the next year in order to work out cropping systems best adapted to the particular conditions under which they are working. At the end of the three years, the data secured will be analyzed and suggestions will be developed as to the best long time croping plans not only for these farms but for ot her farms of similar type in this section of the state. Definite records of what has been done in the past coupled with the best information available as to probable trends of production and prices serve as the safest basis for planning profitable farming systems for the future.

Comparative Cost and Return per icre of Principal Crops
Rock and Nobles Counties, 1929-1930

|  | Husked | Corn | 0ats |  | Barley |  | Flax |  | ¿lfalfa |  | Wild Hay Corn Fodder |  |  |  | Corn Silage |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1929 | 1930 | 1929 | 1930 | 1929 | 1930 | 1929 | 1930 | 1929 | 1930 | 1929 | 1930 | 1929 | 1930 | 1929 | 1930 |  |
| No. of farms | 24 | 24 | 22 | 22 | 16 | 15 | 8 | 13 | 17 | 17 | 15 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 8 | 6 |  |
| Avg. acres per farm | 96 | 97 | 64 | 63 | 30 | 31 | 28 | 27 | 13 | 14 | 22 | 27 | 8 | 13 | 16 | 21 |  |
| Man hours | $13 \frac{3}{4}$ | $\frac{3}{4} \quad 12 \frac{3}{4}$ | $7 \frac{1}{6}$ | 7 | 6 \% ${ }^{3}$ | $\frac{3}{4} \quad 7 \frac{1}{4}$ | 8 | 8 | $10 \frac{3}{4}$ | $\frac{3}{1}$ | $5 \frac{1}{6}$ |  | $\frac{1}{2} \quad 13 \frac{1}{4}$ | 13 | 21.3 | $17 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| Horse hours | 40-1 | 35 | 15 $\frac{3}{\frac{3}{4}}$ | 14 ${ }^{\frac{3}{1}}$ | $15^{\text {² }}$ | 16委 | - 23 | 18\% $\frac{1}{5}$ | $16 \frac{1}{2}$ | 15 $\frac{3}{4}$ | $8 \frac{3}{4}$ | 9 ${ }^{-}$ | - 30 | 30 | $48 \stackrel{1}{4}$ | - 41 |  |
| Tractor hours | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1/5 | 1/5 | 5 | $\stackrel{1}{1}$ |  | $\frac{1}{2}$ | ~ | - | - | - | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $1 \frac{1}{1}$ | - $1 \frac{1}{4}$ |  |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man labor | \$4.13 | 33.83 | 2. 28 | \$2.10 | \$2.03 | 22. 18 | \%2.40 | \%2. 40 | 33.23 | \$2.85 | 䆃. 58 | \$1. 58 | 3. 38 | \$3.90 | ${ }^{3} 6.53$ | \%. 25 |  |
| Horse \& tractor work | 5.32 | 4.44 | 1.94 | 1.70 | 1.86 | 1.97 | 2.76 | 2.45 | 2.08 | 1.70 | 1.04 | . 81 | 3.95 | 3.98 | 6.86 | 5.24 |  |
| Seed | . 42 | . 42 | 1.58 | 1.21 | 1.49 | 1.06 | 2.21 | 2.57 | 1.00 | 1.00 | - | - | 1.01 | . 63 | . 71 | . 60 |  |
| Twine | - | - | . 34 | . 40 | . 36 | . 34 | . 22 | . 26 | - | - | - | - | . 63 | . 50 | . 48 | . 40 |  |
| Threshing | *. 37 | . 47 | 1.21 | 1.11 | . 99 | . 80 | 1.64 | 1.65 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.53 | 1.95 | 1 |
| Manure \& fertilizer | 1.75 | 1.90 | . 89 | . 76 | . 96 | . 73 | . 77 | . 72 | 2.16 | 1.30 | - | - | 1.58 | 1.69 | 3.10 | 1.72 | $\omega$ |
| Machine charge | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | . 99 | . 94 | 1.63 | 1.53 | . 90 | . 85 | 1.65 | 1.65 | 1.56 | 1.53 | 1 |
| Operating costs | 12.94 | 12.01 | 9.09 | 8.22 | 8.64 | 8.03 | 10.99 | 10.99 | 10.10 | 8.38 | 3.52 | 3.34 | 12.80 | 12. 26 | 21.77 | 16.69 |  |
| Land charge | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | , 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 |  |
| Total costs | 18.94 | 18.01 | 15.09 | 14.221 | 14.64 | 14.03 | 16.99 | 16.99 | 16.10 | 14.38 | 8.52 | 8.34 | 18.80 | 18.26 | 27.77 | 22.69 |  |
| Credit | 1.00 | 1.00 | - | - | - | - | - | - | . 14 | . 29 | - | - | - | - | 1.24 | . 54 |  |
| Net cost | 17.94 | 17.011 | 15.09 | 14.221 | 14.64 | 14.03 | 16.99 | 16.99 | 15.96 | 14.09 | 8.52 | 8.34 | 18.80 | 18.26 | 26. 53 | 22.15 |  |
| Yield, grain bu. | 38.0 | 31.7 | 50.7 | 53.7 | 32.2 | 29.2 | 11.2 | 13.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Yield, roughage T . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.0 | 1.6 | 1.00 | 1.2 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 7.3 | 5.1 |  |
| Cost per unit | .47 | . 54 | . 29 | . 27 | . 45 | . 48 | 1.50 | 1.31 | 7.98 | 8.80 | 8.52 | 6.95 | 5.70 | 10.52 | 3.63 | 4.34 |  |
| December 1 price | . 56 | . 48 | . 36 | . 24 | . 49 | . 38 | 2.83 | 1.48 | 15.00 | 14.00 | 9.00 | 7.00 | 10.00 | 8.00 | 5.00 | 4.50 |  |
| Crop value | 21.27 | 15.2418 | 18.25 | 12.881 | 15.78 | 11.10 | 31.84 | 19.24 | 30.00 | 22.40 | 9.00 | 8.40 | 33.00 | 15.20 | 36.50 | 22.95 |  |
| Net return | 3.33 | -1.77 | 3.16 | $-1.35$ | 1.14 | -2.93 | 14.85 | 2.25 | 14.04 | 8.31 | . 48 | . 06 | 14.20 | -3.06 | 9.97 | . 80 |  |
| Return for land | 9.33 | 4.23 | 9.16 | 4.65 | 7.14 | 3.07 | 20.85 | 8.25 | 20.04 | 14.31 | 5.48 | 5.06 | 20.20 | 2.94 | 15.97 | 6.80 |  |
| Return per man hour | . 54 | . 16 | . 74 | . 10 | . 47 | nome | 2.16 | . 58 | 1.61 | 1.17 | . 39 | . 31 | 1.37 | . 06 | . 76 | . 35 |  |

*Corn picker.

Comparative Cost and Return per Acre of Husked Corn

| $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { Farm }} \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Hours of Work |  |  | Costs |  |  |  |  |  | Total Costs | Credit | Net Cost | $\frac{\text { Yield }}{\text { Bu．Grade }}$ |  | Cost per Bushel | Net Return | Return per Man Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Man | Horse | Tractor | Labor | Seed | Husker | Manure \＆ Fertil． | Machine | e Land |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 123 | $10^{\frac{3}{4}}$ | $31 \frac{1}{2}$ | － | \＄6．66 | \％ 27 | \％ | 82.36 | \％． 95 | \＄6．00 | 16．24 | \％ 1.00 | 15．24 | 35.3 | 4 | 4.43 | \＄1．70 | \％． 46 |
| 402 | $10 \frac{5}{3}$ | 34 | － | 6.78 | ． 49 | 1.47 | 1.42 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 17.11 | 1.00 | 16.11 | 36.6 | 4 | ． 44 | 1.46 | ． 44 |
| 401 | $12^{\frac{3}{4}}$ | $37 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 8.73 | ． 48 | ． 70 | 1.94 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 18.80 | 1.00 | 17.80 | 39.8 | 4 | ． 45 | 1.30 | ． 40 |
| 107 | $9 \frac{1}{4}$ | $17 \frac{1}{4}$ | $2 \frac{1}{4}$ | 6.26 | ． 56 | 1.23 | ． 95 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 15.95 | 1.00 | 14.95 | 32.9 | 4 | ． 45 | ． 84 | ． 39 |
| 502 | 12 | $27 \frac{1}{4}$ | $1 \frac{1}{4}$ | 7.82 | ． 45 | － | ． 85 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 16.07 | 1.00 | 15.07 | 33.3 | 4 | ． 45 | ． 91 | ． 38 |
| 119 | $9 \frac{1}{4}$ | $34 \frac{1}{2}$ | － | 6.37 | ． 52 | ． 70 | 2.02 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 16.56 | 1.00 | 15.56 | 33.6 | 4 | ． 46 | ． 57 | .36 |
| 213 | $9 \frac{3}{3}$ | $33 \frac{1}{2}$ | － | 6.46 | ． 35 | ． 70 | 2.10 | ． 95 | 0.00 | 16.56 | 1.00 | 15.56 | 33.1 | ${ }_{5}$ | ． 47 | ． 33 | ． 33 |
| 113 | 13娄 | 42 | － | 8.17 | ． 32 | － | 2.64 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 18.38 | 1.00 | 17.38 | 36.5 | 4 | ． 48 | ． 14 | ． 31 |
| 211 | $12 \frac{3}{4}$ | $34 \frac{1}{2}$ | $1 \frac{1}{4}$ | 8.74 | ． 30 | ． 70 | 1.91 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 18.60 | 1.00 | 17.60 | 35.2 | 3 | ． 50 | － | ． 30 |
| 118 | 14砍 | $26 \frac{1}{4}$ | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 8.68 | ． 39 | － | 1.24 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 17.26 | 1.00 | 16.26 | 32.6 | 4 | ． 50 | －． 61 | ． 26 |
| 104 | 181 $\frac{1}{4}$ | $50 \frac{1}{4}$ | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 11.25 | ． 63 | － | 2.24 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 21.07 | 1.00 | 20.07 | 38.5 | 4 | ． 52 | －1． 59 | ． 21 |
| 218 | $16 \frac{3}{7}$ | 423 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 10.60 | ． 42 | － | ． 65 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 18.62 | 1.00 | 17.62 | 33.2 | 4 | ． 53 | －1．68 | ． 20 |
| 219 | $10 \frac{3}{4}$ | $26 \frac{1}{2}$ | $2 \frac{3}{4}$ | 8.76 | ． 62 | ． 70 | 2.58 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 19.61 | 1.00 | 18.61 | 34.3 | 3 | ． 54 | －1． 46 | ． 16 |
| 202 | 171 $\frac{1}{4}$ | 34 | $2{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 10.90 | ． 47 | － | 2.25 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 20.57 | 1.00 | 19.57 | 35.4 | 4 | ． 55 | －2．58 | .150 |
| 105 | $21 \frac{1}{2}$ | $56 \frac{3}{4}$ | $\underline{-}$ | 12.41 | ． 36 | － | 3.23 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 22.95 | 1.00 | 21.95 | 40.0 | 4 | ． 55 | $-2.75$ | ． 171 |
| 312 | 12 | $41 \frac{1}{4}$ | － | 7.94 | ． 53 | ． 70 | 2.46 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 18.58 | 1.00 | 17.58 | 30.7 | 3 | ． 57 | －2． 23 | ． 11 |
| 116 | 111 $\frac{1}{4}$ | $45 \frac{1}{2}$ | $\square$ | 8.17 | ． 34 | ． 70 | 1.12 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 17.28 | 1.00 | 16.28 | 27.4 | 4－5 | ． 59 | $-3.47$ | none |
| 419 | 11圱 | $37 \frac{1}{4}$ | $\frac{3}{4}$ | 8.21 | ． 50 | ． 70 | 3.05 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 19.41 | 1.00 | 18.41 | 31.2 | 4 | ． 59 | －3．44 | ＂ |
| 501 | 121 | 21 | $2{ }^{\text {爯 }}$ | 8.10 | ． 46 | － | ． 33 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 15.84 | 1.00 | 14.84 | 24.0 | 5 | ． 62 | －3．80 | ＂ |
| 302 | $10 \frac{1}{4}$ | $30 \frac{1}{4}$ | 1 | 6.29 | ． 43 | 1.47 | 4.09 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 19.23 | 1.00 | 18.23 | 28.4 | 4 | ． 64 | －4．60 | ＂ |
| 301 | 13 $\frac{1}{4}$ | $47 \frac{3}{4}$ | － | 8．94 | ． 36 | ． 70 | 2.15 | ． 95 | 0.00 | 19.10 | 1.00 | 18.10 | 26.9 | 4 | ． 67 | －5．19 | ＂ |
| 319 | $8 \frac{1}{4}$ | $26 \frac{1}{4}$ | 13 | 6.23 | ． 29 | ． 70 | 1.54 | ． 95 | 0.00 | 15.71 | 1.00 | 14.71 | 20.7 | 4 | ． 71 | $-4.77$ | ＂ |
| 201 | $13 \frac{1}{2}$ | $30 \frac{3}{4}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 7.80 | ． 30 | － | 1.49 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 16.54 | 1.00 | 15.54 | 21.3 | 5 | ． 73 | －5．74 | ＂ |
| 102 | $14 \frac{1}{4}$ | $34 \frac{3}{4}$ | $\underline{-}$ | 7.90 | ． 35 | － | ． 91 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 16.11 | 1.00 | 15.11 | 19.7 | 4 | ． 77 | $-5.65$ | ＂ |
| inver． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1930 | $12{ }^{\frac{3}{4}}$ | $35 \frac{1}{4}$ |  | 8.27 | ． 42 | ． 47 | 1.90 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 18.01 | 1.00 | 17.01 | 31.7 | 4 | ． 54 | $-1.77$ | ． 16 |
| 1929 | $13 \frac{3}{4}$ | $40 \frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 9.45 | ． 42 | ． 37 | 1.75 | ． 95 | 6.00 | 18.94 | 1.00 | 17.94 | 38.0 | 5 | ． 47 | 3.33 | ． 54 |

December l price per bu． 1930 －No．3，50 ；No．4，48 ；No．5， $46 \phi$.
December I＂＂n 1929 －－－No．4，58申；No．5，56фं；No．6， $54 \phi$.

Comparative Cost and Return per Acre of Oats
Rock and Nobles Counties - 1930

| FarmNo. | Hours of Work |  |  | Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Cost | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yield } \\ & \text { (bu.) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cost } \\ & \text { per bu. } \end{aligned}$ | Net Return | Return per Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Man | Horse | Tractor | Labor | Seed | Twine | Thresh. | Nanure | Machine | Land |  |  |  |  |  |
| 302 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | $14 \frac{1}{4}$ | - | \$3.16 | \$1. 39 | 詈. 39 | $\$ 1.35$ | \$1.15 | \$. 95 | \$6.00 | 614.39 | 72.6 | \%. 20 | \$3.03 | \$. 85 |
| 402 | 6 | $15 \frac{3}{7}$ | - | 3.42 | 1.22 | . 37 | 1.25 | . 56 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.77 | 64.8 | . 21 | 1.78 | . 60 |
| 107 | $5{ }^{3}$ | $11 \frac{1}{2}$ | $\pm$ | 2.92 | 1.25 | . 35 | 1.54 | . 57 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.58 | 59.3 | . 23 | . 65 | . 41 |
| 213 | $6 \frac{1}{4}$ | $11 \frac{1}{2}$ | - | 3.10 | 1.38 | . 38 | 1.09 | . 53 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.43 | 56.1 | . 24 | . 03 | . 30 |
| 218 | $6 \frac{3}{1}$ | $16 \frac{1}{2}$ | - | 3.78 | 1.30 | . 43 | 1.24 | . 65 | . 95 | 6.00 | 14.35 | 59.4 | . 24 | -. 09 | . 29 |
| 201 | $5 \frac{1}{4}$ | $13 \frac{1}{4}$ | - | 2.95 | 1.13 | . 49 | 1.09 | . 54 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.15 | 52.5 | . 25 | -. 55 | . 20 |
| 102 | 8 | 18 | - | 4.28 | 1.06 | . 39 | 1.16 | . 47 | . 95 | 5.00 | 14.31 | 56.8 | . 25 | -. 68 | . 21 |
| 202 | $6 \frac{1}{4}$ | $11 \frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 3.43 | . 90 | . 32 | 1.05 | . 76 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.41 | 54.0 | . 25 | -. 45 | . 23 |
| 319 | $5 \frac{1}{4}$ | $11 \frac{1}{4}$ | $\frac{1}{8}$ | 2.88 | 1.30 | . 37 | 1.19 | . 81 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.50 | 54.5 | . 25 | -. 42 | . 22 |
| 113 | $5 \frac{4}{1}$ | $14 \frac{1}{2}$ | 2 | 3.23 | 1.32 | . 43 | 1.21 | . 64 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.78 | 53.9 | . 26 | -. 84 | . 15 |
| 301 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ | $15 \frac{1}{4}$ | $\vec{\square}$ | 3.56 | 1.17 | . 42 | 1.03 | . 65 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.78 | 51.5 | . 27 | -1.42 | . 08 |
| 502 | $6 \frac{1}{4}$ | $10 \frac{7}{2}$ | $\frac{3}{4}$ | 3.77 | 1.14 | . 50 | 1.03 | . 28 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.67 | 51.4 | . 27 | $-1.33$ | . 09 |
| 118 | 6 | $11 \frac{3}{4}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 3.40 | 1.23 | . 29 | . 99 | . 49 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.35 | 49.1 | . 27 | -1.56 | . 04 |
| 116 | $7 \frac{1}{4}$ | 17 |  | 3.95 | 1.36 | . 47 | 1.00 | . 44 | . 95 | 6.00 | 14.17 | 51.6 | . 27 | -1.79 | . 05 |
| 123 | $5 \frac{3}{4}$ | $11 \frac{1}{4}$ | - | 2.88 | 1.36 | . 52 | 1.14 | 1.86 | . 95 | 6.00 | 14.71 | 54.0 | . 27 | -1.75 | - |
| 401 | $9 \frac{1}{4}$ | 193 | - | 4.82 | 1.17 | . 46 | 1.14 | . 69 | . 95 | 6.00 | 15.23 | 54.5 | . 28 | -2.15 | . 07 |
| 105 | $10 \frac{1}{4}$ | $20 \frac{3}{1}$ | - | 5.28 | 1.28 | . 35 | 1.21 | 1.76 | . 95 | 6.00 | 16.83 | 59.2 | . 28 | -2.62 | . 04 |
| 119 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ | $16 \frac{1}{2}$ | - | 3.68 | . 90 | . 27 | . 97 | . 64 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.41 | 47.8 | . 28 | -1.94 | none |
| 419 | 9 | $20 \frac{1}{4}$ | - | 4.90 | 1.43 | . 38 | 1.14 | 1.38 | . 95 | 6.00 | 16.18 | 56.2 | . 29 | -2.69 | " |
| 211 | 7 | 13 番 | $\frac{3}{4}$ | 4.17 | 1.00 | . 34 | . 84 | . 69 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.99 | 42.2 | . 33 | -3.86 | " |
| 312 | 7 | 19 | $-$ | 4.09 | 1.17 | . 32 | . 98 | 1.08 | . 95 | 6.00 | 14.59 | 44.0 | . 33 | -4.03 | " |
| 501 | $9 \frac{3}{4}$ | 12 | $1 \frac{1}{4}$ | 5.87 | 1.24 | . 48 | . 73 | . 18 | . 95 | 6.00 | 15.45 | 35.6 | . 43 | -6.91 | " |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Aver، } \\ & 1930 \end{aligned}$ | 7 |  | $1 / 5$ | 3.80 | 1. 21 | . 40 | 1.11 | . 76 | . 95 | 6.00 | 14.22 | 53.7 | . 27 | -1.35 | . 10 |
| 1929 | $7 \frac{1}{4}$ | $15 \frac{3}{4}$ | 1/5 | 4.12 | 1.58 | . 34 | 1.21 | . 89 | . 95 | 6.00 | 15.09 | 50.7 | . 29 | -1.35 3.16 | .74 |

December l price per bushel, 1929-\$.36, 1930-\$.24.

Comparative Cost and Return per Acre of Barley
Rock and Nobles Counties - 1930

| Farm <br> No. | Hours of Work |  |  | Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Cost | Yield <br> Bu. | Cost pe Bushel | Net Fetum | Return per Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Man | Horse | Tractor | Labor | Seed | Twine | Thresh. | Nanure | Mach. | Land |  |  |  |  |  |
| 502 | \% | $11 \frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{4}$ | \$ ${ }^{\text {3 }} 3.30$ | 21.06 | \% ${ }^{3} .44$ | 管1.09 | \%. 28 | \%.95 | \$6.00 | \$13.12 | 36.2 | \%. 36 | \$. 64 | \% 41 |
| 419 | 11 | 22 ${ }^{\frac{3}{1}}$ | - | 5.67 | 1.34 | . 38 | 1.14 | 1.37 | . 95 | 6.00 | 16.85 | 46.2 | . 36 | . 71 | . 36 |
| 119 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | $13 \frac{1}{2}$ | - | 3.08 | 1.06 | . 36 | 1.01 | . 54 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.10 | 35.6 | .37 | . 43 | . 38 |
| 107 | $6 \frac{3}{1}$ | 15 | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 3.78 | . 77 | . 34 | . 22 | . 84 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.61 | 34.4 | . 40 | -. 54 | . 22 |
| 218 | $5 \frac{3}{4}$ | 14 $\frac{1}{2}$ | - | 3.22 | . 91 | . 40 | . 84 | . 65 | . 95 | 6.00 | 12.97 | 29.2 | . 44 | -1.87 | none |
| 201 | 53 | 122 | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 3.28 | . 98 | . 11 | . 80 | . 54 | . 95 | 6.00 | 12.66 | 26.2 | . 48 | -2.70 | " |
| 102 | $7 \frac{1}{2}$ | $16 \frac{3}{4}$ | - | 4.00 | 1.09 | . 32 | . 84 | . 68 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.88 | 28.2 | . 48 | -3.16 | " |
| 211 | $7 \frac{1}{2}$ | 15 | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 4.18 | . 90 | . 37 | . 85 | . 69 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.94 | 28.4 | . 49 | -3.15 | " |
| 301 | $5 \frac{3}{1}$ | $12 \frac{1}{2}$ | - | 2.99 | 1.24 | . 46 | . 78 | . 65 | . 95 | 5.00 | 13.07 | 25.9 | . 50 | -3.23 | " |
| 319 | 4 | $8 \frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 2.27 | 1.09 | . 31 | . 70 | . 83 | . 95 | 6.00 | 12.15 | 23.8 | . 51 | -3.11 | " |
| 118 | 63 | $12 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 4.21 | 1.12 | . 29 | . 79 | . 96 | . 85 | 6.00 | 14.32 | 26.4 | . 54 | -4.29 | " |
| 118 123 | $12 \frac{3}{4}$ | 12 ${ }^{2}$ | 1 | 4.21 8.80 | 1.12 .84 | . 29 | . 48 | .96 1.55 | . 95 | 6.00 | 14.32 19.08 | 26.4 34.4 | .54 .55 | -4.25 -6.01 | " |
| 501 | 8 | $8 \frac{1}{2}$ | $1 \frac{3}{4}$ | 5.12 | 1.32 | . 31 | . 79 | . 14 | . 85 | 6.00 | 14.63 | 26.3 | . 56 | -4. 64 | " |
| 116 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ | $15 \frac{1}{2}$ |  | 3.56 | 1.28 | . 27 | . 50 | . 48 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.04 | 21.1 | . 62 | -5.02 | " |
| 113 | $7 \frac{1}{2}$ | 24 $\frac{1}{2}$ | - | 4.80 | . 82 | . 25 | . 46 | . 64 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.92 | 15.4 | . 90 | -8.07 | " |
| Aver. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1930 | $7 \frac{1}{4}$ | $16 \frac{3}{4}$ | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 4.15 | 1.06 | . 34 | . 80 | . 73 | . 95 | 6.00 | 14.03 | 29.2 | . 48 | -2.93 | none |
| 1929 | $6 \frac{3}{1}$ | 15 | - | 3.89 | 1.49 | . 36 | . 99 | . 96 | . 95 | 6.00 | 14.64 | 32.2 | . 45 | 1.14 | . 47 |

tr December 1 price per bu., 1930- $\$ .38,1929-\$ .49$.

Comparative Cost and Return per Acre of Flax

| Farm | Hours of Work |  |  | Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Cost | Yield <br> Bu. | Cost Per$\mathrm{Bu} .$ | Net <br> Return | Return Per Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Man | Horse | Tractor | Labor | Seed | Twine | Threshing | Manure | Machine | Land |  |  |  |  |  |
| 202 | $8 \frac{3}{7}$ | 161 | $\frac{3}{4}$ | \$5.12* | \$1.68 | \$ - | \$2.70 | \$.76 | $\$ .95$ | \$6.00 | \#17.21 | 19.7 | \%. 87 | \$11.95 | \$1. 67 |
| 312 | $7 \frac{3}{4}$ | 24, $\frac{1}{4}$ | - | 4.90 | . 88 | . 30 | 2.24 | 1. 20 | . 95 | 6.00 | 16.47 | 17.2 | . 96 | 8.99 | 1.46 |
| 401 | 9 | $22 \frac{1}{2}$ | - | 5.07 | 3.68 | - | 2.26 | . 97 | . 95 | 6.00 | 18.93 | 18.8 | 1.01 | 8.89 | 1.29 |
| 302 | 7 | 1312 | - | 3.69* | 2.55 | . 40 | 2.05 | 1.17 | . 95 | 6.00 | 16.81 | 16.2 | 1.04 | 7.17 | 1.32 |
| 502 | $8 \frac{1}{4}$ | 19 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 4.95 | 2.65 | . 36 | 1.91 | . 28 | . 95 | 6.00 | 17.10 | 15.1 | 1.13 | 5.25 | . 94 |
| 211 | 6 | 12 | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 3.37 | 2. 48 | . 42 | 1.70 | . 69 | . 95 | 6.00 | 15.61 | 13.6 | 1.15 | 4.52 | 1.05 |
| 301 | $8 \frac{1}{2}$ | 22 | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 5.10 | 3.56 | . 42 | 2.14 | 1.27 | . 95 | 6.00 | 19.44 | 16.7 | 1.16 | 5.28 | . 92 |
| 113 | $5 \frac{3}{4}$ | $15 \frac{3}{4}$ | - | 3.37 | 2.75 | - | 1.85 | . 64 | . 95 | 6.00 | 15.56 | 13.2 | 1.18 | 3.98 | . 99 |
| 402 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | $14 \frac{8}{8}$ | - | 3.57* | 2.58 | . 41 | 1.78 | . 56 | . 95 | 6.00 | 15.85 | 13.3 | 1.19 | 3.83 | $1.00^{\prime}$ |
| 319 | $8 \frac{1}{2}$ | $22 \frac{3}{4}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 5.22 | 1.66 | . 19 | 1.07 | - | . 95 | 6.00 | 15.09 | 10.8 | 1.40 | . 89 | . $40 \stackrel{\text { ra }}{ }$ |
| 218 | $10^{2}$ | 20 | $2 \frac{1}{4}$ | 6.72 | 4.09 | . 29 | . 79 | . 65 | . 95 | 6.00 | 19.49 | 6.6 | 2.97 | -11.04 | none 1 |
| 104 | $11 \frac{1}{4}$ | 23 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 8.12 | 2.39 | . 38 | . 74 | . 65 | . 95 | 6.00 | 19. 23 | 6.2 | 3.10 | -10.05 | none |
| 201 | $6 \frac{1}{4}$ | 15 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 3.89 | 2.52 | . 14 | . 28 | . 54 | . 78 | 6.00 | 14.15 | 2.0 | 7.07 | -11.19 | none |
| $\overline{\mathrm{Avg} .}$ $1930$ | 8 | 18 | 1 | 4.85 | 2.57 | 26 | 65 | 72 | 94 | 5.00 | 16.99 | 13.0 |  | 25 | 58 |
| 1929 | 8 | 23 | - | 5.16 | 2.21 | . 22 | 1.65 1.64 | . 77 | . 98 | 6.00 | 16.99 | 11.2 | 1.31 1.50 | 14.85 | 2.16 |

December 1 price per bu. 1929 - $\$ 2.83,1930-\$ 1.48$
*Includes a small charge for truciing.

Comparative Cost and Return per Acre of Alfalfa Hay

| Farm <br> No. | Hours of Work |  | Costs |  |  |  |  | Total Cost | Creait | Net Cost | Yield Tons | Cost per Ton | Net Return | Return per Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Man | Horse | Total Labor | Seed | $\begin{gathered} \text { Manure \& } \\ \text { Fertilizer } \end{gathered}$ | Nachine | Land |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 113 | $5 \frac{1}{4}$ | $11 \frac{3}{4}$ | \$2. 84 | \$1.00 | 3.64 | \$1.50. | 8.00 | ¢11.98 | \$1.72 | 10.26 | 2.2 | 74. 66 | \$20.54 | \%4. 21 |
| 213 | $9 \frac{1}{4}$ | $14 \frac{3}{4}$ | 4.33 | 1.00 | 3.42 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 16.25 | . 48 | 15.77 | 2.7 | 5.84 | 22.03 | 2.68 |
| 319 | $8 \frac{1}{4}$ | 14 | 3.95 | 1.00 | 2.70 | 1.56 | 6.00 | 15.21 | - | 15.21 | 2.4 | 6.34 | 18.39 | 2.53 |
| 302 | 9 9 | 12 | 4.15 | 1.00 | 1.14 | 1.63 | 6.00 | 13.92 | - | 13.92 | 2.1 | 6.63 | 15.48 | 1.97 |
| 202 | 8 | 131 | 8.34 | 1.00 | 1.98 | 1.50 | ©.00 | 14.32 | . 14 | 14.18 | 2.1 | 6.76 | 15.22 | 2. 20 |
| 102 | $6 \frac{1}{4}$ | $11 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3.10 | 1.00 | 1.85 | 1.30 | 6.00 | 13.26 | - | 13.26 | 1.9 | 6.98 | 13.34 | 2.43 |
| 218 | $9{ }^{\frac{3}{4}}$ | $18 \frac{1}{2}$ | 4. 88 | 1.00 | . 65 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 14.03 | - | 14.03 | 1.7 | 8.25 | 9.77 | 1.30 |
| 419 | $11{ }^{\frac{3}{2}}$ | $26 \frac{1}{4}$ | 6.32 | 1.00 | 1.45 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 16.27 | - | 16.27 | 1.8 | 9.04 | 8.93 | 1.04 |
| 401 | $9 \frac{3}{4}$ | $15 \frac{3}{1}$ | 4.55 | 1.00 | 1.30 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 14.35 | - | 14.35 | 1.4 | 10.25 | 5.25 | . 84 |
| 301 | $6 \frac{3}{4}$ | $12 \frac{1}{4}$ | 3.29 | 1.00 | . 65 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 12.44 | - | 12.44 | 1.2 | 10.37 | 4.36 | . 95 |
| 118 | $13 \frac{1}{2}$ | $19 \frac{5}{2}$ | 6.13 | 1.00 | 1.55 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 16.18 | 2.62 | 13.56 | 1.3 | 10.43 | 4.64 | . 64 |
| 105 | 20 | 28 | 8.92 | 1.00 | . 86 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 18.28 | - | 18.28 | 1.7 | 10.75 | 5.52 | . 58 |
| 402 | $9 \frac{1}{2}$ | $15 \frac{1}{2}$ | 4.51 | 1.00 | . 56 | 2.10 | 6.00 | 15.17 | - | 14.17 | 1.3 | 10.90 | 4.03 | . 72 |
| 219 | $13 \frac{3}{4}$ | 19 | 6.11 | 1.00 | 1.06 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 15.67 | - | 15.67 | 1.2 | 13.06 | 1.13 | . 38 |
| 501 | 8 | 10 | 3.69 | 1.00 | . 50 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 12.69 | - | 12.69 | . 9 | 14.10 | -. 09 | . 29 |
| 119 | $6 \frac{3}{4}$ | $15 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3.69 | 1.00 | . 64 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 12.83 | - | 12.83 | . 7 | 18.33 | $-3.03$ | none |
| 211 | $6 \frac{1}{4}$ | $10 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3.01 | 1.00 | 1.14 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 12.65 | - | 12.65 | . 6 | 21.08 | -4. 25 | " |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.17 |
| 1929 | $10 \frac{2}{2}$ | 16 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 5.31 | 1.00 | 2.16 | 1.63 | 6.00 | 16.10 | . 14 | 15.96 | 2.0 | 7.98 | 14.04 | 1.61 |

December 1 price per ton, 1929 - $\$ 15.00$, 1930 - $\$ 14.00$.

| Comparative Cost and Return per Acre of Wild Hay Rock and Nobles Counties - 1930 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Farm | Hour | Work |  | Costs |  | Total | Yield | Cost | Net | Return |
| No. | Man | Horse | Total Labor | Machine | Land | Cost | Tons | per Ton | Return | per Nan Fiour |
| 218 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 11 | \%2.79 | \%. 85 | \$5.00 | 8.6 全 | 1.7 | \$5.08 | 3.26 | r. 89 |
| 312 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | $11 \frac{1}{4}$ | 2.86 | . 85 | 5.00 | 8.71 | 1.6 | 5.4 | 2.49 | . 75 |
| 319 | $6 \frac{3}{7}$ | $12 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3.36 | . 85 | 5.00 | 9.21 | 1.6 | 5.75 | 1.99 | . 59 |
| 118 | 7 | $9 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3.14 | . 85 | 5.00 | 8.99 | 1.4 | 6. 42 | . 81 | . 42 |
| 105 | $3 \frac{3}{1}$ | $6 \frac{3}{4}$ | 1.87 | . 85 | 5.00 | 7.72 | 1.2 | 6.43 | . 68 | . 48 |
| 119 | 4 | $8 \frac{1}{4}$ | 2.10 | . 85 | 5.00 | 7.95 | 1.2 | 6.63 | . 55 | . 41 |
| 302 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | $7 \frac{3}{4}$ | 2.43 | . 85 | 5.00 | 8.28 | 1.2 | 6. 90 | . 12 | . 32 |
| 102 | $5 \frac{3}{4}$ | 10를 | 2.81 | . 85 | 5.00 | 8.66 | 1.1 | 7.87 | $-.98$ | . 13 |
| 113 | $3 \frac{1}{4}$ | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1.55 | . 85 | 5.00 | 7.40 | . 9 | 8. 22 | -1. 10 | none |
| 301 | $3 \frac{1}{4}$ | $5 \frac{3}{4}$ | 1.56 | . 85 | 5.00 | 7.41 | . 9 | 8.23 | -1.11 | " |
| 116 | 7 | $10 \frac{3}{4}$ | 3.22 | . 85 | 5.00 | 9.07 | 1.0 | 9.07 | -2.07 | \% |
| 201 | $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | $7 \frac{1}{4}$ | 2.14 | . 87 | 5.00 | 8.01 | .5 | 13.35 | -3.81 | " |
| Aver. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1930 | $5 \frac{1}{1}$ | 9 | 2.49 | . 85 | 5.00 | 8.34 | 1.2 | 6.85 | . 06 | . 31 |
| 1929 | $5 \frac{1}{4}$ | $8 \frac{3}{4}$ | 2.62 | . 90 | 5.00 | 8.52 | 1.0 | 8.52 | - 18 | . 39 |

December 1 price per ton, 1930 - 7.00 , 1929 - 0.00 .

Comparative Cost and Return per Acre of Corn Fodder
Rock and Nobles Counties - 1930

| $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { Farm }} \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Hours of Work |  |  | Costs |  |  |  |  |  | Total Cost | Yield tons | Cost per Ton | Net Return | Return per Man Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mian | Horse | Tractor | Total Labor | Seed | Twine | Nanure | Machine | Land |  |  |  |  |  |
| 502 | $9 \frac{3}{4}$ | $19^{3}$ | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | \$6.42 | \%. ${ }^{\text {\% }}$. 77 | \$. 81 | \$. 82 | \$1.65 | $\$ 6.00$ | \$16.47, | 2.9 | \$5.70 | \$6.73 | \$. 99 |
| 104 | $12 \frac{1}{2}$ | $28 \frac{1}{4}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 7.28 | . 53 | . 44 | 1.86 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 16.48* | 2.4 | 6.87 | 2.72 | . 52 |
| 401 | $20 \frac{3}{4}$ | $39 \frac{1}{4}$ | $\frac{3}{1}$ | 11.24 | 1.14 | . 60 | 3.48 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 24.11 | 3.2 | 7.56 | 1.49 | . 37 |
| 213 | $9 \frac{1}{4}$ | $25 \frac{1}{2}$ | $\pm$ | 5.43 | . 50 | . 52 | . 53 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 14.63 | 1.9 | 7.74 | . 57 | . 36 |
| 119 | $10 \frac{3}{4}$ | $30 \frac{1}{2}$ | - | 6.43 | . 46 | . 53 | 1.08 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 16.15 | 1.8 | 8.97 | -1.75 | . 14 |
| 105 | $19 \frac{1}{4}$ | $49 \frac{1}{2}$ | - | 10.95 | . 64 | . 69 | 1.40 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 21.33 | 2.3 | 9.33 | -2.93 | . 15 |
| 211 | $15 \frac{3}{3}$ | 37 | 1 | 9.65 | . 29 | . 65 | 1.49 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 19.73 | 2.0 | 10.06 | -3.73 | . 06 |
| 123 | $11 \frac{1}{2}$ | 38 | - | 7.36 | . 91 | . 57 | 1.59 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 18.08 | 1.7 | 10.70 | -4.48 | none |
| 218 | 9 | 183 | 112 | 5.68 | . 32 | . 44 | 3.97 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 18.07 | 1.6 | 11.15 | $-5.27$ | " 1 |
| 319 | 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ | $30 \frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 6.61 | . 58 | . 41 | 1.52 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 16.77 | 1.4 | 12.41 | -5.57 | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ |
| 118 | $15 \frac{1}{4}$ | $30 \frac{3}{4}$ | (1) $\frac{1}{2}$ | 9.26 | . 45 | . 25 | . 22 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 17.83 | 1.4 | 12.42 | -5.63 | " |
| 202 | 12 | 23 年 | 3 | 8.27 | . 74 | . 27 | . 78 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 17.71 | 1.4 | 12.65 | -6.51 | " |
| 312 |  | $31{ }^{\frac{3}{7}}$ |  | 6.13 | 1.11 | . 47 | 2.59 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 17.95. | 1.4 | 12.65 | -5.75 | " |
| 501 | $15 \frac{1}{2}$ | $21 \frac{1}{4}$ | $2 \frac{3}{4}$ | 9.00 | . 47 | . 28 | . 47 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 17.87 | 1.3 | 13.75 | -7.47 | " |
| 219 | $15 \frac{1}{4}$ | $26 \frac{3}{4}$ | 1 | 8.44 | . 59 | . 53 | 3.52 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 20.73 | 1.4 | 14.88 | -9.53 | " |
| Aver. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\ddagger 930$ | 13 | 30 | 1 | 7.88 | . 63 | . 50 | 1.69 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 18.26 | 1.9 | 10.52 | -3.06 | . 06 |
| 1929 | 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ | 30 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 7.93 | 1.01 | . 63 | 1.58 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 18.80 | 3.3 | 5.70 | 14.20 | 1.37 |

*Credit of $\$ 1.28$ for corn picked up after binder deducted from total expense.
December 1 price per ton, 1929 - $\$ 10.00$, $1930-\$ 8.00$.

Comparative Cost and Return per Acre of Silage Corn
Rock and Nobles Counties - 1930

*Credit for corn picked up after corn binder.
December I price per ton, 1930-\$4.50, 1929-\$5.00.

