

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.

A 40 Report 40

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. on the

FARM ACCOUNTING ROUTE

in

ROCK & NOBLES COUNTIES - MINNESOTA

Вy

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

---0---

Division of Farm Management and Agricultural Economics
University Farm
St. Paul, Minn.
May 1930.

Index

	Page
Introduction	1
Facts About the Organization of the Farm	8
Cost and Returns from Cattle	11
Costs and Returns from Hogs	12
Costs and Returns from Sheep	13
Costs and Returns from Poultry	14
Cost of Horse Work	15
Cost and Return from Husked Corn	16
Cost and Return from Flax	16
Cost and Return from Onts	17
Cost and Return from Borley	17
Cost of Producing Alfalfa	18
Cost of Producing Wild Hay	18
Cost of Producing Corn Fodder	19
Cost of Producing Corn Silage	19

Source of Data

Method of Study

The Division of Form Monagement and Agricultural Recommics and of Animal Husbandry of the University of Minnes, to are cooperating with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture in an accounting study of twenty-four forms in Rock and Nobles Counties in Southwestern Minnesita. This study was started March 1, 1929. The forms 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 same type of beef production is a major enterprise were chasen. The farmers chaperating 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 livestick, 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, livestack feed records, reports of crop yields and practices and other significant facts about the farm operation. 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. The financial returns from these farms, the cost and income from livestick production and other significant facts will be presented in later reports as the information becomes available.

mription of Area

Rock and Nobles Counties are located in the southwestern corner of soil in Rock County and the western edge of Nobles County is This is one of the most fertile soil types in the state.

3 County is covered with a glacial till, the prevailing hern and control part of the state. This too is a preplied with lime. According to the 1925 census, only four had higher land values per more than Rock and Nobles and high land values were due largely to their nearness to the counties are level to gently rolling with practically There are some sections, especially in southern Nobles

County that need drainage to insure results cropping and in Rock County there are limited areas of rock out-crop. The annual rainfall averages between 26 and 28 inches and the average growing season is from 170 to 140 days. Boef 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 studies was 323 acres. This is approximately 55% larger than the average size of farms in these two counties. The larger farms are better adapted to beef production. Two hundred forty-one acres or about 75% of the total acreage is in harvested crops. Of the balance there are 64 acres of pasture and 18 acres of farmstead roads, headlands, and waste. The crop land included 106 acres of corn, 56 acres of oats, 20 acres of barley, 10 acres of flax, 11 acres other small grains, 12 acres alfalfa, 14 acres wild hay, 7 acres other hay, and 5 acres of miscellaneous crops.

Only four of the farms studied are owned by the operators. Light are rented and of the remaining 12 the operator owns part of the land and rents the balance. Thiry-seven per cent of all the land is owned by the operators. Two-thirds of the rented land is rented for cash and one-third on a share basis. More than half of all farms in these two counties are operated by tenants.

The average investment on these forms was approximately \$47,500. The investment in productive livestock, including poultry, was ever \$6,000. For the period herch 1, 1929 to February 28, 1930, 35% of the cash receipts on these forms came from the sale of cattle, 7% from dairy products, 32% from hogs, 3% from sheep and 4% from poultry, a total of 81% from livestock. About 15% of the receipts were from crops chiefly corn, cats and flax.

Method of Computing and Presenting Data

Comparative costs are presented for each of the important classes of livestock and crops raised. These data represent comparative costs and not absolute costs. They have been computed on an owner basis as though the operator owned all land, livestock and tools.

In studying the tables and in considering the income from the different enterprises, one should keep in mind that these figures represent charges which are not all actual cash expenses. All man labor and horse work, interest on the investment, the use of the buildings and equipment, as well as feed have been charged to the livestock. All man labor and horse or tractor work, machinery and equipment and manure have been charged to the crops. Therefore a minus return means that the particular enterprise has failed to pay the prices charged for the different factors. There may be no other more profitable alternative use for same of these factors. A return above the price of marketable feeds and cash expenses may justify continued production although these comparative figures fail to show a gain.

Livestock

Comparative costs and returns for each of the different classes of livestock produced in 1929 are presented in the first part of this preliminary report.

In so far as possible local prices were used in determining the cost and returns. Marketable feeds were charged at local prices and non-marketable feeds on a comparatove feeding value basis. Man labor was figured at 30 cents per hour. 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 the livestock promated 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. The manuar credit is based on a value of 75 cents per ton in the barnyard. Only the amount of the manuar actually spread on the fields was credited to the livestock.

All tables for livestock have been computed on a per hundred pounds gain in weight, a per head, or some other similar basis so that the data for different farms are directly comparable. The tables are largely self-explanatory but a few items will perhaps be clearer after a little explanation. 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. 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 man labor used by it, after allowance has been made for all charges except man labor. The return per pound of grain represents what was left to pay for each pound of farm grain fed, after allowance was made for all other feed and all other charges.

Three types of beef production were found on these farms. Some farmers bought cattle to fatten. Other farmers milked most of their cows and received over a third of their/income from the sale of dairy products. A third group raised their can feeders and let the calves take most of the milk. On some farms there was a tendency to combine these types. An average for the farms in each of the three types was computed as well as an average for all farms. The table indicates that for these farms and this particular year the group that raised their own feeders and let the calves take most of the milk did just a little better than either of the other two groups. The group having over 35% of their income from cattle in dairy products di not secure quite as high returns as the others. However, these figures are for only one year? With a little different relationship between prices of butter-fat and beef a different result might be realized. Due to the impossibility of determing the pork credit for the feed picked up behind steers, this item was omitted from all calculations.

The hog enterprise fits very well with cattle feeding. The average amount of hogs produced per form was 29,000 pounds and the average amount of beef was 20,000 pounds. Taken together the gain on hogs practically offset, the small deficit on cattle.

Seven formers kept small flocks of sheep. A few of these also purchased feeder lambs. In general, the form flocks were profitable but due to the drastic decline in sheep prices, lamb feeding was not profitable.

The poultry enterprise, with a few exceptions, is relatively unimportant. The average return per 100 chickens over all charges was \$\pi_1.30\$. Ducks, geese and turkeys were reduced to their equivalent in chickens for comparative purposes. Fifty-five per cent of the farms keeping chickens secured a return over all charges.

The cost of horse work per hour averaged 11.4 cents, the cost varying from approximately 9 to 17 cents. The farms without tractors worked their horses approximately 120 hours less per horse than those having tractors but cost was reduced enough so that there was no significant difference in the rate per hour.

Crops

Comparative costs and returns for the eight principal crops grown on the farms studied are presented following the livestock data. The factors of cost are charged at the local market prices. The man labor rate, 30 cents per hour, is based on the wages to hired men on these farms and includes an allowance for board. Horse work is charged at 12 cents per hour, 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 crop to which the manure is applied and the balance promated 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 1, 1929 is used in computing the returns from the various crops. All costs are figured at the farm. No marketing charges have been included. The credits include stubble or stalk pasture, corn picked up after corn binder, and similar items.

The costs are shown both on an acre and a bushel or ton basis. The returns have been computed on the basis of the net return per acre over all charges and the return per hour the farmer received for the labor used on 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 for labor is the amount left to pay the labor after the other costs indicated have been met. A minus figure (-) indicates a loss.

Using Crop Records to Increase Crop Profits

Variations in Cost

The range in cost for each item is shown in addition to the average cost for all farms. It is interesting to note that on the average the returns of from every crop at the price used is sufficient to cover all the costs listed and leave some margin of profit. However, in case of every crop there was some farmers who failed to cover his costs. This is illustrated in Table I. A study of these variations in costs should call to the attention of each cooperator any weaknesses in his cropping plans or methods. It should afford suggestions for shifts or economies in production.

Table I

Variations in Production Costs

Crop	Cos	t per Uni	t	Dec. 1	% pro-
······································	Average	High	Low	Price	ducing
Corn	\$.47	\$. 92	}. 36	្ទុំ. 56	25
Oats	.29	.42	.22	,36	18
Barley	.45	.99	.31	.49	31
Flax	1.58	3.32	1.03	2.83	12 1
Alfalfa	7.98	16.14	4.41	15.00	6
Wild Hay	8.49	12.90	5.48	9.00	33

There are in general two ways in which the farmer may adjust his own business so as to make it more profitable. He may either (1) reduce his cost per unit of product or (2) select those craps or kinds of livestock or combinations of the two that bring in the largest returns.

One of the most important factors in reducing the cost per bushol or ton of crops produced is to increase yields. This is illustrated in the two following tables.

Table II

Effect of Yield per Acre on Cost and Returns for Corn

	Rock an	d Nobles	Counties -	1929	
Yield per Acre		Average Yield	Net Cost per Acre		Return per Hr. Man Labor
Under 36 bu.	8	32	19.15	.60	. 22
36 - 41 bu.	9	39	18.28	.47	.62
Over 41 bu.	?	45	17.37	.39	.91

In Table II is presented a grouping of the farms according to the yield of corn. The higher the yield the lower is the cost per bushel. Although the production on the higher yielding farms is only 41% above ther lower group the return per hour for the labor spent on them is more than four times as great. There is not only a larger margin of profit per bushel on the higher yielding farms but there are more bushels on which this profit is made. Apparently it costs as much to raise an acre of low yielding corn as it does a high yielding acre. In fact the costs are even higher in case of the low group.

Selecting Profitable Crops

The second way to increase crop returns is to select those crops or combinations of crops which have proven most profitable. In this connection it should be remembered that these figures cover the results in only one year. Crop costs and returns vary from year to year with crop yields, crop prices, and the prices of the cost factors. Those crops which proved most profitable in 1929 may be disappointing in 1930. One must first determine how nearly representative these figures are before drawing any conclusions. In Table IV is presented a comparison between the yield of the grain crops on these forms

in 1929 and the average yield on all forms in the two counties for the ten year period 1919 to 1928 and a similar comparison between the December 1 prices used in these tables with the average December 1 price for the state for the 10 years 1920 to 1929 inclusive.

Table III

Comparison of Yields on Form Studied and Prices Used with 10-Year Agerages

		Corn	0rts	Brley	Flax
Yield	- farms studied, 1929 - bu.	38:	50 <u>4</u>	324 28 5	1 <u>1</u> 10 +
7	10-year avg.county yields,1919-28-bu.	34	35		
Dec.1 Price	- forms studied	⊋56 €	\$.3 6	3.49 \$2	8.83
	10-year average state price,1920-29	.59	.35	.52 2	.11

All yields on these farms in 1929 are higher than the 10-year county averages. Since these farms maintain considerable livestock, the yields would probably average higher over a period of years than the average yields of the two counties. The advantage in yield, however, is not uniform between crops. Flax yielded only 3% above the 10-year county average, and corn and barley 13% above, but cats exceeded the average by 46%. The high return for cats must be discounted to some extent in line with this comparison. Oats also have an advantage in price as compared with the other crops. The price of oats is 3% above the 10-year state average price whereas corn is 5% below and barley 6% below. Sine this is an area of surplus production for these crops, their price is normally somewhat below the state average price. The state flax price in 1929 was the highest in 10 years. The December 1 price used in these studies is 34% above the 10-year average state price.

In order to present a more fair picture of the relative returns from these four crops over a period of years the costs and returns have been recomputed on the basis of 10-year average yields and 10-year average state prices. These data are shown in Table IV. Apparently our is the most profitable of the feed grains in the long run with barley second. The high yield in 1929 gives cats a special advantage for the one year. Flax appears a remunerative crop for this section on the basis of the ten year figure.

Table N

Comparison between 1929 Crop Costs and Returns and 10-Year County
Averages

	Com	Oats	Barley	Flox
Cost per bushel:				
1929	3.47	5.29	₿.4 5	\$1.50
10-year average			.52	1.61
Net return per acre:				
1929	3.33	3.34	1.16	14.85
10-year average	1.75*	-2.40	.11	5.21
Return per hour man labor:	•			
1929	.54	.76	.47	2.16
10-year average	.38	none	.32	.78

^{*}Loss

Hay, corn fodder, and silage all sjow favorable raturns. Roughages, however, vary widely in quality from form to form and the latter two have no regular market price. For this reason the cost comparisons are of more significance than are the return figures. It is worth while noting that it costs no more to produce a ten of alfalfa than it did a ten of wild hay. Since alfalfa has a much higher feeding value than wild hay, it would not seem worth while to keep the latter in the cropping system except on land too weter otherwise unfit for cultivation. The abundance of lime in the soil in these counties adapts them well for alfalfa production.

Planning for the Future

The data in this report should prove useful in planning the cropping system for the future if one keeps in mind the comparisons on the basis of 10-year average yields and prices and of prospects for the coming year. Since these are livestock forms feed crops must be given first place. Corn and alfalfa hay seem to deserve the most consideration. There must be small grain to balance up the cropping system. It would seem wise to substitute as much barley as possible for dats as a small grain crop, especially if it is gran for sale. Flax offers the best possibility as a dash crop. Because if our high tariff on flax and our heavy imports, flax growers are reasonably sure of a price in 1930 that will insure fair profits wherever average yields can be abtained. Alfalfa promises the most economical roughage.

These crop and livesteck studies will be continued thru 1930 and 1931. Averages secured from the forms cooperating in this study will furnish a better basis for planning the cropping systems for these forms than do county averages. It is therefore especially important to those formers who have kept records in 1929 to continue the work thru the next two years 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 cropping plans and livestock organization not only for these forms but for other forms 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 forming systems for the future.

FACTS ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FARMS.

	:	Per Farm:	=- 1
	Average	High	Low
Acres in corn	105.7	184.2	46.6
Acres in oats	56 . 5 .	167.4	-
Acres in barley	20.3	73•8	
Acres in other grains and grain mixtures	11.3	103.9	-
Acres in flax	9.•5	57-2	-
Acres in alfalfa	11.6	30.9	•••
Acres in tame hay	4.1	24.2	-
Acres in wild hay	14.2	43.5	-
Acres in miscellaneous hay	6.2	38.4	-
Acres in miscellaneous crops	1.8	18.1	 10= 1
Total crop acres	241.2	480.7	123.1
Acres in pasture	63.8	161.4	16.9
Acres in farmstead, roads, waste, etc.	17.8	33.8	7.9
Total acres per farm	322.8	552.8	162.2
Number of cows	19	33	8
No. pounds cattle produced	20089	66020	9105
No. pounds pork produced	29029	99753	5 7 95
No. of sheep	34	<u>397</u>	-
No. of chickens	2 55	436	<u> 36</u>
No. of laying hens	132	2149	27
Total hours man labor per farm	8155	16976	# , †80
Total hours livestock labor	3 856	7639	2439
Total hours crop labor	3138	6929	137 5
Total hours miscellaneous labor	1153	2455	307
Total hours hired labor	2656	5369	3.50
Total hours unpaid family labor	1492	7131	159
Total hours proprietor labor	2882	3696	2089
Hours per man per work day	9.8	11.4	7•5
Hours per man per Sunday	3.•3	5•3	1.1
Tractor farms:			
Number of farms using tractors:	12		
Number of horses per farm	10.1	17.0	0.0
Average hours worked per horse	849	1173	564
No. of crop acres per horse	27.5	34.0	16.6
Non-tractor farms:			
Number of farms	11		, ,
Number of horses per farm	7.6	11.0	4.4
Average hours worked per horse	969	1157	756
Number of crop acres per horse	28.8	35∙ 8	20.9

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

		Aver	age	
	Your	All	Five	Five
70.00 Ave. 10 av. 10 av.	Farm	Farms	Highest	Lowest
RECEIPTS		,		
Cattle	\$	\$3278.23	\$8423.07	\$1908.48
Hogs		3016.82	4548.19	2812.66
Sheep & wool		252.48	591.61	258.12
Poultry & eggs		349.55	455 • 44	498.86
Dairy products		623.43	699.60	579.76
Horses		⁴⁵ •63	171.00	10.96
Corn		491.56	713.20	629.94
Oats		33 ¹ 4•90	314.98	329.16
Barley		198•55	164.11	142.25
Flax		375.53	685.31	141.35
Hay		26.85	52.21	34.96
Other crops		31.39	38.72	69 .1 4
Outside		92.26	156.82	92.12
Miscellaneous		222.03	386.10	97.05
Total Cash Farm Receipts		9339:21	17400.36	7604.81
Farm Produce used in house		338.91	277.13	378.30
Increase in farm inventory		777.20	1616.31	127.76
TOTAL RECEIPTS		10455.32	19293.80	8110.87
EXPENSES				
Hired Labor		467.77	772.91	412.69
Cattle bought		1052.20	3558•97	311.50
Hogs bought		313.68	903.02	215.73
Sheep bought		349.55	582.70	881.59
Poultry bought		47•65	119.10	16.32
Horses bought		72•75	30.00	191.00
Other livestock expense		120.89	159.22	114.06
Feed bought		776.90	2208.16	239.21
Crop expense (twine, threshing, ctc)	•	288.33	436.72	222.54
Real estate		319.62	295.96	336,49
Machinery		5 88.0 9	978.49	382.02
Auto (farm share)		97•55	217.09	44.18
Gasoline, kerosene, oil, etc. (farm	share)	155.12	198.92	211.60
Taxes	·	400.24	511.10	494.06
Insurance		32.62	34.59	
Miscellaneous		47.45	29.78	103.11
(5) Total Cash Farm Expense		5133.41	11036.73	4209.47
(6) Decrease in farm inventory		645.42	813.22	10 ¹ 42•30
(7) Board for hired labor		205.89	351.04	167.87
(S) TOTAL FARM EXPENSES (sum of 5, 6 & 7)	5984.72	12200.99	5419.64
(9) Returns to capital and family labor	(4-8)	141470.60	7092.61	2691.23
(10) Interest on farm investory at 5%	, ,	2374.49	3198.67	2300.15
(11) Family Labor Earnings (9-10)		2096.11	3894.14	391.08
(12) Estimated value of unpaid family lab	or	587.54	358•5 ⁴	524.19
(13) OPERATOR'S LABOR EARNINGS (11-12)		1508.57	3535.60	-433.11
·				

AVERAGE FARM INVENTORIES.

	Your Farm	Route Average	Upper Five	Lowe r Five
Land Buildings Work Horses Other horses Cattle Hogs Sheep Poultry Machinery Auto (farm share)		\$32182.95 3620.66 918.01 94.77 4177.35 1503.79 277.50 204.28 1811.21 155.82	\$41943.40 4798.40 1121.50 239.00 7178.95 2460.73 315.90 218.95 2282.50 311.30	\$30819.20 3582.50 863.00 14.00 3677.40 1499.11 570.40 258.56 1840.22 62.72
Feeds		25 ¹ +3.52	3102.78	2815.93
Total		47489.86	63973.41	46003.04

FARM PRODUCE USED IN THE HOUSE

	Your Farm	Route Average	Upper Five	Lower Five
Cream Farm churned butter Wholemilk Skimmilk Hogs Cattle Sheep Poultry Eggs Potatoes		\$ 47.10 29.57 34.96 .63 107.68 21.71 .47 25.75 45.65 25.20	\$ 51.04 12.14 31.02 .15 85.71 - 2.07 17.81 56.36 20.82	\$ \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
Total		338.91	277.12	378.18
Size of Family (man equivalent)		म • मेम	4.58	4.30

97914T

74. 722

7.62,50

e en

T'C O

07050

.......

COST AND RITURNS FOR CATTLE (Par 100 pounds gain in weight)

	Average	High	Lov	Group*	Group B	Group C
No. of Farms	22	_		7	11	<u> </u>
Pounds Produced	20,089	66,020	9,105	32,297	14,722	17.645
Min Labor, hours	14 🖔	26 1	32	12 3	$19\frac{1}{6}$	10
Horse Labor, hours	$1\frac{1}{2}$	3 <u>\$</u>	3 ² / ₄	12 <u>3</u> 1 <u>3</u>	1 🖫	1
Costs						
Total Labor	\$ 4.58	\$12,20	\$ 1.26	\$ 3.99	\$ 5.99	\$ 3,12
Total Feed	11.04	16.59	7.36	11.25	12.02	9.38
Shelter	.86	2,41	.34	.64	.95	.7€
Ecuipment	.14	.27	.05	.12	.16	.13
Interest	1.18	1.91	. 55	1.07	1,21	1.11
Cash	.12	.40	-	.13	.11	.07
Total Cost	17.92	31.37	9.92	17,20	20,44	14.51
Credits						
Dairy Products	5.15	14.57	.48	4.52	7.89	2.45
Manure Credit	.82	1.94	.36	.67	1,01	.66
Misc. Cash Credit	.05	,55	-	.04	.01	.11
Total Credit	6.02	16.23	1,11	5,23	8,91	3,22
Net Cost	11.90	18.28	8,81	11.97	11,53	11.29
Value of Cattle	10,81	19.23	5,12	11.83	9.78	12,01
Return over all Cost		8.78	-10.62	14	- 1.75	. 72
Return per Hour	\$.23	\$ 1.32	None	\$.29	\$.21	\$.37
Return per 100 lbs of Farm Grain Fed	1.08	3.77	Mana	1 26	1,03	1.35
Return over Feed Cost	4.92	18.15	None None	1,25 5,10		7.00 5.8
neturn over reed Cost	4.78	15,15	None	5,10	5,64	
Feeds Fed						
Corn	: 318	723	89	369	319	285
Small Grain	171	301	27	167	207	1 44
Commercial Feeds	3	13	-	5	2	2
Oilmeal	4	. 36	- `	8	1	6
Hay and Fodder	431	948	86	382	499	
Silage	551	1107	-	346	199	-
Pasture Days	41	72 <u>1</u>	3	31	51	42

^{*}Group A - Farms having purchases of cattle in excess of \$850.

Group B - Farms on which dairy products furnished over 35% of the total income from cattle.

Group C - Farms which raised their feeders and on which dairy products furnished less than 35% of the total income from cattle.

Cost and Returns per 100 Pounds Kogs Produced

	Average	<u> Figh</u>	Low
Number of farms	22	•	
Pounds of hogs produced	29,029	99,753	5,795
Man labor, hours	2 3	44	1
Horse work, hours	2 <u>34</u>	44	-
Costs			
Food	\$7.07	\$17.02	\$4.12
Total labor	.87	1.43	.30
Shelter	.24	. 14	.03
Equipment	.09	.33	_
Interest @ 5%	,31	.64	
Misc, cash expense	, 28	.67	.01
Total costs	8.86	19,31	5.52
Manure credit	.09	.40	.01
Net cost	8.77	19,18	5.31
Value of product	9.31	10.78	7.11
Return over all costs	.54	4.68	-12.07
Return over feed cost	2, 24	5.84	none
Return per hour man labor	.50	3.42	
Return per 100 pounds of farm grain	1.45	2.91	none
Feeds			
Corn	446	1152	239
Small grain	104	267	23
Commercial feed	4	19	
Tankoge	5	16	· _
Skimmilk	35	135	-
Pasture days	21	104	_

COSTS AND RETURNS FER SHEEP*

Man labor, hours Horse labor, hours	Average 2 1	High 42 14	Low
Costs			
Feed Total Labor Shelter Equipment Interest Misc. Cash	\$ 3.49 .66 .21 .26 .50	\$ 5.44 1.41 .48 1.57 .61	\$ 2.14 .11 .02 - .35
Total Expense	5.28	6.99	3,63
Credits			
Manure Misc. Total Credit	.03 .03 .06	.15 .19 15	-
Net Expense	5,22	6.97	3.63
Value of Product			
Sheep Wool	3,22 1,33	9.84 2.75	-2.77 .10
Total Product	4,55	12.59	-2.67
Gain Return over Feed Cost Return per Hour	67 1.07 None	6.84 8.24 6.98	-6.30 None
Feeds		•	
Corn, lbs. Small grain, lbs. Hay and Fodder, lbs. Silage, lbs. Pasture Days	49 37 113 31 245	197 133 350 185 359	15 - 165

^{* - 2} lambs considered equivalent to one sheep.

COSTS AND RETURNS PER 100 CHICKENS.

	Averoge	<u> Hich</u>	Low
No. of farms Size of flock Number of laying hens Man hours Horse hours	22 255 132 166 1 4 2	1436 219 1429 1 16	36 · 27 · 34½
Total feed Man labor Horse work Shelter Equipment Interest Hiscellaneous cash expense Total costs Manure credit Net production cost Product:	\$59.90 49.91 16.85 6.39 3.97 4.49 142.05 3.71 138.34	\$111.38 128.97 2.71 133.33 17.75 6.48 21.47 371.89 9.37 369.81	10.26 1.65 .17 .43 61.26 .39 60.87
Poultry Eggs Total product	45.31 94.33 139.64	189.78 180.05 251.25	-67.11 50.33 11.63
Return over all charges	1.30	130.62	-180.70
Return per hour of man labor	•31	2.01	50
FEEDS Small grain Commercial feeds Skirmilk Eggs per hen	3547 395 436	7811 1498 2607 122	15 ¹ 41 - - ¹ 43
Selling price of eggs	\$.28	\$- 37	\$.22 ¹ 2

Cost of Horse Labor per Work Horse

	Anerage	High	Low
Man labor, hours	51	$93\frac{1}{4}$	5
Costs	·		
Man labor Total feed Shelter Equipment Interest Cash Depreciation	\$17.36 63.77 6.77 6.02 5.17 ,59	\$27.96 84.83 22.91 12.85 7.86 2.52 41.75	\$11.30 38.59 2.04 1.58 2.77 .02 .89
Total Cost	109,92	156.58	81.36
Credits			
Miscellaneous Manure	,02 5,62	11.02 9.37	1,17
Total Credit	5,64	18,45	1,17
Net cost Hours worked Cost per hour	104.28 916 \$.114	150.90 1173 \$.168	76.28 622 1 ♀.091
Feeds			
Hay, lbs. Grain, lbs. Pasture, days	3487 3682 132	8376 9227 190	2146

Cost per Acre of Producing Corn

	Average	High	Low
No. of farms	24		
Acres per farm	96	184	14
Man labor, hours	13을	21	8 3
Horse work, hours	40 1	55	$24\frac{3}{4}$
Tractor use, hours	12	$3\frac{3}{4}$	***
Labor cost	\$9.4 5	\$12.99	\$7.08
Seed	.42	.74	.19
Husker	.37	.70	_
Manure	1.75	7.38	.37
Machinery	.95	.95	.95
Land	6,00	6.00	6.00
Total cost Credit	\$18.94	\$28.06	\$16.76
Net cost	.99 17.95	1.00 27.06	.63
Yield, bu.	38	$\frac{27.06}{46\frac{1}{3}}$	15.76 29 1
Cost per bu.	\$.47	\$.92	\$.3 6
Dec. 1 price	.56	.58	.54
Crop value at Dec. 1 price	21.28	26.97	
Net return	3,33	8,98	-11.15
Return per hour of man labor	.54	1.06	none
Cost per Acre of Produ	cing Flax		
No. of farms	8		
Acres per farm	28	57	7
Man labor hours	8	10 -3	$6\frac{1}{4}$
Horse work, hours	23	34½	154
Labor cost	\$5.16	\$7.17	\$3.75
Good.		n · • —	
Seed	2.21	3.75	1.04
Twine	2.21 .22	**	1.04
Twine Threshing	2.21 .22 1.64	3.75 .52 2.29	1.04
Twine Threshing Manure	2.21 .22 1.64 .77	3.75 .52 2.29 1.89	1.04
Twine Threshing Manure Machine	2.21 .22 1.64 .77	3.75 .52 2.29 1.89 1.30	1.04 1.19 .12 .95
Twine Threshing Manure Machine Land	2.21 .22 1.64 .77 .99 6.00	3.75 .52 2.29 1.89 1.30 6.00	1.04 1.19 .12 .95 6.00
Twine Threshing Manure Machine Land Net cost	2.21 .22 1.64 .77 .99 <u>6,00</u> \$16.99	3.75 .52 2.29 1.89 1.30 6.00 \$20.90	1.04 1.19 .12 .95 6.00 13.96
Twine Threshing Manure Machine Land Net cost Yield, bu.	2.21 .22 1.64 .77 .99 <u>6.00</u> \$16.99	3.75 .52 2.29 1.89 1.30 6.00 \$20.90	1.04 - 1.19 .12 .95 6.00 13.96
Twine Threshing Manure Machine Land Net cost Yield, bu. Cost per bu.	2.21 .22 1.64 .77 .99 6,00 \$16.99 11.4 \$1.50	3.75 .52 2.29 1.89 1.30 6.00 \$20.90 163 \$3,32	1.04 1.19 .12 .95 6.00 13.96 6
Twine Threshing Manure Machine Land Net cost Yield, bu.	2.21 .22 1.64 .77 .99 <u>6.00</u> \$16.99	3.75 .52 2.29 1.89 1.30 6.00 \$20.90	1.04 - 1.19 .12 .95 6.00 13.96
Twine Threshing Manure Machine Land Net cost Yield, bu. Cost per bu. December 1 price	2.21 .22 1.64 .77 .99 <u>6,00</u> \$16.99 11\frac{1}{4} \$1.50 2.83	3.75 .52 2.29 1.89 1.30 6.00 \$20.90 16\frac{1}{3} \$3.32 2.83	1.04 1.19 .12 .95 6.00 13.96 6 \$1.03 2.83

Cost per Acre of Producing Oats

		<u>Average</u>	High	Low
No. of farms Acres per farm		22 65	167	16
Actes per farm	. :	C D	101	10
Man labor, hours	•	71	11 5	4 1
Horse labor, hours		15毫/_	23	9
Tractor use, hours		1/5	$1\frac{1}{4}$	-
Labor cost		\$4.12	\$5.50	\$2,82
Seed		1.58	ຶ2,03	1,19
Twine		.34	.49	, 23
Threshing		1.21	1,83	J.00
Manure		.89	1,98	.12
Machinery		, 95	.95	.95
Land thorge		6.00	6.00	6.00
Total Cost		\$15.09	\$17.46	\$13.29
Yield, bu.		50毫	7 3	ੁੱ 38 ਨ ੂੰ
Cost per bu.		\$.29	\$.4 2	\$.22
December 1 price		.36	,36	.35
Crop value at Dec. 1 price .		18,27	27,40	13.91
Net return	* *	3,34	10.31	-2.25
Return per hour of man labor	• • •	.76	1.87	.04

Cost per Acre of Producing Barley

	•			
•		Average	<u>High</u>	Low
No. of farms Acres per farm		16 30	74	8
Man labor, hours Horse work, hours Tractor use, hours		6 <u>3</u> 15 -	12 22	5 † 1 8 2 -
Labor cost Seed Twine Threshing Manure Machinery		\$3,89 1,49 .36 .99 .96	\$6.02 1.86 .57 1.31 2.59	\$3.07 .89 .17 .64 -
Land charge Total Cost Yield, bushels Cost per bu. December 1 price Crop value at Dec. 1 price	. *	\$.45 .49	6.00 \$18.71 47\frac{1}{4} \$.99 - 23.18	6.00 \$13.15 15\$ \$.31 - 7.62
Net return Return per hour of man labor		7.16 .47	14.68 1.43	-1.85 59

Cost per Acre of Alfalfa

	Averege	High	Low
No. of farms	17		
Acres per farm	13	34	3
Man labor, hours	10 🚰	18 1	<u>3</u> 0
Horse work, hours	16 1		8 <u>월</u> 10 <u>월</u>
Tractor work, hours	•08	$28\frac{1}{4}$	-
11 33 tol World	•00	4	
Labor cost	\$5.31	\$8.08	\$4.19
Seed	1.00	1.00	1.00
Manure and fertilizer	2.16	7.26	.45
Machine	1,63	2.00	1.50
Land charge	<u>6,00</u>	6.00	6.00
Total cost	\$16,10	\$21.91	\$13,62
Credit	. 1.4	1.29	-
Net cost	15.96	21.91	12,95
Yield, tons	2,0	3.9	.9
Cost per ton	\$7.98	\$16.14	\$4.41
Cost per Acre of Wil	d Hay		
No of forms	15		
No. of farms Acres per farm	15 22	44	4
Acres per larm	e.e.	77	7
Man labor, hours	51	9	31
Horse work, hours	8 \$	$13\frac{1}{4}$	5 3
Labor cost	\$2.62	\$4.85	}1.68
Machine cost	Ψ ε.θε , 9 0	1.10	.85
Land charge	5.00	5.00	.00
Total cost	\$8.51	\$10.70	\$7.53
Credit	.02	.37	a - 1 - 2 -
Net cost	8.49	10.70	7.53
Yield, tons	1.00	1.7	. 7
Cost per ton	\$8.49	\$12.90	\$5.48
-	11 -		••

Cost per Acre of Producing Corn Fodder

	Average	<u> High</u>	Low
No. of farms Acre per farm	12 8	15	3
Man labor, hours Horse work, hours Tractor use, hours	13½ 30 ½	19 1/3 42 1/2 3	10 18
Total labor cost Seed Twine Manure Machine Land Total cost Credit Net cost Yield, tons Cost per ton	\$7.93 1.01 .63 1.58 1.65 6.00 \$18.80 - 18.80 3.3 5.70	\$11.64 1.85 .94 2.79 1.65 6.00 \$21.75 - 21.75 5.0 9.04	1.65 6.00 \$16.74 2.1 4.24
	Cost per Acre of Producing Corn Silage		
No. of forms Acres per form	8 16	32	7
Man labor, hours Horse work, hours Tractor use, hours	21 2 48 1 1 1	25 <u>1</u> 59 <u>1</u> 3 <u>1</u>	17] 36] -
Total labor cost Seed Twine Manure Silo filling Machine Land Total cost Credit	\$13.39 .71 .48 3.10 2.53 1.56 6.00 \$27.77	\$15.27 1.04 1.13 7.31 4.16 1.65 6.00 \$34.31 3.58	\$11.51 .51 .45 1.09 .95 6.00 \$22.82