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SOURCE OF DATA

## Method of Study

The Division of Ferm Manapement and Aricultural Eonomics and of Animal Husbandry of the University of ?innesota are cooperating with the Bureau of Agricultural Bconomics of the United States Department of joriculture in an accounting study of twenty-four farms in Rock and Nobles Counties in Southwestern Minnesota. This study was started Iarch $1,1929$. 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 checker. at least twice a month by the route man and supplemented with inventories, livestock feed records, reports of crop yields and practices and other simificant 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 cach 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 livestock production and other significant facts will be presented in later reports as the information becomes available.

## Descrigtion of Area

Pock and Irbles Counties are located in the southwestern corner of rinnesota. 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. Accorine 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 lareely to their noanaess to the Twin Sities, Both counties are level to gently rolling vith prectically all land tillable. There are some sections, especially is southem Vobles

County that need drainage to insure regular cropping and in Rock County there are limited areas of rock out-crop. The annual rainfall avernpes 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 althoufh there is a considerable surplus for sale on many farms, Alfalfa and wildhay are the principal roughages eromn.

Description of Farms
The average size of the farms studied was 323 acres. This is approximately $55 \%$ larger than the average size of farms in these two counties. The larger farms are vetter adapted to beef production. Tvo hundrec. 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.

Onlr four of the farms studied are owned by the operators. Eight are rented and of the remaining 12 the operator owns part of the land and rents the balance. Thirty-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.

MWIHODS OF COMPUTING AND FRESENTING DATA.

## Factors of Cost

Comparative costs and returns for the eight principal crops grovn 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 wages to hired men on these farms and includes an allovance for board, Horse work is charged at 12 cents per hour, 2 -plow tractors at 75 cents per hour and 3-plow tractors at 费l.00 per hour. Manure is charged at 75 cents per ton plus the cost of bauling. Fifty per cent of this is charged against the crop to which the manure is applied and the balance prorated to the other crops in the rotation on an acre basis. Machiner is charsed 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 compting the returns from the varicus 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 available. 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.

## Methods of Presentation

The costs are shown both on/ecre ard a bushel or ton basis. 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 the return per hour the farmer received for the labor used on the crop. Tre net return is the gain or loss left after subtractine from the value of the crop the items of cost thet are presented. The return for the land is the anount of rent earned over and above the other cost items. The return for labor is the amount left to pay the labor after the other costs indicated have been met. A minus figure (-) indicetes a loss.

The costs presented \&re relative rather than absolute costs. Since many of the cost items such as the farmers own labor and the use of his own land and his equipment do not represent actual "out-of-pocket". expense, it is necessary to estimate their velue. Hovever, uniform ratos have been used for all crops so that comperisons may be made betwcen different crops and different farms. l'niform rental rates for land are used for each crop since the varied rentrl aystems and rates on the different farms including cash rented, shore rented, and owned land would tend to obscure these comparisons. All crops have boen credited et uniform prices except as they vary in quality. Some farmers undonbtedly receive higher prices than these nnd others lower. Tre receder in inter-preting these figures must make such adjustments in the retrorns that fit the prices he receives.

TSIIG GROF REOCRDS TO IMMESER CROP ERORITS

## Variations in Cost

The cost of producing each crop on each farm is shown in addition to the everage cost for all farms. This will onable esch cooper tor to compare his costs and retwrns with those of the other producers. It is interasting to note that on the averace the returns from every crop at the

Trole I

| Variations in Production Costs Rock and Nobles Counties - 1929 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crop | Cost per Tnit |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dec.1 } \\ & \text { Price } \end{aligned}$ | \% producing a.t loss |
|  | Averame | High | Low |  |  |
| Corn | \$. 48 | \%.92 | 䓝. 36 | \$. 56 | 25 |
| Oats | . 29 | . 42 | . 22 | . 36 | 18 |
| Barley | . 45 | 1.00 | . 31 | . 49 | 31 |
| Flax | 1.68 | 3.32 | 1.03 | 2.83 | 122 |
| Alfalfa | 7.85 | 15.36 | 4.39 | 15.00 | 6 |
| Wild Hay | 7.87 | .12.41 | 5.43 | 9.00 | 33 |

price used is sufficient to cover all the costs listed and lerve some myein of profit. However, in cese of every crop there was some frmer 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 eny werknessos in his cropping plans or methods. It should afford suecestions for shifts or economies in production.

There are in general two.weys 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 crops or kinds of livestock or combinations of the two thet bring in the largest returns.

One of the most important factors in reducing the cost per bushel 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 and Nobles Counties - 1929

| Yield per Acre | Number Ferms | fverage Yield | Net Cest per Acre | Cost per Bushel | Fsturn per Hr.Man Labor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 36 bu. | 8 | 32 | 19.15 | .60 | - 22 |
| 36-41 bu, | 9 | 39 | 18. 28 | . 47 | . 62 |
| Over 41 ba. | 7 | 45 | 17.37 | . 39 | . 91 |

In Teble II is presented grouping of the farms accordine to the yield of corn. The higher the yield the lower is the cost per bushel. Although the production on the higher vielding farms is only $41 \%$ above the 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 ase of the low group.

Toble III
Effect of Yiela per Acre on Cost and Returns for Alfalfa Fock and Nobles Counties - 1929

| Yield per Acre | Number <br> Farms | Average <br> Yield | Net Cost <br> per Acre | Cost per <br> Ton | Return per Man Labor |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under $1 \frac{1}{3}$ tons | 4 | 1.2 | 14.90 | 12.88 | .57 |  |
| $1 \frac{1}{2}-2 \frac{1}{4}$ | $*$ | 7 | 1.9 | 14.90 | 7.84 | 1.68 |
| Over $2 \frac{1}{4}$ | $*$ | 6 | 2.8 | 17.18 | 6.14 | 2.17 |

The advantage of high yields of alfalfa is shown in Table III. The high yields may cost slichtly more per acre bat the returns are more than proportionately greater. The same advantage of high yields is true of the other crops. It is impossible in this preliminary report to analyze all the causes for the difference in yield and costs. In some cases it is due to quality of soil. In other it may be due to kind or quality of seed, cultural methods, and other factors directly within the farmers control. These factors will be analyzed in later reports but each farmer is urged to compare his own fipures with the others reported in order to locate any weakness in his own production methods.

## 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 ferms in 1929 and the average yield on all farms 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 IV

Comparison of Yields on Farms Studied and Prices Used with 10-year Averages


All yields on these farms in 1929 are higher than the lo-year county averages. Since these farms maintain considerable livestock, the yields would prooably 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 oats exceeded the average by $46 \%$. The high return for oats mast 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. Since 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 county yields and 10 -year average state prices. These data are shown in Table V. Apparently corn is the most profitable of the feed grains in the long run with barley second. The high yield in 1929 gives oats a special advantare for the one year. Flax appears a remunerativa crop for this section on the basis of the ten year figure.

Table $V$
Comparison between 1929 Crop Costs and Returns and 10-year County Average

|  | Corn | Oats | Barley | Flax |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost per bushel: |  |  |  |  |
| 1929 | 虫. 48 | \$. 29 | \$.45 | 雱1.58 |
| 10-year average | . 54 | . 42 | . 52 | 1.61 |
| Net return per acre: |  |  |  |  |
| 1929 | 3.25 | 3.40 | 1.43 | 13.43 |
| 10-year average | 1.75 | -2.40 | . 11 | 5.21 |
| Return per hour man labor: |  |  |  |  |
| 1929 | . 53 | . 77 | . 50 | 1.98 |
| 10-year average | .38 | none | . 32 | .78 |

## Loss

Hay, corn fodder, and silafe all show favorable returns, foughages, however, vary widely in quality from farm to farm 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 $a$ ton of alfalfa than it did a ton of wild hay. Since alfalfa has a much higher feeding value than wild hoy, it would not seem worth while to keep the letter in the cropping system except on land too wet or otherwise unfit for cultivation. The abundence of lime in the soil in these counties adepts them well for alfalfa production.

## Planning for the Future

The deta in this report shovld prove useful in planning the cropping system for 1930 if one keeps in mind the comparisons on the basis of lo-year severage yields and prices and of prospects for the coming year. Since these sre livestock farms feed crops must be given first place. Corn and alfalfa hny seem to deserve the most consideration. There must be small grain to belence up the cropping system, The relative prices of corn and barley will probably be about the same as in 1929 but if there is any change in oat prices they will be relatively lower. Hence it would seem wise to substitute as mach barley as possible for oats as a small grain crop, especially if it is grown for sale, Flax offers the best possibility os a cash crop. Because of our high triff on flox and our heavy imports, flax growers are reasonably sure of a price in 1930 that will insure frir prcfits wherever average yields can be obtained. Alfalfa promises the most economicel roughege.

These crop cost stvdies will be continued thru 1930 end 1931. Averages secured from the farms cooperating in this study will furnish a better basis for planning the cropping systems for these forms then do county averaes. It is therefore especially important to those frrmers who have kept records in 1929 to continue the work thru the next two yecrs in order to work out cropping systems best edapted 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 not only for these forms but for other forms of similer type in this section of the stnte. Definite records of what hes been done in the past coupled with the best informetion aveilable as to probable trends of production and prices serve as the safest basis for planning profitsble ferming systems for the future.

Table VI
Comparative Costs and Returns per Acre on Principal Crops Rock and Nobles Counties, Minnesota - 1929

|  | Corn | Oats | Berley | Flax | Alfalfa | Wild <br> Hay | Corn Fodder | Corn Silage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of Farms | 24 | 22 | 16 | 8 | 17 | 15 | 12 | 8 |
| Avg. Acres per Farm | 96 | 64 | 30 | 28 | 13 | 22 | 8 | 16 |
| Man Hours | 14 | $7 \frac{1}{4}$ | $7 \frac{1}{4}$ | 8 | 11 $\frac{1}{8}$ | $5{ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 13 $\frac{3}{1}$ | $21 \frac{1}{4}$ |
| Horse Hours | 41 | 15 | 16 $\frac{1}{4}$ | 23 | 172 | -9妾 | $30 \frac{3}{4}$ | $49 \frac{1}{4}$ |
| Tractor Hours | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 4 | - | - | - | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\underline{4}$ |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man Labor | \$4.20 | \$2. 18 | \$2.18 | \$2.40 | \$3.45 | \$1.65 | \$3.69 | \$6.38 |
| Horse \& Tractor Work | 5.42 | 1.94 | 1.95 | 2.76 | 2.10 | 1. 14 | 4.54 | 6.75 |
| Seed | . 44 | 1.61 | 1.47 | 2. 21 | 1.00 | - | . 98 | . 69 |
| Twine | - | . 34 | . 34 | . 22 | - | - | . 65 | . 51 |
| Threshing | *. 35 | 1.27 | 1.03 | 1,64 | - | - | - | **2.52 |
| Mamure \& Fertilizer | 1.93 | . 90 | . 94 | . 77 | 1.66 | - | 1.57 | 2.15 |
| 1achine Charge | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | . 99 | 1.62 | . 89 | 1.65 | 1.56 |
| OPERATING COSTS | 13.29 | 9.19 | 8.86 | 10.99 | 9.83 | 3.68 | 13.08 | 20.56 |
| land Oharge | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6,00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 5.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 |
| Total costs | 19.29 | 15.19 | 14.86 | 16.99 | 15.83 | 8.68 | 19.08 | 26.56 |
| Credit | . 98 | . 14 | - | - | . 14 | . 02 | - | 1.00 |
| NET COST | 18,31 | 15.05 | 14.86 | 16.99 | 15.67 | 8.66 | 19.08 | 25.56 |
| YIELD - Grain bu. Roughoge, tons | 38- | $51 \frac{1}{4}$ | $33 \frac{1}{4}$ | 10 $\frac{5}{4}$ | - 2 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 7.3 |
| COST PER UNIT | \$. 48 | \$. 29 | \$. 45 | \$1.58 | \$7.85 | \$7.87 | 费5.96 | 83.50 |
| December 1 Pri e | . 56 | . 36 | . 49 | 2.83 | 15.00 | 9.00 | 10.00 | 5.00 |
| Grop Value | 21.56 | 18.45 | 16.29 | 30.42 | 30.00 | 9.90 | 32.00 | 36.50 |
| NET RETVIRN | 3.25 | 3.40 | 1.43 | 13.43 | 14.31 | 1.24 | 12,92 | 10.94 |
| REvHET FOT Likn | 9.25 | 9.40 | 7.43 | 19.43 | 20.31 | 6.24 | 18.92 | 16.94 |
| RETURN PER PAN HCUR | . 53 | .77 | . 50 | 1.98 | 1.55 | . 53 | 1.24 | . 81 |

*Corn Picker
**Silo Filling Machinery

Cost per Acre of Producing Corn - Rock and Nobles Counties - 1929

| Farm | Hours of Work |  |  | Cost |  |  |  |  |  | Total Cost | Credit | ITet Cost | Yield <br> bu. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cost } \\ & \text { ner } \\ & \text { bu. } \end{aligned}$ | Net Return | Retrorn ner Four |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Man | Horse | Tractor | Labor | Seed | Manure | Picker | Machine | Land |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 107 | $11 \frac{3}{4}$ | 38 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | \$9.88 | \$. 46 | \$.82 | \$.70 | \$.95 | \$6.00 | \$17.31 | \$1.00 | \$16.31 | **45 | \$.36 | \$14.89 | \$1.06 |  |
| 401 | $14 \frac{1}{6}$ | 39 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 9.38 | . 44 | 2.53 | - | . 95 | 6.00 | 19.30 | 1.00 | 18.30 | *49 ${ }^{2}$ | . 37 | 15.41 | 1.08 |  |
| 213 | 113 | $42 \frac{1}{4}$ | - | 8.64 | . 19 | 1.74 | . 70 | . 95 | 6.00 | 18.22 | 1.00 | 17.22 | *45 | . 38 | 14.88 | 1.06 |  |
| 201 | $14 \frac{3}{4}$ | $36 \frac{1}{2}$ | - | 8.80 | . 33 | 2.27 | - | . 95 | 6.00 | 18.35 | 1.00 | 17.35 | **44 $\frac{1}{2}$ | . 39 | 13.57 | . 81 |  |
| 113 | 14 | $40 \frac{1}{2}$ | - | 9.04 | . 39 | 1.69 | - | . 95 | 6.00 | 18.07 | 1.00 | 17.07 | *43 | . 40 | 12.87 | .79 |  |
| 302 | $8 \frac{3}{4}$ | 37 | - | 7.08 | . 50 | 1.53 | . 70 | . 95 | 6.00 | 16.76 | 1.00 | 15.76 | **39 | . 40 | 12.08 | . 99 |  |
| 402 | $10 \frac{1}{4}$ | $44 \frac{7}{7}$ | - | 8.42 | . 42 | . 37 | . 70 | . 95 | 6.00 | 16.86 | 1.00 | 15.86* | **38 | . 42 | 10.66 | .75 |  |
| 116 | $11 \frac{3}{4}$ | 46 | - | 9.09 | . 33 | 1.55 | . 70 | . 95 | 6.00 | 18.62 | 1.00 | 17.62* | **41 | . 43 | 10.52 | . 68 |  |
| 119 | $10 \frac{1}{4}$ | $42 \frac{1}{1}$ |  | 8.17 | . 45 | 1.51 | . 70 | . 95 | 6.00 | 17.18 | 1.00 | 16.78 | *382 | . 44 | 11.55 | . 84 |  |
| 106 | 14. | $27 \frac{1}{4}$ | $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ | 10.41 | . 50 | 1.10 | .70 | . 95 | 6.00 | 19.66 | 1.00 | 18.66 | **42 | . 44 | 11.00 | . 65 |  |
| 212 | 12\% | 273 | 13 | 8.70 | . 35 | 1.87 | - | . 95 | 6.00 | 17.87 | 1.00 | 16.87 | **37 ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | . 45 | 11.13 | . 72 |  |
| 112 | 153 | 46 | ${ }^{-}$ | 10.27 | . 41 | 1.60 | - | . 95 | 6.00 | 19.43 | 1.00 | 18.43 | ** 41 | .45 | 10.53 | . 59 | - |
| 202 | $18 \frac{1}{2}$ | $47 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 12.03 | . 45 | . 59 | - | . 95 | 6.00 | 20.02 | 1.00 | 19.02 | **39 | . 49 | 8.82 | . 45 | 1 |
| 319 | $10 \frac{3}{4}$ | 38 | 1 | 8.78 | . 42 | 1.10 | . 70 | . 95 | 6.00 | 17.95 | 1.00 | 16.95 | **32 | . 53 | 6.97 | . 39 |  |
| 219 | 12 | $24 \frac{3}{4}$ | 21 | 8.46 | $\cdot 45$ | 3.01 | . 70 | . 95 | 6.00 | 19.57 | 1.00 | 18.57 | **35 | . 53 | 7.03 | . 39 |  |
| 111 | $12 \frac{3}{4}$ | 41 | $\frac{1}{3}$ | 9.07 | .50 | 1.01 | - | . 95 | 6.00 | 17.53 | 1.00 | 16.53* | **31 ${ }^{\frac{1}{4}}$ | . 53 | 6.35 | . 33 |  |
| 419 | $12 \frac{1}{4}$ | 423 | $\frac{9}{2}$ | 9.05 | . 46 | 2.74 | . 70 | . 95 | 6.00 | 19.90 | 1.00 | 18.90 | **:3年 | . 56 | 5.86 | . 29 |  |
| 118 | $19 \frac{1}{4}$ | $46 \frac{1}{4}$ | - | 11.31 | . 40 | 2.01 | - | . 95 | 6.00 | 20.67 | 1.00 | 19.67 | **34 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | . 57 | 5.65 | . 28 |  |
| 301 | $13^{\frac{3}{4}}$ | $43 \frac{3}{4}$ | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 9.75 | .37 | . 86 | . 70 | . 95 | 5.00 | 18.63 | 1.00 | 17.63* | **30 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | . 58 | 4.84 | . 22 |  |
| 105 | 21 | 54 | - | 12.74 | . 51 | 3.38 | - | . 95 | 6.00 | 23.58 | 1.00 | 22.58 | *392 | . 58 | 6.19 | . 31 |  |
| 12\% | $12 \frac{3}{4}$ | $39 \frac{1}{4}$ | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 8.67 | . 30 | 1.79 | - | . 95 | 6.00 | 17.71 | 1.00 | 16.71 | **29 | . 58 | 5.46 | . 26 |  |
| 312 | 15 | 55 | - | 11.12 | . 62 | 3.21 | . 70 | . 95 | 6.00 | 22.60 | 1.00 | 21.60 | **377 | . 58 | 5.40 | . 26 |  |
| 102 | $16{ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | $47 \frac{1}{4}$ | - | 10.63 | . 47 | . 51 | - | . 95 | 6.00 | 18.56 | . 63 | 17.93 | **30 | . 60 | 4.87 | . 23 |  |
| 101. | $20 \frac{1}{4}$ | 36 | 31 | 12.99 | . 74 | 7.38 | - | . 95 | 6.00 | 28.06 | 1.00 | 27.06* | **29롤 | . 92 | -5.13 | none |  |
| A209\%: | -4. | 41. | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 9.62 | . 44 | 1.93 | . 35 | . 95 | 6.00 | 19.29 | . 98 | 18.31 | $37 \frac{3}{1}$ | . 49 | 8.83 | . 50 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Decse. } \\ & * \quad \text { Gr } \\ & * * \\ & * * \end{aligned}$ | cr 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pricc: } \\ & 4-58 \phi \\ & 5-56 \phi \\ & 6-54 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { per bu. } \\ " \# \\ " \\ " \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cost per Acre of Producing Oats - Rock \& Norles Counties - 1929

| Earm Hours of Tork - |  |  |  | Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  | potal |  | Net <br> Cost | Yield bu. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cost } \\ & \text { ner } \\ & \text { hu. } \end{aligned}$ | Net Return | Return ner पour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Man | Porse | Tractor | Lahor | Seed | Twine | Itreshing | Manure | Machine | Land | cost | Credit |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 219 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ | $13^{3}$ | $\frac{1}{4}$ | \$3,82 | \$1.92 | \$.44 | \$1.83 | \$1.26 | \$. 95 | \$6.00 | 糔6.22 | , | \$16.22 | 73 | \$. 22 | $\$ 16.06$ | \$1.85 |  |
| 105 | 112 | 17 | - | 5.50 | 1.19 | . 43 | 1.83 | 1.19 | . 95 | 6.00 | 17.09 | - | 17.09 | 76 | . 22 | 16.27 | 1.19 |  |
| 401 | 7 | 172 | - | 4.37 | 1.23 | . 49 | 1.30 | 1.22 | . 95 | 6.00 | 15.56 | 1.42 | 14.14 | 59 | . 24 | 13.10 | 1.25 |  |
| 119 | $7{ }^{7}$ | $18 \frac{1}{4}$ | - | 4.54 | 1.32 | . 43 | 1.37 | . 58 | . 95 | 6.00 | 15,19 | - | 15.19 | $58 \frac{1}{4}$ | . 26 | 11.78 | 1.05 |  |
| 213 | $6 \frac{1}{4}$ | $9 \frac{3}{4}$ | $\cdots$ | 3.06 | 1.36 | . 23 | 1.39 | . 65 | .95 | 6.00 | 13.64 | . 65 | 12.99 | 49 | . 27 | 10.65 | 1.04 |  |
| 106 | 7 7 | $10 \frac{1}{4}$ | $1 \frac{1}{4}$ | 4.41 | 1.60 | .30 | 1.29 | . 45 | .95 | 6.00 | 15.00 | - | 15.00 | $56 \frac{1}{6}$ | . 27 | 11.25 | 1.00 |  |
| 402 | $5 \frac{3}{4}$ | $16 \frac{1}{4}$ | - | 3.69 | 1.54 | . 28 | 1.21 | . 12 | .95 | 6,00 | 13.79 | - | 13.79 | $51 \frac{1}{2}$ | . 27 | 10.75 | 1.13 |  |
| 403 | 5 | 17 | - | 3.53 | 1.43 | .30 | 1.09 | . 58 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.88 | - | 13.86 | $51 \frac{3}{4}$ | . 27 | 10.75 | 1.25 |  |
| 102 | $6 \frac{1}{4}$ | $13 \frac{3}{4}$ | - | 3.56 | 1.69 | .31 | 1.28 | . 45 | . 95 | 6.00 | 14.24 | ... | 14,24 | 53 | .27 | 10,84 | 1.07 |  |
| 123 | $7 \frac{1}{2}$ | 154 | - | 4.14 | 1.57 | . 48 | 1.41 | . 81 | . 95 | 6.00 | 15.36 | - | 15.36 | $56 \frac{1}{4}$ | . 27 | 10.89 | . 95 |  |
| 113 | 6 | 17 | - | 3.88 | 1.96 | . 32 | 1.30 | 1.33 | .95 | 6.00 | 15,34 | - | 15.34 | 55 | . 28 | 10.46 | 1.04 |  |
| 107 | $8 \frac{3}{4}$ | $16 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 5.25 | 2.03 | , 32 | 1.50 | ${ }^{.84}$ | . 95 | 6.00 | 16.89 | - | 16.89 | $56^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | .30 | 9.36 | . 68 | 1 |
| 319 | $6{ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | $14 \frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 3:93 | 1.44 | . 40 | 1.26 | . 55 | . 95 | 6.00 | 14.53 | - | 14.53 | $47 \frac{1}{4}$ | .31 | 8.48 | . 68 | 0 |
| 118 | $8 \frac{3}{4}$ | $10^{3}$ | $\cdots$ | 4.90 | 1,58 | . 30 | 1.00 | . 62 | . 95 | 6,00 | 15.35 | . 11 | 15.34 | 49 | . 31 | 8.40 | .57 |  |
| 419 | 8 | $17 \frac{1}{5}$ | - | 4.44 | 1.71 | .45 | 1.19 | 1.18 | . 95 | 6.00 | 15.92 | .79 | 15.13 | $47 \frac{3}{4}$ | . 32 | 8.06 | . 56 |  |
| 111 | 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ | 11年 | - | 2.82 | 1.57 | . 28 | 1.00 | .67 | .95 | 6.00 | 13.29 | - | 13.29 | 40 | . 33 | 7.11 | .55 |  |
| 201 | $4 \frac{3}{4}$ | 12 | - | 2.86 | 1.81 | . 24 | 1.12 | 1.03 | . 95 | 6.00 | 14.01 | - | 14.01 | 42 | . 33 | 7.11 | .47 |  |
| 202 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ | 9 | $1 \frac{1}{4}$ | 3.91 | 1.59 | .28 | 1.24 | 1.17 | . 95 | 6.00 | 15.14 | - | 15.14 | 437 | .35 | 6.43 | .37 |  |
| 312 | $9 \frac{1}{4}$ | 23 | $\cdots$ | 5.49 | 1.59 | . 38 | 1.07 | 1.98 | . 95 | 6.00 | 17.46 | - | 17.46 | $48 \frac{1}{4}$ | . 36 | 5.91 | . 29 |  |
| 301 | $7{ }^{7}$ | 12.2 | - | 3.74 | 1.93 | . 28 | 1.05 | . 47 | . 95 | 6.00 | 14.42 | - | 14.42 | 391 | .37 | 5.80 | .27 |  |
| 116 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ | $18^{\frac{1}{4}}$ | - | 4.12 | 1.78 | .30 | 1.14 | 1.43 | . 95 | 6.00 | 15.72 | - | 15.72 | $39 \frac{1}{2}$ | . 40 | 4. 50 | . 07 |  |
| 112 | $8 \frac{3}{4}$ | 1.7 | - | 4.66 | 1.72 | .34 | 1.15 | 1.34 | . 95 | 6.00 | 16.16 | - | 16.16 | 38- | . 42 | 3.70 | . 04 |  |
| Avg. <br> 1422 <br> Acre | ${ }^{2 \frac{1}{4}}$ | 15 | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 4.12 | 1.61 | . 34 | 1.27 | .90 | .95 | 6.00 | 15.19 | .14 | 15.05 | $51 \frac{1}{4}$ | .29 | 9.40 | .77 |  |

Price December 1, 1929-366 per bushel.

Cost por Acie of Producing Barley - Roci Min Mobles Counties - 1929


Price Decamber 1, 1929-49ф ner bushel.

Cost per acre of Producing Flax - Rock ancinote Countios - 1929

| Firm Hodes of Tors |  |  | Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  | Net Cost | Yicld <br> bu. | $\begin{aligned} & \cos t \\ & \text { Der bu. } \end{aligned}$ | Net Feturn | Reterm Der Fowr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Labor | Seed | Twine | Threshicis | Lanure | Machinc | Land |  |  |  |  |  |
| 113 | $7 \frac{1}{4}$ | $20 \frac{3}{4}$ | \$4,70 | 82.33 | -6 | \$2.29 | \%.69 | \$. 95 | \$6.00 | \$16.96 | $16^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 1.03 | \%35.74 | \$4.40 |
| 111 | $6 \frac{3}{4}$ | $1+\frac{1}{2}$ | 3.94 | 1.34 | .06 | 1.24 | . 43 | . 95 | 6.00 | 13.96 | $10 \frac{1}{1}$ | 1.36 | 21.05 | 2.71 |
| 40.1 | 8 | $22 \frac{3}{4}$ | 5.09 | 2.46 | - | 1.90 | 1.22 | . 95 | 6.00 | 17.62 | 122 | 1.41 | 23.76 | 2.52 |
| 301 | $6 \frac{1}{4}$ | 251 | 3.75 | 2.70 | . 29 | 1.84 | . 47 | . 95 | 6,00 | 16,00 | $11 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1,42 | 21.84 | 2.83 |
| 302 | $7 \frac{1}{4}$ | 18 | 4.29 | 1.04 | . 52 | 1.59 | . 58 | .95 | 6.00 | 14.97 | $9 \frac{1}{6}$ | 1. 62 | 17.21 | 1.85 |
| 312 | 10 | 34, | 7.17 | 2.66 | .43 | 1.80 | 1.89 | . 95 | 6,00 | 20.90 | $12^{\frac{3}{3}}$ | 1.64 | 21.18 | 1.82 |
| 201 | 9 | $23 \frac{1}{3}$ | 5.50 | 1.39 | - | 1.19 | . 77 | . 95 | 6.00 | 15.80 | $7{ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 2.11 | 11.43 | . 90 |
| 402 | $10 \frac{3}{4}$ | $31^{\frac{3}{4}}$ | 7.03 | 3.75 | .47 | 1.27 | . 12 | 1.30 | 6.00 | 19.94 | 6 | 3.32 | 3.04 | .02 |
| Avg. 226 <br> deres | 8 | 23 | 5.16 | 2.21 | . 22 | 1.64 | .77 | . 99 | 6.30 | 16.99 | $10 \frac{3}{4}$ | 1.58 | 19.43 | 1.98 |

Cost per Acre of Producing ilfilfa - Rock \& Wobles Counties - 1929

| Earm NO. | Fours of work |  | Cost |  |  |  |  | Total |  | Net | Yield | Cost | Net | Return |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Man | Forse | Lzbor | Seed | Maniare | Machine | Land | Cost | Credit | Cost | Tons | per Ton | Retur | per Hour |  |
| 218 | 123 | $18 \frac{3}{4}$ | \$6.09 | \% 1.00 | \$2.02 | \$2.00 | \$6.00 | \$17.11 | - | \$17.11 | 3.9 | \$4.39 | \$46,39 | 33.47 |  |
| 111 | $11 \frac{3}{4}$ | $22 \frac{1}{4}$ | 6.16 | 1.00 | . 77 | 2.00 | 6.00 | 15.93 | - | 15.93 | 2.8 | 5.69 | 34.07 | 2.52 |  |
| 105 | $10 \frac{1}{4}$ | $10 \frac{3}{4}$ | 4.39 | 1.00 | 2.59 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 15.48 | . 39 | 15.09 | 2.3 | 6.56 | 25.41 | 2.19 |  |
| 301 | 122 | 21 | 6.28 | 1.00 | . 47 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 15.25 | -- | 15.25 | 2.3 | 6.63 | 25.25 | 1.84 |  |
| 302 | $8 \frac{3}{4}$ | $13^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 4.19 | 1.00 | . 58 | 1.86 | 6.00 | 13.63 | - | 13.63 | 2.0 | 6.81 | 22.37 | 2.17 |  |
| 419 | 9 | 13 | 4.29 | 1.00 | . 92 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 13.71 | - | 13.71 | 2.0 | 6.85 | 22.29 | 2.11 |  |
| 101 | 12 | 197 | 5.94 | 1.00 | 7.26 | 1.71 | 6.00 | 21.91 | - | 21.91 | 3.2 | 6.85 | 22.09 | 1.64 |  |
| 202 | $9 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1612 | 4.81 | 1.00 | 1.08 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 14.39 | - | 14.39 | 2.0 | 7.20 | 21,61 | 1.94 |  |
| 212 | 93 | $15 \frac{3}{4}$ | 4.81 | 1.00 | . 96 | 2.00 | 6.00 | 14.77 | - | 14.77 | 2.0 | 7.39 | 21.23 | 1.86 |  |
| 107 | $11 \frac{1}{3}$ | 14, $\frac{1}{2}$ | 5.17 | 1.00 | .57 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 14.24 | 1.29 | 12.95 | 1.7 | 7.62 | 18.55 | 1.39 |  |
| 401 | 15 $\frac{1}{2}$ | $28 \frac{1}{4}$ | 8.06 | 1.00 | 1.22 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 17.78 | - | 17.78 | 2.3 | 7.73 | 22.72 | 1.38 |  |
| 102 | $10 \frac{3}{4}$ | 18 | 5.36 | 1.00 | 3.55 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 17.41 | . 73 | 16.68 | 2.1 | 7.94 | 20.82 | 1.68 | 1 |
| 106 | 10 | $14 \frac{1}{2}$ | 4.75 | 1.00 | . 45 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 13.70 | - | 13.70 | 1.3 | 10.54 | 11.80 | . 88 | is |
| 118 | 183 | 21 | 8.08 | 1.00 | 1.61 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 18.19 | - | 18.19 | 1.6 | 11.37 | 11.81 | . 61 | , |
| 219 | 9 | $16 \frac{1}{2}$ | 4.66 | 1.00 | 1.64 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 14.80 | - | 14.80 | 1.2 | 12.33 | 9.20 | . 66 |  |
| 319 | 14 | $23_{4}^{3}$ | 7.03 | 1.00 | 1.76 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 17.29 | - | 17.29 | 1.3 | 13.30 | 8.21 | . 46 |  |
| 201 | $8_{4}^{3}$ | 16 | 4.55 | 1.00 | . 77 | 1.50 | 6.00 | 13.82 | - | 13.82 | . 9 | 15.36 | 5.68 | . 26 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Avgo } \\ & 215 \\ & \text { Acres } \end{aligned}$ | 111 | 172 | 5.55 | 1.00 | 1.66 | 1.62 | 6.00 | 15.83 | . 14 | 15.69 | 2.0 | 7.85 | 80.31 | 1.55 |  |

Price Decomber 1, $1929-\$ 15.00$ por ton.

| Fatm | Howns | Of Tork |  | Cost |  | Tot 11 |  | Net | Yield | $\cos t$ | Not | Return |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ho. | Hin | Horse | Lebor | Machine | Lend | Cost | Credit | $\operatorname{Cost}$ | Tena | per Ton | Roturn | mer Peus |
| 312 | 6 | $13 \frac{1}{4}$ | \$3.38 | \$.85 | \$5.00 | \$9.23 | - | \%9.23 | 1.7 | 85.43 | \$11.07 | $\% 1.31$ |
| 402 | $6 \frac{1}{4}$ | - 9 | 2.97 | . 85 | 5.00 | 8.82 | - | 8.82 | 1.5 | 5.88 | 9.68 | 1.05 |
| 302 | $6 \frac{1}{4}$ | $10 \frac{3}{4}$ | 3.17 | . 85 | 5.00 | 9.02 | - | 9.02 | 1.5 | 6.01 | 9.48 | 1.02 |
| 219 | 4 | $6 \frac{3}{4}$ | 2.24 | .85 | 5.00 | 8.09 | . 37 | *7.72 | 1.2 | 6.43 | 8.08 | . 95 |
| 319 | 5 | $10^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | 3.09 | 1.02 | 5.00 | 9.11 | - | 9.11 | 1.2 | 7.59 | 6.69 | . 58 |
| 110 | $b_{4}$ | $8 \frac{1}{2}$ | 2.77 | . 85 | 5.00 | 8.62 | - | 8.62 | 1.1 | 7.84 | 6.28 | . 52 |
| 301 | 4 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1.99 | .85 | 5.00 | 7.84 | - | 7.84 | 1.0 | $7.8 \pm$ | 6.16 | . 59 |
| 213 | $4 \frac{1}{4}$ | $8 \frac{1}{2}$ | 2.27 | .85 | 5.00 | 8.12 | - | 8.12 | 1.0 | 8.12 | 5.88 | .51 |
| 102 | 9 | 18 | 4.85 | . 85 | 5.00 | 10.70 | - | 10.70 | 1.3 | 8.23 | 6.00 | . 41 |
| 105 | $5 \frac{1}{7}$ | $10 \frac{1}{4}$ | 2.80 | 1.02 | 5.00 | 8.82 | - | 8.82 | 1.0 | 8.82 | 5.18 | . 33 |
| 113 | $3 \frac{1}{4}$ | $5 \frac{3}{4}$ | 1.68 | . 85 | 5.00 | 7.63 | - | 7.53 | . 8 | 9.41 | 4.67 | . 20 |
| 112 | $4 \frac{1}{4}$ | $7 \frac{1}{4}$ | 2.13 | . 85 | 5.00 | 7.98 | - | 7.98 | . 8 | 9.98 | 4.22 | . 12 |
| 118 | $6 \frac{3}{4}$ | 93 | 3.18 | 1.10 | 5.00 | 9.28 | - | 9.28 | . 8 | 11.60 | 2.92 | none |
| 106 | $6 \frac{1}{9}$ | ${ }^{7} 0^{\frac{3}{4}}$ | 2.81 | .85 | 5.00 | 8.66 | - | 8.66 | .7 | 12.37 | $2.64$ | none |
| 201 | $5 \frac{1}{4}$ | 10 | 2.76 | . 93 | 5.00 | 8.69 | - | 8.69 | . 7 | 12.41 | 2.61 | none |
|  | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | $9 \frac{1}{2}$ | 2.79 | .89 | 5.00 | 8.68 | . 02 | 8.66 | 1.1 | 7.87 | 6.24 | . 53 |

Price Decomber 1, 1929-\$9.00 per ton

Cost pr Acre of Producing Corn Fodder -- Rook and Noblos Countics - 192

| Farm | Hours of work |  |  | Cost |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Net } \\ & \text { Cost } \end{aligned}$ | Yield Tons | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cost } \\ & \text { mer Ton } \end{aligned}$ | Net <br> Return | Hetarn <br> per Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N0. | Man | Horsc | Tractor | Libor | Scod | Twinc | Manure | Machinc | Land |  |  |  |  |  |
| 123 | $13 \frac{3}{4}$ | 32 | - | ¢8.15 | \$1.26 | \$. 58 | \%1.82 | \$1.65 | $\$ 6.00$ | \$19.56 | 4.6 | \$4.25 | \$32.44 | \$2.22 |
| 112 | 19 | 422 | - | 10.97 | . 39 | . .58 | 1.92 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 21.50 | 5.0 | 4.30 | 34.50 | 1.76 |
| 202 | 173 | 36 ${ }^{\frac{1}{4}}$ | 3 | 11.64 | . 54 | . 66 | . 45 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 20.94 | 4.3 | 4.87 | 28.06 | 1.58 |
| 312 | 10 | $25 \frac{3}{4}$ | - | 6.12 | 1.00 | . 54 | 2.79 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 18.11 | 3.3 | 5.49 | 20.89 | 1.79 |
| 319 | 1313 | 32, $\frac{1}{4}$ | - | 7.87 | :72 | .51 | - | 1.45 | 6.00 | 16.74 | 3.0 | 5.58 | 19.26 | 1.30 |
| 116 | 11娄 | $26 \frac{1}{2}$ | - | 6.58 | 1.85 | . 83 | 2.52 | 1. 55 | 6.00 | 19.43 | 3.3 | 5.89 | 19.57 | 1.51 |
| 119 | $12 \frac{1}{4}$ | $23 \frac{3}{4}$ | - | 6.57 | . 62 | . 79 | 1.82 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 17.45 | 2.7 | 6.46 | 15.55 | 1.08 |
| 106 | 11 | 18 | $14^{3}$ | 6.72 | 1.83 | .37 | . 53 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 17.10 | 2.5 | 6.84 | 13.90 | 1.02 |
| 302 | $15 \frac{3}{4}$ | 41 $\frac{1}{\frac{1}{7}}$ |  | 9.70 | .91 | .78 | 2.72 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 21.75 | 3.0 | 7.25 | 14.25 | .82 |
| 212 | $10 \frac{3}{4}$ | 1919 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 6. 79 | . 98 | .42 | .96 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 16.81 | 2.3 | 7.31 | 12.19 | . 88 |
| 401 | 13, | $30 \frac{1}{2}$ | - | 7.64 | 1.07 | -65 | 1.22 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 18.24 | 2.1 | 8.69 | 8.75 | . 51 |
| 105 | $18^{\prime \prime}$ | $38^{\frac{3}{4}}$ | - | 10.03 | . 62 | . 94 | 2.08 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 21.32 | 2.4 | 8.88 | 8.68 | .45 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { dvg. } \\ & 101 \end{aligned}$ | $13 \frac{3}{4}$ | $30 \frac{3}{4}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 8.23 | . 98 | .65 | 1.57 | 1.65 | 6.00 | 19.08 | 3.2 | 5.96 | 18.92 | 1.24 |
| Acres |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |

Prico Docombor 1, $1929-\$ 10.00$ per ton


Prico Decomber 1, $1929-\$ 5.00$ per ton.

