

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.

Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago - .

November 14, 1975

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CONDITIONS eased during the third quarter despite continued strength in the demand for loans. Forty-six percent of over 700 agricultural bankers responding to an early October survey reported a year-to-year increase in the demand for loans during the third quarter. In the same survey 41 percent of the bankers noted a year-to-year increase in fund availability, up from 14 percent of the bankers holding such views a year ago—and the highest proportion since April 1, 1974. The improved liquidity position stems from a pickup in the rate of loan repayments and a simultaneous decline in loan renewals or extensions.

Banker's view of credit conditions

| | 1974 | | | | 1975 | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|----|-----|----|------|----|-----|
| Year-to-year increases in: | 上 | 11 | 111 | IV | 1 | 11 | 111 |
| | (percent of banks reporting) | | | | | | |
| Loan demand | 47 | 56 | 46 | 47 | 52 | 55 | 46 |
| Fund availability | 44 | 21 | 14 | 28 | 29 | 35 | 41 |
| Loan repayments Renewals and | 43 | 14 | 13 | 17 | 8 | 10 | 21 |
| extensions | 13 | 30 | 32 | 41 | 51 | 33 | 19 |

The loan-to-deposit ratios of reporting agricultural banks averaged slightly over 57 percent, up slightly from July 1 but somewhat below the year-earlier figure. Furthermore, nearly 42 percent of the bankers indicated that their loan-to-deposit ratios were below the desired level, double the proportion of bankers who felt their actual loan-to-deposit ratios exceeded their desired ratios.

A sharp turnaround in livestock prices plus renewed strength in crop prices prompted a rise in net farm income during the third quarter, probably the major factor behind the improved position of many agricultural banks. Net farm income jumped to a seasonally adjusted annual rate of over \$28 billion in the third quarter, up about one-third from the level recorded in the first two quarters. This enabled many farmers to bring loan payments up to date and enhance their deposit balances.

Seventh District bankers also indicated that agricultural loan portfolios have improved since earlier this year, probably a reflection of the increase in net farm income. One-half of the respondents indicated the quality of their agricultural loan portfolios had improved, while less than 3 percent reported a deterioration. The most significant improvement was indicated in Illinois where two-thirds of the banks reported improved agricultural loan portfolios; the remainder suggested no change since early in the year. In Michigan, the only state where bankers indicated any significant decline in the quality of agricultural

Agricultural

Waite Memorial Book Collection

Dhiston of Agricultural Economics

etter

IN LIBRARY USE ONLY

Number 1352

loan portfolios, only 9 percent of the bankers reported a deterioration compared to the 28 percent that reported an increase in the quality of loan portfolios. For the first time in over a year more banks reported an increase in loan repayments than reported a decrease. Banks reporting increases in extensions or renewals also were at the lowest level in a year.

Banks extending farm mortgage loans in 1975 reported an increase in the proportion of such funds utilized to finance farmland transfers and to refinance operating debt. Nearly one-half of the banks reporting farm mortgage activity indicated that a higher proportion of mortgage funds was being used for farmland transfers, while slightly over 30 percent indicated a decrease in the proportion of mortgage funds used to buy farmland. Two-fifths of the banks also indicated that a greater-than-normal proportion of their farm mortgage funds was being used to refinance operating debt with land equity. This was most apparent in Iowa where one-half of the banks reported this type of activity. The Iowa situation is probably a reflection of the losses cattle feeders sustained during most of 1974 and the first four or five months of 1975. During this period operating losses forced many feeders to convert short-term operating debt to longer-term mortgages.

Interest rates charged by agricultural banks rose slightly during the third quarter, thus halting the downtrend of the past nine months. Banks responding to the survey charged an average of 8.81 percent on feeder cattle loans, up 5 basis points from midyear. The average rate charged on longer-term farm real estate loans rose to 8.96 percent, up 7 basis points.

Seventh District bankers generally anticipate a slight easing in the demand for credit in the fourth quarter. The two notable exceptions are in the area of feeder cattle and farm machinery loans. Bankers look for a continuation in the trend towards more feeder cattle placements. Likewise, almost one-half the bankers responding to the survey also anticipate increases in farm machinery loans in the fourth period. However, a record harvest and relatively high farm prices suggest the demand for credit in most other areas may fall below year-earlier needs in the last quarter of 1975.

Terry Francl Agricultural Economist

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

| California | Unite | Latest povisel | Value | Percent change from | | |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|------------|------------------------------|--------------|--|
| Subject | Unit | Latest period | value | Prior period | Year ago | |
| INDEX OF PRICES | | | | | | |
| Received by farmers | 1967=100 | October | 193 | - 0.5 | + 4 | |
| Crops | 1967=100 | October | 199 | - 1.5 | - 13 | |
| Livestock 1991 1991 1991 | 1967=100 | October | 190 | + 1.1 | + 22 | |
| Paid by farmers | 1967=100 | October | 188 | - 0.5 | + 6 | |
| Production items | 1967=100 | October | 192 | - 1.0 | + 5 | |
| Wholesale price index (all commodities) | 1967=100 | October | 179 | + 0.6 | | |
| Foods | 1967=100 | October | 187 | + 0.6 | + 5 + 9 | |
| Processed foods and feeds | 1967=100 | October | 186 | + 0.4 | + 2 | |
| | 1967=100 | October | | Charles Training Street From | | |
| Agricultural chemicals | | | 200 171 | - 0.6 | + 17 | |
| Agricultural machinery and equipment | 1967=100 1967=100 | October September | 164 | + 1.2 + 0.5 | + 11 + 8 | |
| Consumer price index (all items) Food at home | 1967=100 | September | 178 | - 0.4 | + 8 | |
| rood at nome | 1907-100 | september | 170 | - 0.4 | т о | |
| CASH PRICES | | | | | | |
| Corn | dol. per bu. | October | 2.62 | - 5.1 | - 24 | |
| Soybeans | dol. per bu. | October | 4.92 | - 7.5 | - 40 | |
| Wheat | dol. per bu. | October | 4.02 | - 2.2 | - 17 | |
| Sorghum | dol. per cwt. | October | 4.43 | - 1.2 | - 23 | |
| Oats | dol. per bu. | October | 1.41 | - 2.8 | - 16 | |
| Steers and heifers | dol. per cwt. | October | 38.30 | - 1.0 | + 15 | |
| Hogs | dol. per cwt. | October | 58.00 | - 0.9 | + 56 | |
| Milk, all sold to plants | dol. per cwt. | October | 9.53 | + 4.0 | + 14 | |
| Broilers | cents per lb. | October | 28.80 | - 3.4 | + 26 | |
| Eggs | cents per doz. | October | 52.80 | - 5.4 | - 4 | |
| | contrapor doz. | | | | | |
| INCOME (seasonally adjusted annual rate) | | | | | | |
| Cash receipts from farm marketings | bil. dol. | 3rd Quarter | 98 | + 11.4 | + 7 | |
| Net realized farm income | bil. dol. | 3rd Quarter | 28 | + 37.6 | + 11 | |
| Nonagricultural personal income | bil. dol. | September | 1,226 | + 1.0 | + 8 | |
| | | | | | | |
| FARM FINANCE | | | | | | |
| Total deposits at agricultural banks ¹ | 1972-73=100 | October | 143 | + 2.4 | + 13 | |
| Time deposits | 1972-73=100 | October | 157 | + 1.4 | + 18 | |
| Demand deposits | 1972-73=100 | October | 124 | + 4.7 | + 5 | |
| Total loans at agricultural banks ¹ | 1972-73=100 | October | 149 | + 1.7 | + 14 | |
| Production credit associations | | | | | | |
| loans outstanding: | | | | | | |
| United States | mil. dol. | August | 10,884 | + 0 | + 16 | |
| Seventh District states | mil. dol. | August | 1,836 | + 0 | + 23 | |
| loans made: | | | | | | |
| United States | mil. dol. | August | 984 | - 13.8 | + 0 | |
| Seventh District states | mil. dol. | August | 173 | - 14.4 | + 26 | |
| Federal land banks | | | | | | |
| loans outstanding: | | | | | | |
| United States | mil. dol. | August | 15,332 | - 2.1 | + 18 | |
| Seventh District states | mil. dol. | August | 2,794 | + 1.1 | + 23 | |
| new money loaned: | | | | | | |
| United States | mil. dol. | August | 253 | - 10.9 | - 19 | |
| Seventh District states | mil. dol. | August | 42 | - 8.7 | - 7 | |
| Interest rates | | An electrical de | | | | |
| Feeder cattle loans ² | percent | 3rd Quarter | 8.79 | - 0.1 | - 2 | |
| Farm real estate loans ² | percent | 3rd Quarter | 8.90 | - 0.1 | - 1 | |
| Three-month Treasury bills | percent | 10/30-11/5 | 5.52 | - 2.5 | - 29 | |
| Federal funds rate | percent | 10/30-11/5 | 5.17 | - 8.5 | - 46 | |
| Government bonds (long-term) | percent | 10/30-11/5 | 8.18 | - 0.7 | - 7 | |
| | | | | | | |
| AGRICULTURAL TRADE | | PART THE LETTER | | | | |
| Agricultural exports | mil. dol. | August | 1,601 | + 3.5 | + 10 | |
| Agricultural imports | mil. dol. | August | 688 | - 9.9 | - 19 | |
| EARM MACHINERY CALES | | | | | | |
| FARM MACHINERY SALES | S SHEET LINE IN | A | 10 12/ | 1 10 5 | The state of | |
| Farm tractors | units | August | 10,134 | + 10.5 | - 5 | |
| Combines Balers | units | August | 3,036 | + 1.7 - 37.0 | - 10 | |
| | units | August | 3,642 | - 3/ () | - 8 | |

¹Member banks in Seventh District having a large proportion of agricultural loans in towns of less than 15,000 population.

 $^{^2\}mbox{\ensuremath{\mbox{Average}}}$ of rates reported by district agricultural banks.