

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
<a href="http://ageconsearch.umn.edu">http://ageconsearch.umn.edu</a>
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.

## AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION DIVISION UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

#### W. C. Coffey, Acting Director

#### MINNESOTA FARM BUSINESS NOTES

No. 150

June 20, 1935

Prepared by the Division of Agricultural Economics University Farm, St. Paul, Minnesota

THE EFFECT OF THE DROUTH ON FARM INCOME, CROP YIELDS, AND FARM ORGANIZATION AND PRACTICE
Prepared by G. A. Sallee and G. A. Pond

Some effects of the drouth in west central Minnesota during the past four years are indicated in the records of a group of farms in Stevens County. Annual rain fall in this county for the past four years has ranged from 17 to 35 per cent below normal. During the growing season the deficit has ranged from 21 to 43 per cent. The accumulated deficiency during the four years exceeds one year's normal precipitation. High temperatures accentuated the effect of the drouth. The mean temperature during the growing season averaged three degrees above normal for the four-year period. The mean monthly temperatures were above normal all but two months during this period.

The most obvious effect of the drouth was the reduction in crop yields. The amount of this reduction is shown in Table 1. Grain production was reduced

Table 1

		Production of	of Crops in	Pounds per Acre	9	
		% decrease	Rough-	% decrease	Total	% decrease
Year	Grain	from 1932	age	from 1932		from <b>1</b> 932
1932	885	<b></b>	558	<b>-</b>	1443	<del>-</del>
1933	157	82	448	20	605	58
1934	43	95	335	40	378	74

very sharply in 1933 and practically wiped out in 1934. Roughage production declined less, relatively. This was largely due to the fact that crops seeded for grain were harvested for roughage. In 1932 crops were usually harvested for the purpose for which they were planted. In 1933 and especially in 1934 drouth damage resulted in an abnormal utilization of crops. This is shown in Table 2. Nearly

Table 2

	Per	centage	Utilizatio	n of Cro	ps Seeded	for Grain	n ·		
	Cut for Grain		Cut for Hay		Pastu	Pastured		Abandoned	
Crop	1933	1934	1933	1934	1933	1934	1933	1934	
Wheat	64	24	. 3	13	-	6	33	58	
Oats	62	23	17	31	3	13	18	33	
Barley	73	25	2	13	74	12	21	50	
Flax	87	42	<b>944</b>	8	1	2	. 12	48	

half of the small grain acreage was entirely abandoned in 1934. Hay crops were similarly affected but in a less degree. Only 55 per cent of the alfalfa acreage was cut for hay in 1934, 11 per cent was pastured and the balance was a complete

Published in furtherance of Agricultural Extension Act of May 8 and June 30, 1914, W. C. Coffey, Acting Director, Agricultural Extension Division, Department of Agriculture, University of Minnesota, cooperating with U.S. Department of Agriculture.

failure. Because of the acute feed shortage, crops were harvested that ordinarily would have been completely abandoned. Hence the damage is more severe than these figures indicate.

Because of the feed shortages, curtailment of livestock production was necessary. In spite of increased feed purchases both numbers of livestock and livestock rations were cut sharply. The decrease in the number of each class of livestock is shown in Table 3. This decrease would have been even greater had not relief agencies supplied feed in return for work. The cattle-buying program served to lessen the losses that would have occurred had the surplus cattle been thrown on the public market. The reduction in hogs largely reflected the shortage of concentrate feeds. All of these farmers signed corn-hog contracts but the drouth compelled a cut in production in excess of contract requirements.

Table 3

Average Numbers of Livestock on Hand March 1, 1932-1935 Other Total Year cattle cattle Chickens Turkeys Cows Hogs Sheep 1932 21.4 134 16.2 39.3 41.3 23.1 32.8 20 1933 24.4 29.4 154 16.9 17.7 23 1934 143 16 15.8 21.2 13.6 20.1 37.0 1935 12 12.6 13.6 26.2 10.4 16.9 125 % reduction 1932 to 1935 40 41 68 22 33 21

In addition to reducing numbers of livestock, the rations were also reduced, especially the concentrate ration. This is shown in Table 4. The reduction was actually greater than these figures indicate since much less feed was obtained from pasture than is normally the case and the roughage used in 1933 and 1934 was of much poorer quality than that used in 1932.

Table 4

Pounds of	Feed Use	ed per Anim	al Unit,	1932-1934			
	1932			<b>1</b> 933		1934	
Class of livestock	Grain	Roughage	Grain	Roughage	Grain	Roughage	
Work horses	3314	4310	2188	4215	1333	4778	
Cattle - Dairy	2271	5107	1622	5402	1000	4922	
Milk and beef	1976	2097	1104	5018	188	4502	
Beef	1640	28 <del>/</del> +8	989	3220	316	4139	
Sheep	7474.1	2513	329	2485	224	1612	
Hogs	9165	-	8316	-	6098	<b></b>	

The average cash income and expense of these farms for the three years, 1932-1934, are shown in Table 5. Livestock production and sales were maintained in 1933 but fell in 1934 as the result of a sharp decrease in numbers and production. Crop sales decreased some in 1933 but much more in 1934 in spite of the much higher prices the latter year.

Most items of expense were reduced during the three years. On the other hand, feed purchases were increased sharply to make up for the decreased feed production shown in Table 1. Crop expense decreased in 1933 because of lower twine and threshing bills. It increased sharply in 1934 because of the necessity of buying practically all seed used, including that for emergency crops.

Table 5

Average Cash Income, Cash Expense, and Net Cash Income 1934 1932 1933 Year: 24 22 Number of farms 22 374 **35**2 372 Size of farm, acres Cash Farm Income: Sales of livestock and livestock products\$1848 \$1889 \$1565 Sales of crops 472 349 171 Miscellaneous income \$2302 Total cash farm income Cash Expense: \$592 Feed purchases \$168 \$258 Livestock expense 146 99 327 148 115 Labor 206 143 98 139 Crop expense Other expense 766 \$1744 \$1610 \$1408 Total cash farm expense Net cash income from farm Outside work A.A.A. payments Total net cash income\*

\*Amount available for personal and household expenses and for interest and principal payments.

The net cash income from the farm represents the difference between the cash farm income and the cash farm expense. In addition these farmers received some income from outside work. In 1934 this was largely relief work remunerated by feed payments and services rendered in connection with the wheat and corn-hog adjustment administrations in the county. In 1934 A.A.A. adjustment payments were the largest source of net cash income. They amounted to 55 per cent of the total.

The net cash income is the amount available for household and personal expenses and for interest and principal payments. The average personal and household expenses were \$693 a year. Since the annual interest due amounted to over \$400 per farm, it is obvious that a substantial delinquency occurred each year and default on principal payments was inevitable.

The facts presented thus far indicate the immediate effects of the drouth. Long time effects can not be portrayed so accurately. It will take some time to replace hay and pasture seedings and reestablish the normal cropping systems. Foundation livestock has been sacrificed in many cases. It will take time to replace this. Breeding stock has been weakened by remaining too long on reduced rations. The seriousness of the wind erosion that has occurred is difficult to estimate as yet. Perhaps one of the serious permanent losses is the very severe damage to groves and windbreaks. It will take at least a generation to replace these. Because the drouth damage coincided with the price depression, the farmer's financial resources have suffered severely. He has been unable to meet interest and principal payments. His debts have increased except in so far as he has secured favorable refinancing terms. This represents a problem to each individual farmer that is likely to continue pressing for several years to come.

### MINNESOTA FARM PRICES FOR MAY 1935 Prepared by W. C. Waite and W. B. Garver

The index number of Minnesota farm prices for the month of May 1935 was 86.1. When the average of farm prices of the three Mays 1924-25-26 is represented by 100, the indexes for May of each year from 1924 to date are as follows:

May	1924 -	84.3	May	1930	- 98.2
11	1925 -	106.1	11	1931	<b>-</b> 63.5
11	1926 -	110.1	11	1932	<b>-</b> 43.1
11	1927 -	109.0	11	1933	- 49.0
11	1928 -	113.4	11	1934	- 53.1*
11	1929 -	112.6	11	1935	<del>-</del> 86.1*

\*Preliminary.

The price index of 86.1 for the past month is the net result of increases and decreases in the prices of farm products in May 1935 over the average of May 1924-25-26 weighted according to their relative importance.

Average Farm Prices Used in Computing the Minnesota Farm Price Index,

		May	15. 1935	, with Co	mparisons*		
	May 15, 1935	Apr. 15, 1935	May 15, 1934	Av. May 1924-25- 26	<pre>% May 15, 1935 is of Apr. 15, 1935</pre>	% May 15, 1935 is of May 15, 1934	% May 15, 1935 is of May 15, 1924-25-26
Wheat Corn Oats Barley Rye Flax Potatoes Hogs	\$1.01 .77 .45 .70 .49 1.57 .36 8.10	\$1.02 .80 .50 .84 .55 1.63 .37 8.30	\$.74 .36 .27 .48 .47 1.67 .50	\$1.31 .65 .35 .59 .75 2.32 .83 9.60	99 96 90 83 89 96 97	136 214 167 146 104 94 72 270	77 118 129 119 65 68 43 84
Cattle Calves Lambs-sheep	7.20 <b>7.</b> 10	6.80 7.20 7.03	3.95 4.80 7.05	6.38 8.07 11.39	106 99 99	182 148 99	113 88 61
Chickens Eggs Butterfat Hay	.136 .21 .29	.131 .20 .37 17.52	.092 .12 .24 9.18	.189 .22 .40	104 106 78 96	148 175 121 183	72 95 73 147
Mi 1)z	1.58	1.73	1.27	1.95	91	124	81

\*Except for milk, these are the average prices for Minnesota as reported by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Indexes and Ratios of Minnesota Agriculture\* May April May Av. May 1934 1935 1935 1924-26 78.3 54.0 100.0 U.S. farm price index 79.8 86.1 Minnesota farm price index 91.2 53.1 100.0 96.1 U.S. purchasing power of farm products 97.9 70.1 100.0 Minnesota purchasing power of farm products 105.6 69.0 111.9 100.0 U.S. hog-corn ratio 9.3 6.5 9.2 12.1 Minnesota hog-corn ratio 10.5 8.3 10.4 15.1 Minnesota egg-grain ratio 14.0 12.7 14.4 12.9 Minnesota butterfat-farm-grain ratio 20.5 23.5 28,8 34.5

<sup>\*</sup>Explanations of the computation of these data are given in Farm Business Notes No. 144.