

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.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION DIVISION UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

F.W. Peck, Director

MINNESOTA FARM BUSINESS NOTES

No. 159

March 20, 1936

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

THE FARM REAL ESTATE SITUATION IN MINNESOTA Prepared by E. C. Johnson

The sale prices of farm real estate in Minnesota increased greatly between 1910 and 1920. Since 1921, they have declined with sharp breaks occurring in the years 1922-1923 and the period 1930 to 1934. This decline was the result of low income to farmers followed by many forced sales due to debt difficulties. In 1935, however, the sale prices of farm real estate in Minnesota were higher than 1934, reflecting an improvement in the real estate market brought about by recent increases in prices for farm products and greater net incomes to farmers. The trends in farm real estate prices are shown in Table 1. The figures given are the average prices of sales of farm properties by two-year periods with forced sales excluded. Figures for 1934 and 1935 are preliminary and subject to revision when additional data on sales are compiled. Table 2 gives an index of sales values and shows the relative changes in the sale price of farm real estate in agricultural districts of the state.

Table 1. Average Sale Value per Acre of Farm Real Estate by Two-

Year Periods in Agricultural Districts of Minnesota													
Dis-	1910-	1912-	1914-	1916	-	- 1920	-			-	1930-	1932-	1934-
trict	<u> 11</u>	_13	_15	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35
S.E.	\$58	\$69	\$82	\$ 92	\$117	\$141	\$114	\$104	\$106	\$100	\$88	\$64	\$53
S.W.	57	69	84	100	118	152	119	110	109	102	88	65	59
W.C.	39	46	56	67	78	98	82	74	72	67	51	42	38
E.C.	24	29	34	41	50	68	56	49	49	71,71	36	27	26
N.W.	24	29	32	37	4О	57		J1,71	36	33	22	20	22
N.E.	11	13	14	15	18	24	23	22	22	21	18	14	15
Minn.	41	49	58	68	82	104	85	78	76	71	60	45	4 ₀

Table 2. Index of Sale Value per Acre of Farm Real Estate by Two-Year Periods in Agricultural Districts of Minnesota

			(19.	12 -1 3 :	<u>= 100)</u>								
Di s-	1910-	1912-	1914-	1916-	1918-	1920-	1922-	1924-	1926-	1928-	1930-	1932-	1934-
trict	11	13	15	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35
S.E.	871	100	119	133	170	50,14	165	151	154	145	128	93	77
S.W.	83	100	122	145	171	220	172	159	158	148	128	94	. 86
W.C.	85	100	122	146	170	213	178	161	157	146	111	91	83
E.C.	83	100	117	141	172	234	193	169	169	152	124	93	93
N.W.	83	100	110	128	138	197	152	152	124	114	76	69	76
Ν.Ε.	85	100	108	115	138	185	177	169	169	162	138	108	115
Minn.	8,14	100	118	139	167	212	173	159	155	145	122	92	82

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

Readers who are interested in the average sale price of farm real estate in individual counties of Minnesota will find such data in Bulletin 307 of the Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station. Table 3 below supplements Bulletin 307 by giving final figures on average sale prices for the two-year period 1932-1933 and preliminary figures for the two-year period 1934-1935. The latter are subject to revision. Apparent discrepancies in some of these figures are explained by the fact that the number of sales in some counties was small and not representative of all farms. Obviously there may be a wide range between sale prices of individual farms in a county.

Table 3. Average Sale Price per Acre of Farm Real Estate in Minnesota

county 33 35 county 33 35 county 33 35 Southeastern Minnesota Carver \$90 \$- Houston \$48 \$62 Rice \$82 \$69 Dakota 74 60 Le Sueur 92 57 Scott 63 52 Dodge 47 51 McLeod 92 65 Steele 63 56 Fillmore 58 41 Meeker 55 48 Wabasha 56 - Freeborn 62 67 Mower 65 54 Waseca 70 53 Goodhue 58 51 Olmsted 54 50 Washington 55 46 Hennepin 61 63 Ramsey - - Wright 73 55 Southwestern Minnesota Southwestern Minnesota 50 - - 40 - - - - - <t< th=""><th></th><th>Counti</th><th>es for</th><th>Two-Year Period</th><th>ls, 1932</th><th>2-33 and</th><th>1 1934-35</th><th></th><th></th></t<>		Counti	es for	Two-Year Period	ls, 1932	2-33 and	1 1934-35		
Southeastern Minnesota Carver \$90 \$- Houston \$48 \$62 Rice \$82 \$69 Dakota 74 60 Le Sueur 92 57 Scott 63 52 Dodge 47 51 McLeod 92 65 Steele 63 56 Fillmore 58 41 Meeker 55 48 Wabasha 56 - Freeborn 62 67 Mower 65 54 Waseca 70 53 Goodhue 58 51 Olmsted 54 50 Washington 55 46 Hennepin 61 63 Ramsey - - Winona 50 - Southwestern Minnesota 55 55 56 56 56 56 56 56 - 57 56 - - - 70 53 56 - - - -	Name of	1932-	1934-		1932-	1934-	Name of	1932-	1934-
Carver \$90 \$- Houston \$48 \$62 Rice \$82 \$69 Dakota 74 60 Le Sueur 92 57 Scott 63 52 Dodge 47 51 McLeod 92 65 Steele 63 56 Fillmore 58 41 Meeker 55 48 Wabasha 56 - Freeborn 62 67 Mower 65 54 Waseca 70 53 Goodhue 58 51 Olmsted 54 50 Washington 55 46 Hennepin 61 63 Ramsey - - Winona 50 - Southwestern Minnesota 55 Minnesota 55 55	county	33	35	county	33	35	county	33	35
Carver \$90 \$- Houston \$48 \$62 Rice \$82 \$69 Dakota 74 60 Le Sueur 92 57 Scott 63 52 Dodge 47 51 McLeod 92 65 Steele 63 56 Fillmore 58 41 Meeker 55 48 Wabasha 56 - Freeborn 62 67 Mower 65 54 Waseca 70 53 Goodhue 58 51 Olmsted 54 50 Washington 55 46 Hennepin 61 63 Ramsey - - Winona 50 - Southwestern Minnesota 55 Minnesota 55 55	Southeastern M:	innesot	a.						
Dakota 74 60 Le Sueur 92 57 Scott 63 52 Dodge 47 51 McLeod 92 65 Steele 63 56 Fillmore 58 41 Meeker 55 48 Wabasha 56 - Freeborn 62 67 Mower 65 54 Waseca 70 53 Goodhue 58 51 Olmsted 54 50 Washington 55 46 Hennepin 61 63 Ramsey - - Winona 50 - Southwestern Minnesota 50 - Wright 73 55				Houston	\$4g	\$ 62	Rice	\$82	\$69
Dodge 47 51 McLeod 92 65 Steele 63 56 Fillmore 58 41 Meeker 55 48 Wabasha 56 - Freeborn 62 67 Mower 65 54 Waseca 70 53 Goodhue 58 51 Olmsted 54 50 Washington 55 46 Hennepin 61 63 Ramsey - - Winona 50 - Southwestern Minnesota 50 - Wright 73 55	Dakota		60	Le Sueur	92	· 57	Scott	63	
Fillmore 58 41 Meeker 55 48 Wabasha 56 - Freeborn 62 67 Mower 65 54 Waseca 70 53 Goodhue 58 51 Olmsted 54 50 Washington 55 46 Hennepin 61 63 Ramsey - Winona 50 - Wright 73 55	Dodge	47	51	McLeod			Steele	63	56
Freeborn 62 67 Mower 65 54 Waseca 70 53 Goodhue 58 51 Olmsted 54 50 Washington 55 46 Hennepin 61 63 Ramsey - - Winona 50 - Southwestern Minnesota Southwestern Minnesota - Winona 73 55	_			Meeker			Wabasha		
Hennepin 61 63 Ramsey Winona 50 - Wright 73 55 Southwestern Minnesota	Freeborn		67	Mower		54	Waseca		53
Hennepin 61 63 Ramsey Winona 50 - Wright 73 55 Southwestern Minnesota	Goodhue	58		Olmsted	54		Washington		46
Southwestern Minnesota Wright 73 55	Hennepin			Ramsey		_			
Southwestern Minnesota	-			· ·			Wright		55
	Southwestern M:	innesot	a				J	, ,	
	Blue Earth	76	– 63	Lyon	59	47	Redwood	65	53
Brown 77 59 Martin 70 74 Renville 56 51	Brown	77	59	Martin		74	Renville		51
Cottonwood 56 59 Murray 62 50 Rock 68 79	Cottonwood	56	59	Murray		50	Rock	68	79
Faribault 69 65 Nicollet 66 60 Sibley 69 52 Jackson 73 62 Nobles 77 89 Watonwan 66 61	Faribault	69		Nicollet	66		Sibley	69	52
Jackson 73 62 Nobles 77 89 Watonwan 66 61	Jackson	73	62	Nobles	77	89	Watonwan		61
Lincoln 54 49 Pipestone 64 57 Yellow Medicine 54 44	Lincoln	54	49	Pipestone	64		Yellow Medicin	e 54	7474
West Central Minnesota									
Bigstone 35 35 Kandiyohi 52 40 Stevens 39 41	Bigstone	35	35	Kandiyohi	52	-	Stevens	39	41
Chippewa 52 47 Lac qui Parle 61 47 Swift 38 37	Chippewa	52	47	Lac qui Parle		47	Swift	38	37
Douglas 43 36 Pope 25 33 Traverse 28 38	Douglas	43	36	Pope	25	33	Traverse	28	
Grant 35 32 Stearns 43 35 Wilkin 33 33	Grant	35	32	Stearns	43	35	Wilkin	33	33
East Central Minnesota	East Central Mi	innesot							
Anoka 30 25 Hubbard 20 17 Ottertail 24 28	Anoka		25	Hubbard			Ottertail		28
Becker 24 24 Isanti 39 33 Pine 23 19	Becker			Isanti	39	33	Pine	23	
Benton 33 38 Kanabec 28 24 Sherburne 25 20 Chisago 44 45 Mille Lacs 28 26 Todd 32 26	Benton	33	38	Kanabec	28		Sherburne	25	
	Chi sago	71,71		Mille Lacs	28	26	Todd	32	26
Crow Wing 19 16 Morrison 27 20 Wadena 22 21	Crow Wing	19	16	Morrison	27	20	Wadena	22	21
Northwestern Minnesota	Northwestern Mi	innesot	a					•	
Clay 23 33 Marshall 16 16 Polk 25 25	Clay	23	33	Marshall	16	16	Polk	25	25
Kittson 18 17 Norman 25 26 Red Lake 17 22	Kittson			Norman	25	26	Red Lake		22
Mahnomen 21 24 Pennington 18 19 Roseau 12 13	Mahnomon	21	24	Pennington	18	19	Roseau		13
Northeastern Minnesota	Northeastern M:	innesot	a	- -					_
Aitkin 15 17 Clearwater 15 19 Lake	Aitkin	15	 17	Clearwater	15	19	Lake	-	-
Beltrami 10 12 Cook ← - Lake of the	Beltrami	10	12	Cook		-	Lake of the		
Carlton 20 18 Itasca 14 12 Woods 8 11	Carlton	20	18	Itasca	1,4	12	Woods	8	11
Cass 14 14 Koochiching 8 12 St. Louis 15 15					8				15

The average sale price of farm real estate was higher in most districts of Minnesota in 1935 than in 1934 and the number of sales greater. The average price of farms sold in the southeastern district was 10 per cent higher in 1935 than in 1934. Increases in the other districts were as follows: southwestern, 5 per cent; west central, 8 per cent; cast central, 7 per cent; northwestern, 9 per cent. The northeastern district showed a decrease of 8 per cent. The

increase in the number of sales in 1935 over 1934 was as follows: southeastern, 13 per cent; southwestern, 31 per cent; west central, 44 per cent; east central, 7 per cent. The northwestern and northeastern districts showed decreases of 1 per cent and 5 per cent respectively in number of sales.

Among the factors which may tend to result in stable or rising prices of farm real estate in Minnesota, one might mention the following: (1) The recovery in agricultural prices during 1934 and 1935 has resulted in greater confidence in farm real estate as an investment. (2) Lower taxes on farm real estate in most communities tend to increase the net income to owners of farm land. (3) Credit, which is now available at comparatively low rates of interest is an encouragement to people interested in purchasing farms. (4) The tendency to capitalize net annual income from farm land at lower rates of interest may tend to increase land values. (5) Many people seem to feel that we are in a period of rising general prices and may purchase farms to take advantage of an expected rise in values. Factors which may operate in the direction of causing declines in the price of farm real estate are the following: (1) A large number of farms are available for sale in most communities of the state. (2) The loss of foreign markets for farm products is likely to necessitate curtailment in agricultural production. (3) The need for agricultural land in the United States may never exceed the amount now used for agriculture. Students of population indicate that the population of the United States is reaching a stable level which may not exceed 140,000,000 inhabitants. Further expansion in agriculture in the future with increased demand for land seems improbable.

Most persons who are now buying farms are purchasing them with a comparatively small down payment and will be paying for the farm over a long period of years. Since the farms must be paid for out of income produced by the farms, it is important that prices of real estate be in line with income over the purchase period. The great distress which has been experienced by farmers since 1920 has in a large degree been associated with the purchase of farms at high prices under large mortgages, prices which were far out of line with the income produced by the property. Stability of tenure for farmers must be attained if we are to have a stable and prosperous agriculture, but it can not be attained unless the indebtedness of farmers can be held to levels which will enable them to meet payments out of farm income.

Finally, it may be well to emphasize that intelligent purchasing of farm real estate demands careful attention to the productivity of the soil. In the past, there has been a definite tendency to over-value the farms with poorer soils and this tendency is still noticeable in many regions. The potential productivity of the soil is an important consideration. Very often soils which are in good productive condition at present have low potential productivity and income from such farms may decline over a period of years. Such farms often sell for prices just as high as the farms of high potential productivity, but eventually may cause hardships for the purchaser. On the other hand, farms in poor present condition but with soils of high potential productivity are often under-valued. Such farms may represent bargains for a purchaser who has the capital and ability to place the farm in condition to permit full use of its high potential productivity.

MINNESOTA FARM PRICES FOR FEBRUARY 1936 Prepared by W.C. Waite and W. B. Garver

The index number of Minnesota farm prices for the month of February 1936 was 87.1. When the average of farm prices of the three Februarys 1924-25-26 is represented by 100, the indexes for February of each year from 1924 to date are as follows:

February	1924 -	88	February	1931		69	
11	1925 -	100	t1	1932	-	46	
11	1926 -	115	11	1933		36	
13	1927 -	113	11	1934		54	
11	1928 -	101	11	1935		87*	
11	1929 -	107	11	1936	-	87*	
11	1930 -	102					*Preliminary

The price index of 87.1 for the past month is the net result of increases and decreases in the prices of farm products in February 1936 over the average of February 1924-25-26 weighted according to their relative importance.

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

February 15, 1936, with Comparisons										
	Feb. 15, 1936	Jan. 15, 1936	Feb. 15, 1935	Av. Feb. 1924-25- 26	<pre>% Feb. 15, 1936 is of Jan. 15, 1936</pre>	% Feb. 15, 1936 is of Feb. 15, 1935	% Feb. 15, 1936 is of Feb. 15, 1924-25-26			
Wheat Corn	\$1.03 .45	\$1.01 .42	\$.97 .82	\$1.41 .64	102 107	106 55	73 70'			
Oats Barley	.22 .40	.21 .37	.51 .90	.39 .61	105 108	43 44	56 66			
Rye Flax	.44 1.64 .46	.39 1.65 .41	.59 1.70 .36	.82 2.57 .80	113 199 112	75 96 128	53 64 58			
Fotatous Hogs Cattle	9.60 6.60	9.10 6.30	7.40 5.70	8.88 5.54	105 105	130 116	108 119			
Calves Lambs-shee	9.50	8.40 8.75	6.60 7.08	8.50 11.63	113 100	144 124	112 75			
Chickens Eggs	.151	.153	.116 .24	.167 .30	99 110	130 89	90 70			
Butterfat Hay	.37 5.74	.35 5.76	.37 16.96	.45 11.41	106 99	100 34	82 50			
Milk	1.73	1.72	1.69	2.19	101	102	. 79			

*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* Feb. Jan. Feb. Av. Feb. 1936 1936 1935 1924-26 U.S. farm price index 77.0 77.0 78.0 100.0 Minnesota farm price index 87.0 85.0 87.0 100.0 U.S. purchasing power of farm products 98.0 95.0 96.0 100.0 106.0 107.0 Minnesota purchasing power of farm products 111.0 100.0 16.8 8.4 11.4 U.S. hog-corn ratio 16.7 Minnesota hog-corn ratio 21.3 21.7 9.0 13.7 18.2 18.3 Minnesota egg-grain ratio 17.2 15.2 49.4 36.4 49.1 22.7 Minnesota butterfat-farm-grain ratio

^{*}Explanations of the computation of these data are given in Farm Business Notes No. 144.