



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

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.*



MINNESOTA farm business NOTES



NO. 385

ST. PAUL CAMPUS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

JULY 29, 1957

Farmers Have Changed Their Cropping Systems

S. A. Engene and F. T. Hady*

Minnesota farmers have made big changes in their cropping systems since 1920 (see table 1). They have increased corn acreage by almost one-third. Most of this increase has been in the corn belt counties. To some extent it is due to a northward movement.

One of the most spectacular changes has been the introduction and rapid increase in soybeans. Most of the soybeans are raised in the southern part of the state, with the heaviest concentration along a line from Blue Earth to Mankato to Montevideo. With development of new varieties this crop also is spreading northward.

Potato acreage has fallen very sharply. In the 1920's, potatoes were of commercial importance in most parts of the state. Now almost two-thirds of the potato crop is in the Red River Valley.

Farmers in all parts of the state except the southwest corner have increased the acreage of oats. However, the change has not been large.

Barley acreage has been up and down. It now is near the level of the

| Period | Corn | Soybeans | Potatoes | Oats | Barley | Spring wheat | Winter wheat | Flax | Rye | All hay | Total |
|---------|---------------|----------|----------|-------|--------|--------------|--------------|-------|-----|---------|--------|
| | (1,000 acres) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1921-24 | 4,173 | † | 414 | 4,249 | 932 | 1,871 | 108 | 466 | 837 | 4,112 | 17,162 |
| 1925-29 | 4,199 | † | 314 | 4,413 | 1,613 | 1,615 | 157 | 712 | 418 | 4,216 | 17,657 |
| 1930-34 | 4,796 | † | 350 | 4,280 | 1,826 | 1,253 | 148 | 719 | 364 | 4,298 | 18,034 |
| 1935-39 | 4,591 | 47 | 264 | 4,198 | 2,100 | 1,798 | 199 | 705 | 495 | 4,344 | 18,694 |
| 1940-44 | 4,925 | 182 | 215 | 4,283 | 1,443 | 1,158 | 148 | 1,411 | 216 | 4,362 | 18,343 |
| 1945-49 | 5,488 | 707 | 131 | 5,015 | 887 | 1,107 | 92 | 1,323 | 160 | 3,903 | 18,813 |
| 1950-54 | 5,399 | 1,349 | 78 | 5,125 | 1,187 | 914 | 59 | 1,111 | 140 | 3,805 | 19,158 |
| 1955 | 5,815 | 2,286 | 81 | 4,828 | 1,175 | 601 | 33 | 843 | 115 | 3,900 | 19,677 |
| 1956 | 5,734 | 2,697 | 85 | 4,297 | 975 | 690 | 37 | 995 | 99 | 3,848 | 19,457 |

* Source: Minnesota Agricultural Statistics, State-Federal Crop and Livestock Reporting Service.

† Not available.

1920's. Many farmers have substituted barley for wheat in the northern part of the Red River Valley. Farmers in the west central counties have held their acreage about steady. In other areas, farmers have almost eliminated the crop.

Wheat acreage also has gone down sharply. Farmers in most sections of the state used to raise some wheat; now it is important only in the Red River Valley.

The trend in flax production has been upward. Most flax is grown in the western half of the state.

Rye has almost disappeared. It now is grown mostly on sandy land—especially in the east-central part of the state.

Hay acreage rose slowly until about 1940, and has fallen somewhat since that time. It has held steady or increased slightly north of a line drawn from the southeast to the northwest corner of the state. It has fallen by about one-fourth south of that line.

This shift in crops has meant a change in cropping patterns within the different sections of the state. This is shown in tables 2 through 9. The location of the various areas is shown on the map.

The acreage of corn in Area 1 (southeast Minnesota) has increased; it is now one-third of all crops harvested. Adding soybeans brings intertilled crops to more than 40 percent of the harvested crops. Small grains other than oats have

almost disappeared. The changes in Area 2 (south central) have been nearly

Table 2. Crops Harvested—Area 1

| Crop | 1921-24 | 1950-54 |
|--------------------|---------------|---------|
| | (1,000 acres) | |
| Corn | 524 | 669 |
| Soybeans | 0 | 164 |
| Oats | 541 | 619 |
| Other small grains | 405 | 80 |
| Hay | 497 | 533 |
| Total | 1,967 | 2,065 |


Table 3. Crops Harvested—Area 2

| Crop | 1921-24 | 1950-54 |
|--------------------|---------------|---------|
| | (1,000 acres) | |
| Corn | 916 | 1,231 |
| Soybeans | 0 | 354 |
| Oats | 628 | 1,014 |
| Other small grains | 762 | 188 |
| Hay | 853 | 665 |
| Total | 3,159 | 3,452 |

Table 4. Crops Harvested—Area 3

| Crop | 1921-24 | 1950-54 |
|--------------------|---------------|---------|
| | (1,000 acres) | |
| Corn | 1,178 | 1,405 |
| Soybeans | 0 | 326 |
| Oats | 1,057 | 970 |
| Other small grains | 246 | 304 |
| Hay | 476 | 332 |
| Total | 2,957 | 3,337 |

(Continued on pages 2 and 3)



* Agricultural Research Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Grass-Legume Seed Marketing Channels

Harold C. Pederson

Farmers, Agricultural program leaders, and the seed trade all share interest in the marketing of grass and small-seeded legumes. This interest has increased with the recent developments in the Soil Bank program in agriculture.

Furthermore, there has been a rather steady increase in the production and use of grass and small-seeded legume seed during the past 50 years. This is due partially to improved farm practices and more emphasis on both grassland farming and soil conservation. Such trends suggest the wide-spread importance of these seeds, even though they do not loom large in cash farm receipts or farm production expenses.

The North Central states figure heavily in the production and use of grass and small-seeded legume seed. The Marketing Research Report No. 158 by the USDA, AMS, Marketing Research Division titled "Seed Marketing Channels" summarizes a study conducted on such seeds.

This 11-state area produces more than one-third of the principal seeds in question and consumes a major share also. It has about 36 percent of the known wholesale producers handling these seeds.

Grass seed, as defined in this report, includes: (1) the principal grass seeds (timothy, Kentucky bluegrass, rye grass, orchard grass, brome grass, Sudangrass, and tall fescue) as well as redtop and other fescues which accounted for more than four-fifths of the total grass seed covered in this study, and (2) the main small-seeded legume seeds handled including alfalfa, red clover, alsike clover, sweetclover, Ladino clover, white clover, and lespedeza.

This report describes: (1) the marketing channels and methods used by wholesalers in handling certified and noncertified seeds of different grasses and small-seeded legumes, and (2) the functions of and services rendered by wholesale dealers of these seeds.

Unlike most farm crops, the seeds under consideration are both produced and consumed by farmers. Furthermore, these seed crops encountered a large degree of instability in the production phase. A large share of the crop is not even planned. The weather, availability of harvesting equipment, and other factors influence the producers in deciding whether or not the crop will be used for hay, pasture, or seed. In other instances, the soil-building

characteristics are given first consideration.

In recent years, the annual farm value of this group of grass and small-seeded legume seed in Minnesota amounted to around a tenth of the total farm value of these seeds reported for the United States with red clover seed leading the list in importance.

The local country seedsmen sell back to the farmers in the same or other rural areas. No data are available on the volume of seed moving between farmers or on the quantity bought, sold, or traded by country elevators, farm implement dealers, and others.

However, local trading in these seeds seems to have been minimized in recent years. The reasons given are: (1) increased use of specialized production areas, and (2) rising importance of certified seed. This means farmers have become more dependent on commercial seed dealers.

Wholesale seed dealers depend upon the farmers for their seed supply and their markets. These dealers first assemble seeds from producing areas, then select, test, blend, process, and distribute the seeds into consumer channels in compliance with both state and federal laws. Directing this flow is an important function.

More specific observations noted from this study included:

- Almost half of the grass and small-seeded legume seed purchased by wholesale dealers in the North Central states was obtained from country buyers, shippers, and assemblers. Other wholesale dealers supplied nearly a third, while one-fifth came directly from producers.

- Nearly all wholesalers clean these seeds. Many firms reclean seeds already cleaned. About four-fifths of the alfalfa and clover seed was packaged in bushel containers.

- Of the total of these small seeds handled by wholesalers in 1954-55, about 60 percent were legumes sold mostly to retailers. By contrast, other wholesalers were the largest receivers of the grass seeds.

- Most of the small-seeded legume seeds handled by wholesale dealers in the North Central states went to purchasers in these same states. Substantial amounts of grass seeds went to the Northeast, Southeast, and Great Plains regions.

- The volume of certified seed has increased in recent years causing more merchandising problems.

MINNESOTA farm business NOTES

Prepared by the Department of Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Extension Service.

Published by the University of Minnesota Agricultural Extension Service, Institute of Agriculture, St. Paul 1, Minnesota.

Farmers—

(Continued from page 1)

Table 5. Crops Harvested—Area 4

| Crop | 1921-24 | 1950-54 |
|----------------|---------|---------|
| (1,000 acres) | | |
| Corn | 964 | 1,284 |
| Soybeans | 0 | 431 |
| Oats | 922 | 979 |
| Barley | 211 | 255 |
| Flax | 147 | 363 |
| Wheat | 541 | 129 |
| Rye | 106 | 16 |
| Hay | 603 | 392 |
| Total | 3,494 | 3,849 |

Table 6. Crops Harvested—Area 5

| Crop | 1921-24 | 1950-54 |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|
| (1,000 acres) | | |
| Corn | 157 | 244 |
| Soybeans | 0 | 36 |
| Potatoes | 83 | 4 |
| Oats | 174 | 253 |
| Rye | 84 | 66 |
| Other small grains | 52 | 14 |
| Hay | 357 | 373 |
| Total | 907 | 990 |

Table 7. Crops Harvested—Area 6

| Crop | 1921-24 | 1950-54 |
|----------------|---------|---------|
| (1,000 acres) | | |
| Corn | 214 | 324 |
| Potatoes | 71 | 6 |
| Oats | 345 | 650 |
| Barley | 132 | 167 |
| Flax | 51 | 177 |
| Wheat | 212 | 137 |
| Rye | 139 | 13 |
| Hay | 522 | 611 |
| Total | 1,686 | 2,085 |

Table 8. Crops Harvested—Area 7

| Crop | 1921-24 | 1950-54 |
|----------------|---------|---------|
| (1,000 acres) | | |
| Corn | 143 | 151 |
| Soybeans | 0 | 28 |
| Potatoes | 138 | 44 |
| Oats | 468 | 480 |
| Barley | 189 | 534 |
| Flax | 98 | 284 |
| Wheat | 599 | 594 |
| Rye | 170 | 11 |
| Hay | 420 | 391 |
| Total | 2,225 | 2,517 |

Table 9. Crops Harvested—Area 8

| Crop | 1921-24 | 1950-54 |
|--------------------------|---------------|---------|
| | (1,000 acres) | |
| Corn | 41 | 51 |
| Potatoes | 35 | 8 |
| Oats | 91 | 133 |
| Other small grains | 49 | 66 |
| Hay | 324 | 468 |
| Total | 540 | 726 |

similar. Here, however, the acreage of hay has been decreased.

With the introduction of soybeans, farmers in Area 3 (southwest) have increased the proportion of intertilled crops from 40 percent of cropland harvested to 52 percent. They, too, have

cut the acreage of hay; they now have only one-tenth of the cropland in hay. They never have raised much small grains other than oats; but they have increased the acreage of flax slightly.

Farmers in Area 4 (west central) also have increased the acreage of corn and soybeans and have reduced hay. They have cut the acreage of wheat very sharply and have practically eliminated rye.

In Area 5 (east central) intertilled crops are less important. However, the corn acreage is increasing rapidly. Soybeans are coming into the area. Potatoes were important, but farmers have almost eliminated this crop.

The changes in Area 6 (north cen-

tral) have been quite similar to Area 5. Small grains are important here, and farmers have increased the acreage of oats, barley, and flax.

Corn and soybeans are not very important in Area 7 (Red River Valley); however, the acreage has increased slightly. These farmers have cut the acreage of potatoes, although they now raise more than one-half of the potatoes in the state. They have increased barley and flax very sharply.

Farmers in Area 8 (northeast) have not changed their cropping systems greatly. Hay has continued to be the most important crop, with oats second. Potatoes were an important cash crop; but the acreage has been cut sharply.

S. Minn. Saw Higher Farm Income in 1956

T. R. Nodland and G. A. Pond

The average net cash income of farmers in the Southeastern Minnesota Farm Management Association was 6 percent higher in 1956 than 1955 and 26 percent higher than the five-year average, 1950-54 (see table 1). The corresponding increase for the Southwestern Minnesota Farm Management Association was 11 percent over 1955 and 11 percent over the 1950-54 average.

The farms in these associations were

somewhat larger than the average of the area. However, they represent the same general type of farming and reflect the effect of changes in crop yields, prices, and other factors affecting the financial returns in farming during the period.

In the Southeastern Association, the net cash income in 1956 exceeded that for any year from 1950 through 1955. In the Southwestern Association, 1953 was the only year in which the net cash income exceeded that of 1956.

Table 1. Cash Receipts, Expenses, and Net Cash Income on Farms in Southern Minnesota, 1955 and 1956

| | Southeastern Minnesota | | | Southwestern Minnesota | | |
|---|------------------------|----------|----------|------------------------|----------|----------|
| | Average 1950-54 | 1955 | 1956 | Average 1950-54 | 1955 | 1956 |
| Number of farms | 162 | 165 | 165 | 138 | 146 | 135 |
| Acres per farm | 225 | 226 | 231 | 265 | 272 | 284 |
| Farm receipts | | | | | | |
| Dairy products | \$4,702 | \$5,145 | \$5,934 | \$1,085 | \$1,091 | \$1,324 |
| Cattle | 2,981 | 2,688 | 2,781 | 8,613 | 8,002 | 11,033 |
| Hogs | 4,253 | 3,525 | 3,717 | 7,455 | 6,147 | 5,797 |
| Sheep and wool | 171 | 327 | 237 | 978 | 798 | 1,344 |
| Poultry and eggs | 1,652 | 1,699 | 1,473 | 1,491 | 1,504 | 1,798 |
| Crop sales | 2,115 | 3,274 | 3,772 | 4,114 | 6,467 | 6,061 |
| Miscellaneous | 878 | 810 | 984 | 925 | 881 | 933 |
| Total farm receipts | \$16,752 | \$17,468 | \$18,898 | \$24,661 | \$24,890 | \$28,290 |
| Farm expenses | | | | | | |
| Cattle bought | 902 | 750 | 947 | 4,312 | 3,963 | 5,702 |
| Other livestock purchases | 393 | 439 | 386 | 1,237 | 1,048 | 1,423 |
| Miscellaneous livestock expense | 360 | 433 | 476 | 378 | 424 | 468 |
| Feed bought | 2,242 | 2,348 | 2,491 | 4,323 | 4,498 | 5,291 |
| Crop expenses | 1,009 | 1,344 | 1,280 | 1,234 | 1,690 | 1,539 |
| Custom work hired | 552 | 649 | 688 | 439 | 587 | 646 |
| New power and machinery | 2,005 | 1,482 | 1,974 | 2,034 | 1,762 | 1,634 |
| Power and mach. upkeep, gas and oil | 1,609 | 1,821 | 1,908 | 1,869 | 2,054 | 2,183 |
| Buildings new and upkeep | 1,351 | 1,010 | 1,112 | 1,193 | 1,058 | 872 |
| Hired labor | 856 | 828 | 878 | 883 | 895 | 863 |
| Personal property and real estate taxes | 632 | 716 | 787 | 622 | 724 | 804 |
| Miscellaneous | 239 | 274 | 296 | 260 | 327 | 358 |
| Total farm expenses | \$12,150 | \$12,094 | \$13,223 | \$18,784 | \$19,030 | \$21,783 |
| Net cash income | 4,602 | 5,374 | 5,675 | 5,877 | 5,860 | 6,507 |

Table 2. Percentage Changes in 1956 from the Averages for 1950-55

| | S. E. Ass'n. | S. W. Ass'n. |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | percent | |
| Size of business | | |
| Acres per farm | 3.0 | 7.0 |
| Milk cows per farm | 9.5 | 7.0 |
| Lbs. hogs per farm | 10.5 | 2.0 |
| Lbs. feeder cattle per farm | 35.5 | 17.5 |
| Hens per farm | 5.6 | 19.4 |
| Crop yields per acre | | |
| Corn, bushels | 28.6 | 24.4 |
| Soybeans, bushels | 29.7 | 11.6 |
| Alfalfa, tons | 5.5 | 8.0 |
| Production per animal | | |
| Butterfat per cow | 10.0 | 4.9 |
| Eggs per hen | 3.6 | 10.5 |
| Feeding efficiency | | |
| Lbs. feed per 100 lbs. hogs | -7.0* | -17.0* |
| Lbs. feed per doz. eggs | -9.0* | -11.5* |

* Minus sign indicates decrease.

The higher net income in 1956 was achieved in spite of lower prices for most products sold by these farmers. Corn prices were 4 percent lower than for the average of the previous 6 years and soybean prices were 10 percent lower. Milk prices were about the same as the average of the previous six years. Both fat cattle and hogs were 24 percent lower in price, and these are important sources of income on these farms. Egg prices averaged 11 percent lower in 1956.

Among the factors accounting for the increased net income in 1956 in the face of falling prices for most of the sale products were: (1) an increase in size of business as indicated by a small increase in acres per farm and in numbers or production of livestock, (2) an increase in crop yields due in part to more favorable weather and to increased fertilizer applications, (3) an increase in production per head of livestock, and (4) an increase in feeding efficiency (see table 2).

Minnesota Farm Prices, May and June, 1957

Prepared by R. A. Andrews

Average Farm Prices for Minnesota, May
1957, June 1955, 1956, 1957*

| | May 1957 | June 1957 | June 1956 | June 1955 |
|-------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Wheat | \$ 2.01 | \$ 2.01 | \$ 2.11 | \$ 2.26 |
| Corn | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.33 | 1.33 |
| Oats | .64 | .62 | .57 | .66 |
| Barley | .91 | .86 | .94 | 1.03 |
| Rye | .97 | 1.00 | .96 | 1.02 |
| Flax | 2.84 | 2.77 | 3.16 | 3.05 |
| Potatoes | .39 | .39 | | 1.30 |
| Hay | 15.60 | 15.40 | 16.10 | 16.40 |
| Soybeans† | 2.12 | 2.09 | 2.82 | 2.22 |
| Hogs | 17.00 | 17.60 | 15.00 | 17.50 |
| Cattle | 17.80 | 18.20 | 16.00 | 17.60 |
| Calves | 20.00 | 20.60 | 18.30 | 18.00 |
| Sheep-lambs | 19.26 | 19.14 | 19.32 | 18.18 |
| Chickens | .103 | .101 | .151 | .168 |
| Eggs | .220 | .230 | .310 | .280 |
| Butterfat | .630 | .630 | .630 | .620 |
| Milk | 3.10 | 3.10 | 3.15 | 2.90 |
| Wool† | .51 | .53 | .41 | .41 |

* Average prices as reported by the USDA.

† Not included in Minnesota farm price indexes.

Wheat, corn, and soybean prices reached their lowest June levels since 1949. The June crop price index fell 20.5 points, or 9 percent, from a year ago to reach the lowest June level since 1944.

The livestock price index increased 15 percent from a year ago. The beef-corn ratio reached its highest point for any month since December 1952.

Comparison of May and June Prices

| Commodity class | Average June prices as a percentage of average May prices |
|--------------------------|---|
| Crops | 99 |
| Livestock | 103 |
| Livestock products | 101 |
| All commodities | 101 |

Indexes for Minnesota Agriculture*

| | Average June 1935-39 | June 1957 | June 1956 | June 1955 |
|--|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| U. S. farm price index | 100 | 228.5 | 234.3 | 230.6 |
| Minnesota farm price index | 100 | 215.3 | 211.0 | 218.6 |
| Minnesota crop price index | 100 | 199.8 | 220.3 | 231.2 |
| Minnesota livestock price index | 100 | 235.0 | 204.1 | 228.6 |
| Minnesota livestock products price index | 100 | 202.8 | 214.4 | 206.9 |
| Purchasing power of farm products | | | | |
| United States | 100 | 96.9 | 102.8 | 102.5 |
| Minnesota | 100 | 91.4 | 92.5 | 97.1 |
| U. S. hog-corn ratio | 12.0 | 15.1 | 11.0 | 13.1 |
| Minnesota hog-corn ratio | 15.2 | 16.0 | 11.3 | 13.2 |
| Minnesota beef-corn ratio | 12.8 | 16.5 | 12.0 | 13.2 |
| Minnesota egg-grain ratio | 14.6 | 9.1 | 11.4 | 9.8 |
| Minnesota butterfat-farm-grain ratio | 30.9 | 33.0 | 31.9 | 28.7 |

* Minnesota index weights are the average of sales of the five corresponding months of 1935-39. U. S. index weights are the average sales for 60 months of 1935-39.

The Outlook Corner—Farm Wage Rates

Farmers' production cost rates, in general, have more than doubled since 1940 (table 1). However, some have increased more than others. Farm wage rates, for example, have risen by more than 300 percent, whereas prices of fertilizer and gasoline have advanced 53 and 64 percent, respectively. The cost of electricity per kilowatt-hour has declined about 25 percent since 1940.

Farm wage rates vary by regions too. As of April 1, they were highest in the Pacific region, lowest in East South Central region. The North Central region compared favorably with the average farm wage rates for the entire country.

Compared with a year ago, farm wages increased three times as much in the New England area as in the Pacific area. The North Central region increase was about the same as the average increase for the entire United States, or in some instances slightly

below depending upon the location within the region.

Competition from nonfarm employers is a big factor in differences in farm wage rates between regions. Early this year, earnings of factory workers in the United States averaged \$2.05 an hour or 6.2 percent higher than a year ago.

Wage rates in industry have increased more than farm wage rates during the last year and also over a longer period. In 1956, wage rates of production workers in manufacturing establishments were about 50 percent higher than in 1947-49, whereas farm wage rates rose about 25 percent.

Current short supply of experienced regular farm workers continues and is characteristic of the past several years. However, the need for farm labor will be less this year due mostly to a reduction in crop acreages by cotton and tobacco producers. Labor needs for other crops in other areas, however, will not decrease much.

If one assumes employment levels as a whole to remain high the farm wage rate index won't reverse its trend in the near future. In the meantime, labor-saving practices and opportunities to make labor more productive by adopting improved crop and livestock production practices will probably continue at an accelerated rate.

Table 1. Index Numbers on the Prices of
Goods and Services Used in Farm Production,
United States. (1947-49 = 100)*

| Year(s) or period | Commodities interest, taxes, and wage rates | Commodities only | Wage rates |
|-------------------------|--|---------------------|---------------|
| 1940 | 49 | 52 | 30 |
| 1940-44 | 61 | 62 | 49 |
| 1945-49 | 92 | 91 | 95 |
| 1950 | 104 | 104 | 99 |
| 1951 | 115 | 115 | 109 |
| 1952 | 117 | 116 | 117 |
| 1953 | 112 | 106 | 119 |
| 1954 | 112 | 106 | 119 |
| 1955 | 112 | 105 | 120 |
| 1956 | 114 | 105 | 125 |
| 1957 (Apr.) | 119 | 110 | 131 |

* Farm Cost Situation, AMS, May 1957

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Institute of Agriculture
Agricultural Extension
St. Paul 1, Minn.

SKULI RUTFORD, Director
Minn. 7-7-57-3M
Permit No. 1201

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE
USE TO AVOID PAY-
MENT OF POSTAGE, \$300

FREE—Cooperative Agricultural Extension
Work, Acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914.