

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.

GIANNING FOUNDATION OF

AINAN

(UNIVERSITY OF LONDON)

Ja hur lipis

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

# Farm Management Survey REPORT No. VI

Financial Results for 1951 and for the Five Years 1947 to 1951

By J. B. BUTLER, J. H. HOOPER and R. F. LORD

Copies of this Report may be obtained, 5/- post free, on application to the Secretary, Wye College, Near Ashford, Kent

#### CORRIGENDA

Page 2, para. 1, line 6 - For "county" read "country"

Page 5, para. 6, lines 7 and 9 - For "75" read "70"

## FARM MANAGEMENT SURVEY

### FINANCIAL RESULTS FOR 1951 AND FOR THE FIVE YEARS 1947 TO 1951

THIS report is the sixth in a series, published annually by the Department of Economics of Wye College, dealing with current trends in the financial and economic side of farming in the counties of Kent, Surrey and Sussex. The figures now presented refer to the cropping year 1951 and are based on farm records and accounts for a financial year ending on dates varying from September, 1951 to April, 1952. They form part of a national investigation carried out on behalf of the Ministry of Agriculture by University departments of Agricultural Economics for the purpose of providing statistical information for national use and also of assisting in the local study of problems of farm management and organization.

The survey included, in the year under review, 161 general farms and 35 specialized holdings growing fruit, hops or market garden crops. The farms were widely distributed throughout the three counties, but Kent had a considerably higher representation than the other two, the figures for general farms being, Kent 100, Surrey 16 and Sussex 45. With five exceptions the 35 specialized holdings were all in Kent.

As in previous reports, the farms have been classified by type and not by situation. Apart from certain fruit and hop growing districts, there are few areas in the province where farming systems are at all uniform. Milk production is the most important single enterprise, three-quarters of the farms investigated deriving 30 per cent. or more of their incomes from this source. The farms have, therefore, been grouped according to the proportion of their total income which came from sales of milk, without reference to geographical situation.

#### FARMING IN 1951

By 1951 the pattern of post-war farming was becoming well established and British farmers had settled down to the task of supplying a considerably larger part of the domestic market than before the War. As a result of balance of payments difficulties and rising overseas living standards, imports of food had declined to about 80 per cent. of the pre-war level. Farming in this country was being carried on, therefore, in conditions of shortage favourable to producers.

Government policy during the year, as indicated at the February, 1951 price review, aimed at maintaining the wheat acreage and encouraging the growing of coarse grains, whilst laying emphasis upon increased meat production. A tendency for seasonal over-supply of milk and eggs, on the other hand, led to some discrimination against these products in fixing prices; and in view of the importance of milk in the South Eastern counties, this policy had a marked effect on farming in the area.

Farmers had considerable difficulties to contend with during the year, due to bad weather. A wet spring, following a wet autumn, hampered arable cultivations and wheat in particular was severely affected. Harvest conditions, too, were far from ideal.

Some information about farming trends during the year, in comparison with previous years, can be obtained from the agricultural statistics. The returns for the counties concerned (Kent, Surrey, East and West Sussex) show some interesting features.

#### Table I

#### Crops and Livestock Changes in Kent, Surrey and Sussex

,		1947	1950	1951
Wheat (acres)	••	123,372	139,210	125,474
Barley (acres)	••	71,517	67,81 <b>5</b>	73,472
Oats and Mixed Corn (acres)	••	127,811	156,004	142,590
Temporary Grass (acres)	••	181,464	191,763	212,213
Cows and Heifers	••	132,077	141,487	140,347
Sheep	•• •	566,780	534,861	559,180
Pigs	•••	77,904	156,785	184,178
Poultry	•••	2,299,742	3,679,303	3,827,529

There was a 10 per cent. reduction in the wheat acreage in 1951 compared with 1950, partly due to the unfavourable autumn weather conditions, but reflecting also the tendency to grow barley in place of wheat, since the area of barley increased by over 5,000 acres or 8 per cent. The acreage of oats and mixed corn fell substantially and there was an increase of about 10 per cent. in leys. These trends are in line with those for the county as a whole. The increase in leys and the reduction in oats and mixed corn are an indication of the growing reliance upon grass as a source not only of summer grazing but also, in the form of silage or hay, of winter feed; for the greater part of the increase in the area of leys was under the head of temporary grass for mowing.

Dairy cows, which had been increasing steadily in numbers since 1947, were slightly less numerous in 1951. Recent price policy, directed towards checking further expansion in milk production, has already been mentioned and the effects of this policy can be seen in the returns. Sheep, which were fewer in numbers in 1950 than in 1947, increased in 1951; but this increase was the culmination of a steady process of recovery from the very low levels of 1948, the aftermath of the severe winter of 1946-7.

A very striking feature of the farming of the province in recent years is the rapid increase in the numbers of pigs and poultry. Pigs increased from 78,000 in 1947 to 157,000 in 1950 and 184,000 in 1951. In 1947 there were nearly two dairy cows and more than seven sheep for every pig. By 1951 pigs outnumbered cows and the ratio of sheep to pigs was down to three to one. Pig numbers in 1947 were at their lowest ebb since the War and the increase in numbers since that date has been continuous. The provisional returns for 1952, incidentally, show a further very large increase and there is some reason to doubt whether the market will continue to absorb increased production of pig products on this scale at current prices.

Poultry, although not rising in numbers so rapidly as pigs, went up by some 65 per cent. between 1947 and 1951. The number of fowls kept increased rapidly after the end of the War until 1949, when the rate of increase tended to slow down and between 1950 and 1951 the rise in poultry numbers was only some 5 per cent.

Summarizing these changes, it is clear that the year 1951 witnessed a considerable shift in emphasis from dairying to other intensive livestock enterprises, particularly pigs; that grass was becoming increasingly important in the farm economy and that there was some change over to barley growing in place of wheat. These were all, however, relatively minor changes which left unaffected the main system of farming in most of the area, with its reliance on milk production as the main enterprise. The changes represented a slowing up of the rate of expansion in dairying and a tendency to think in terms of other subsidiary livestock enterprises as alternatives to the keeping of more cows. The reliance on home grown foodstuffs continued but with greater use of grass and a more restricted use of oats and mixed corn.

#### PRICES IN 1951

These notes on the changes taking place in the cropping and stocking of farms may be supplemented by some data on price trends:

#### TABLE II

#### Indices of Price Changes 1947-51 1947=100

1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.													
						1947		1948		1949		1950	1951
Wheat	••	•••	••		••	100		119		122		133	141
Barley	• •	••	• •		••	100	•**	115		109		118	176
	•••		• •	•••	• •	100		105		112		118	125
Fat Baconers		••	••	••		100		106	1	124		140	156
All Farm Pro		••	••	· · ·	••	100		103		107		112	122
Farm Wages		•••	• •	·	• • •	100		108	19	112	÷	114	122
General Whol	esale	Price	Index	•••	•••	100		114	1. 1.	120		137	167

(Recalculated from The Farm Economist and N.F.U. Information Service.)

Prices of farm products increased less rapidly than general wholesale prices; but in both cases the increase was greater between 1950 and 1951 than in previous years. The rapid increase in barley prices, compared with those for wheat, explains the attractions of barley growing during the year (although the wide difference in price between malting and other barleys must not be forgotten).

The relationship between the movements of prices for milk and bacon respectively also provides an adequate explanation of the rapid increase in the number of pigs kept.

#### FINANCIAL RESULTS OF GENERAL FARMS

The average results of the 161 general farms included in the survey are summarized in Table III. In interpreting this and subsequent tables it must be noted that the figures shown for the various items of expenditure and revenue are in all cases net figures and not simply cash payments or cash receipts. For example, expenditure on foodstuffs is not necessarily the amount actually bought during the year but consists of cash purchases *plus* the quantity in stock in the opening valuation *minus* the quantity in stock in the closing valuation and minus also any sales. Similarly, revenue from, say, sheep is made up of sales of sheep plus closing valuation *minus* opening valuation and purchases, and thus represents the actual net output from the sheep flock during the year. When prepared in this way, the tables show the actual cost or revenue attributable to each item and give a clearer picture of the results than figures relating only to sales and purchases.

#### Table III

#### 1048 1947 1949 1950 1951 No. of Farms . 168 164 171 166 161 Average size (adjusted acres) 258 233 253 227 230 £ £ f. Expenditure per 100 acres 2,042 2,209 2,345 2,467 2,624 • Revenue per 100 acres 2,687 2,253 2,550 3,058 . . . . 2,744 Profit per 100 acres ... 211 341 342 277 434 874 42·8 Total labour per 100 acres 935 920 931 935 Labour as percentage of total expenditure 35.6 42.3 39 • 1 37.7 Revenue per £100 labour 258 273 292 295 327 Capital invested per 100 acres 2,209 2,033 2,376 2,575 2,345 No. of farms showing a profit 120 115 111 120 122 . . . . No. of farms showing a loss 49 46 46 . . 53 39

#### General Farms: Summary of Results, 1947 to 1951

The trend of financial results in the post-war period has already been discussed in previous reports\*. 1951 showed a continuation of the trend. Prices continued to rise, which affected both the amount received for produce sold and also the cost of production. This continuous upward trend in the price level no doubt had a stimulating effect, but it led to a number of problems of adjustment between costs and income, aggravated in some cases by the operation of the price review procedure with its tendency to cause a time lag between rising costs and the adjustment of prices.

A more precise picture of the short term changes is obtained from a comparison confined to the same farms in successive years, as this eliminates any effects of changes in the sample. In Table IV the results of those farms, 147 in number, which were included in the scheme in both 1950 and 1951 are shown.

#### TABLE IV

						1050		1051
Acreage						1950		1951
	••	••	••	•••	234	0/	232	
Expenditure					Ł	%	£	%
Labour	••	••	•••	••	902	37.7	939	36.1
Purchased Foods	÷ •	• •	• •	•••	352	14.7	432	16.6
Manures and Seeds	••	•••	• •		274	11.5	315	12.0
Rent and Rates		••			154	6.4	164	6.3
Machinery Expenses	;				462	19.3	485	18.7
Sundries					250	10.4	268	10.3
	•••		•••	••	-5*		200	10 5
TOTAL EXPENDITUR	E	••	••	••	2,394	100.0	2,603	100.0
								Manda and
Revenue					• • •	,		
Livestock	••	••	••.	• • •	515	19.2	673	21.9
Milk	÷.			۰.	1,150	42.7	1,219	39.7
Crops	•••	• •	••		885	32.9	1,027	33.4
Sundries		•••			142	5.2	151	5.0
TOTAL REVENUE	• •	••	••	••	2,692	100.0	, 3,070	100.0
Durch								<u> </u>
Profit	••		••	••	298		467	
Revenue per £100 labo	ur	• •	••	••	298		327	
Capital invested	••	••	••	••	2,253		2,566	

#### Summarized Results for the same 147 Farms, 1950 and 1951 (Per 100 acres)

Both expenditure and income showed consistent increases, comparable in amount with the rise in the general price level indicated in Table II. Expenditure, however, rose by only 8 per cent. and revenue by 14 per cent. with the result that the margin of profit increased substantially. This result was brought about (or accompanied) by several changes in the organization of the farms under review.

Milk declined somewhat in importance (from about 43 per cent. of all revenue to about 40 per cent.) and since the price of milk failed to keep pace with the general rise in prices (see Table II) this helped to improve the net result.

There was an increase in the value of livestock sales considerably greater in magnitude than the decrease in milk and proportionately greatest in pigs, sales of which increased by 45 per cent. compared with 1950 (although they still provided only 4 per cent. of total revenue).

In spite of the increase of 8s. per week in the minimum wage which occurred in October, 1951, expenditure on Labour increased very little and actually decreased as a proportion of total costs. This decrease was not due to any substantial increase in machinery costs for this item, too, remained stable. Table II shows that in fact wages

\* Farm Management Survey, Report No. V.

rose less than the majority of other costs between 1950 and 1951 and the reduction in expenditure on labour is a reflection of this fact.

The cost of foods, seeds and manures rose substantially owing to rising prices.

Rents and rates rose very slightly, from 30s. 10d. per acre to 32s. 10d., but rents remained much below current values on most farms. There was considerable variation in rents, the smaller farms being more highly rented than the large and farms recently let usually having considerably higher rents than those let at an earlier date. Interest payable on improvements frequently formed quite a substantial part of the rent payment.

The combination of higher revenue and almost stationary labour costs resulted in an appreciable improvement in the revenue per  $\pounds$  100 labour. For comparisons between farms this is a useful measure of labour efficiency, but in view of the rise in prices, it is probable that the apparent increase of 10 per cent. in labour productivity means simply that physical output per man remained about the same in 1951 as in 1950, but was valued at higher prices in the latter year.

The capital invested in the farms, as indicated by the average valuation, increased slightly, but not significantly, over the period: a precise measure of the value of capital investment is not possible from the data available.

#### EFFECTS OF SIZE AND TYPE OF FARMING

An average figure, based on farms of widely differing sizes and types, must necessarily mask many individual variations. In order to bring out some of these and to see what indications there are that some types or sizes of farms may be more successful than others under present conditions, the data have been divided in Table V into sub groups in which three main types of farming are distinguished. Each of these is then divided again according to size. The classification by type has been made according to the part played by milk production in the economy of the farm. Those farms on which 75 per cent. or more of the total revenue came from sales of milk are classed as "dairy farms". Where the proportion of milk was between 30 per cent. and 75 per cent. the farms are regarded as "mixed" and a third group, in which milk sales were negligible, are classed as "non-milk farms". The last group is the most varied, for the smaller holdings under this heading were often specialists in livestock, such as pigs or poultry, whereas the larger units were arable farms having, in many cases, cattle or sheep as a subsidiary enterprise. Market garden holdings and farms specializing in such intensive crops as fruit and hops have been excluded from the sample.

In comparing farms of different sizes it is important to remember that the labour cost shown includes the value of the farmer's manual work. This is likely to be more important on the small farms than on the larger holdings.

The main points which emerge from a consideration of the figures may be summarized as follows:

INTENSITY OF CULTIVATION. The most intensively cultivated farms were the small dairy farms, which had a turnover approaching  $\pounds 40$  per acre. Mixed farms over 400 acres and non-milk farms over 100 acres had a turnover around  $\pounds 25$  per acre.

LABOUR. Labour requirements were highest on dairy farms and lowest on farms where no cows were kept. The difference, however, was not large on the small farms where other livestock tended to take the place of cows and it was on the arable farms that the smaller labour requirement was most noticeable. Increase in acreage tended to lead to reduction in labour cost per acre, but this tendency was by no means uniform.

MECHANIZATION. Machinery costs (fuel, repairs and depreciation) averaged between  $\pounds 5$  and  $\pounds 6$  per acre on most farms, but where the level of cultivation was less intensive (i.e. on farms over 400 acres and on the larger non-milk farms) it fell to below

#### TABLE V

	0–100 acres	101–250 acres	251–400 acres	Over 400 acres	All farms
MILK PRODUCERS (over 70 per cent. of Revenue from Milk)		-		1	
No. of farms	21	12			36*
Labour cost	£ 1,281	£ 1,155		· _ ·	1,209
Machinery costs	554	586			558
Contract work	125	61			77
Total and address	3,947	3,388			3,592
Tetal					3,891
Draft	3,983	3,544			
	36	156			299
Revenue per £100 labour	311	307			322
MIXED FARMS (30 per cent70 per cent. Revenue from Milk)					
No. of farms	20	35	13	23	91
	· £	55 1	£		£
Labour cost	1,226		1,216	£ 808	
Machinemy costs		1,034			947 489
Company of anomin	540	550	546	442	•
	104	109	117	40	72
Total expenditure	3,647	3,065	3,054	2,151	2,583
Total revenue	3,777	3,377	3,555	2,570	2,976
Profit	130	312	501	419	393
Revenue per £100 labour	308	327	292	318	314
Non-Milk Farms		,			
No. of farms	II	15	5		34*
	£	£	5 £		£
Labour cost	1,092	686	716	·	732
Machinery costs	574	440	411		485
Contract work	199	62	167		83
Total amon diture	3,302	1,882	2,048		2,196
Tatal martine					2,861
Drofit	3,712	2,318	2,762	_	665
	410	436	714	-	
Revenue per £100 labour	340	-33 <sup>8</sup>	386		391

#### Summary of Results by Size and Type Groups (Per 100 acres)

\* NOTE.—Where the total number of farms differs from the sum of the groups it is due to the inclusion of larger farms which were too few in numbers to be shown separately.

 $\pounds 4$  10s. per acre. On all but the largest group of farms the use of contract services provided a substantial supplement to the mechanical resources of the farm itself.

PROFIT. In considering profitability it must be remembered that the manual work done by the farmer has been deducted from the profits shown (and is included in the "labour" figure) so that, on the smaller farms particularly, the total income derived from the farm by the occupier is often appreciably higher than the profit shown in the table: for example, on farms of less than 100 acres approximately £230 per 100 acres was the average value of manual work done by the farmer and this has to be added to the profit to arrive at the total income from the farm. For this reason, any detailed comparison of relative profitability is of little value, especially where the smaller farms are concerned. It does appear, however, as was indicated by a similar analysis of 1950 results in last year's report, that the non-milk farms tend to be the most profitable enterprises and that profitability tends to increase with size.

These results are not unexpected. We have already seen that the declining profitability of milk has led many farmers to seek for more remunerative alternatives. With regard to size, the economic weakness of the small mixed farm is well known; it springs mainly from the difficulty of carrying out arable farming efficiently in units too small for the economic employment of adequate machinery and from the organizational problems arising where buildings are often inadequate and layout poor.

#### SPECIALIST FARMS

Farms specializing in the production of fruit, hops or vegetables have been excluded from the sample upon which the discussion of farming trends has so far been based. The organization and management of such farms presents special problems and the economic conditions for their success are different from those of more normal holdings. Specialist farms of this kind, however, form an important part of the agriculture of the area, particularly of Kent, and in order to give some idea of their progress, records were obtained from a limited number of such farms and are summarized in Table VI.

#### TABLE VI

		Fruit farms	Hop farms	Market gardens
No. of farms	··· ·· ·· ··	7 125	14 216 1	
Labour per 100 acres Machinery costs per 100 acres Total expenditure per 100 acres Total revenue per 100 acres Profit per 100 acres Capital invested per 100 acres Revenue per £100 labour Profit per farm		2,865 1,155 6,708 8,295 1,587 6,295 290 1,991	2,396 904 5,443 6,250 807 3,819 261 1,741	$\begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ 3,9^{27} \\ & & & \\ 1,322 \\ & & & \\ 8,654 \\ & & & \\ 8,345 \\ (\text{Loss}) & 309 \\ & & & \\ 5,507 \\ & & \\ 212 \\ (\text{Loss}) & 127 \end{array}$

#### Results of Farms Growing Special Crops, 1951

The farms growing hops were larger in size and employed less capital and less labour than the fruit and market garden holdings. Hop growing is carried out as a part of mixed farming and, although the hop garden is usually the most important (and most remunerative) part of the farm, it is not the sole enterprise. Fruit and vegetables, on the other hand, are frequently the only important products on farms specializing in these branches. As a result of this, the comparison of profits, or of costs and returns, does not indicate the relative profitability of the crops themselves but only of the farms upon which they are grown. The groups are too small for accurate generalization, but on the farms studied there was a very remarkable difference in profitability between the hop and fruit farms on the one hand, with their substantial profits, and the market gardens which made an aggregate loss.

The results for these farms agree very closely with those recorded last year. The revenue of market garden holdings was slightly lower per 100 acres in 1951 than in 1950 and the small profit of the earlier year was converted into an overall loss in 1951.

#### SUMMARY

A study of the results of 161 general farms and 35 farms growing hops, fruit and market garden crops for the cropping year 1951 leads to the following main conclusions.

(1) The rise in prices of farm products and requisites continued during the year and led to an increase in both costs and revenue. Revenue rose slightly more than costs so that the margin of profit was higher. (2) The increase in revenue corresponded with the rise in the price level of farm products and there is nothing to indicate any marked change in real output.

(3) There were some significant changes in composition of the output on a number of farms. Pig production increased, milk output declined slightly, and there were increases in the acreages of barley and leys, but a net reduction in the area of wheat, partly due to bad weather in the autumn and partly the effect of prices.

(4) In spite of a wage increase during the year, labour costs rose slightly less than the prices of farm products, and there was no further indication of any widespread replacement of manual labour by machinery.

(5) Profits tended to be higher on farms concentrating on enterprises other than dairying (e.g. arable cropping, pigs or poultry). The larger holdings again had rather better results than the smaller ones.

(6) The profit earned on small dairy farms of under 100 acres, was low, averaging only 7s. per acre, but on farms of this size the farmer earned, on the average, a further 46s. per acre, which represented the value of his manual work.

(7) Specialist hop and fruit growing farms again showed a much higher degree of intensity than general farms and made higher profits. Market garden holdings had a bad year and showed an aggregate loss.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The results given in this report could not have been obtained without the active help of the farmers concerned and to these farmers acknowledgement of their cooperation is gratefully made.

June, 1953.

#### APPENDIX

#### SCHEDULE OF DEFINITIONS

Adjusted Acreage. Allowance is made for rough grazing and other relatively poor land.

EXPENDITURE

- Labour. Hired: All hired labour, including salaried management. Family: Allowance for work done by relations and family workers. Farmer: Manual work done by the farmer.
- Foods. All purchased foodstuffs, hay, straw and payment for stock put out to keep.

Note.—In arriving at the expenditure figures for foods, seeds, manures and sundries, the opening and closing stocks on hand are taken into account.

Seeds. All seeds, plants, bushes and trees purchased.

- Manures. All mixtures, lime, slag, organic and other manures. Subsidies on lime are deducted. No allowance is made for home produced farmyard manure.
- Rent and Rates. Rent and/or rental value of the occupied land, rates on the farmhouse and cottages and drainage rates.

Repairs. Repairs to machinery and implements and the cost of small tools.

*Fuel.* Petrol, paraffin, oil, coke and coal.

Contract Work. Work done by contractors and hire of implements.

Sundries. All other expenses not included above.

Implement Depreciation is obtained by adding together the opening valuation and the cost of new implements and deducting the closing valuation and sales of implements.

Revenue

*Livestock Output* is arrived at by deducting the opening valuation plus purchases from the closing valuation plus sales.

- *Milk*. All wholesale and retail milk, excluding allowances to workers and the farmhouse, minus milk purchased.
- Crops. Sales of crops plus valuation of harvested and growing crops and tillages at the end of the year, *minus* the valuation of harvested and growing crops and tillages at the beginning of the year.

Fruit. All fruit sales.

Hops. All hop sales.

- Sundries. Allowances for milk and other produce to workers and to farmhouse; also rent and rates on farmhouse and cottages, and all other sales not included above.
- Government Grants. The grant for ploughing up eligible pastures, for rearing calves and assistance towards drainage and water supply schemes. Crop acreage payments appear under crops.

#### Profit

Realized. The excess of receipts over payments.

Unrealized. The amount by which the total valuations at the end of the year exceed those at the beginning of the year.

#### AVERAGE VALUATIONS

The average of the opening and closing valuations of live and dead stock, etc.

#### CAPITAL INVESTED

Taken as equivalent to the average valuations.

## TABLE I

## Average Results for 1951 General Farms

	No. of farms	••	••	••	161
	Average acreage (total)	••	••	••	249
· ·	Average acreage (adjusted)	••	••	••	230

$\pounds$ $\pounds$ $\pounds$ $\pounds$ Labour : Hired         1,971       854         Family         30       13         Farmer         158       68         TOTAL         2,159       935         Foodstuffs         2,159       935         Foodstuffs         1,003       435         Seeds          1,34         Manures          300       134         Manures           326       129         Depreciation on machinery, etc.          331       143         Contract work           465       201         Total Expenditure            465       201         Total Expenditure                Total Expenditure         <	32 · 5 0 · 5 2 · 6 35 · 6 16 · 5 5 · 1 7 · 0 6 · 3 8 · 7 4 · 8 5 · 5 2 · 8 7 · 7 100 · 0 9 · 1
Labour: Hired         1,971 $854$ Family         30       13         Farmer         158       68         TOTAL         1,003       435         Seeds         310       134         Manures         380       164         Repairs and renewals         229       229         Depreciation on machinery, etc.        288       125         Fuel          311       143         Contract work           326         TotAL Expenditure              TotAL Expenditure              TotAL Expenditure               Kevenue                Livestock output :	0.5 2.6 35.6 16.5 5.1 7.0 6.3 8.7 4.8 5.5 2.8 7.7 100.0
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0.5 2.6 35.6 16.5 5.1 7.0 6.3 8.7 4.8 5.5 2.8 7.7 100.0
Farmer $158$ $68$ TOTAL $2,159$ $935$ Foodstuffs $1,003$ $435$ Seeds $1,003$ $435$ Manures $310$ $134$ Manures $426$ $184$ Rent and rates $380$ $164$ Repairs and renewals $526$ $229$ Depreciation on machinery, etc. $288$ $125$ Fuel $311$ $143$ Contract work $465$ $201$ TOTAL EXPENDITURE          Mevenue $6,059$ $2,624$ Revenue	$     \begin{array}{r}       2 \cdot 6 \\       35 \cdot 6 \\       16 \cdot 5 \\       5 \cdot 1 \\       7 \cdot 0 \\       6 \cdot 3 \\       8 \cdot 7 \\       4 \cdot 8 \\       5 \cdot 5 \\       2 \cdot 8 \\       7 \cdot 7 \\       100 \cdot 0 \\       9 \cdot 1   \end{array} $
TOTAL $2,159$ 935         Foodstuffs $1,003$ 435         Seeds $310$ $134$ Manures $310$ $134$ Manures $310$ $134$ Manures $426$ $184$ Rent and rates $380$ $164$ Repairs and renewals $526$ $229$ Depreciation on machinery, etc. $288$ $125$ Fuel $311$ $143$ Contract work $465$ $201$ Total Expenditure $6,059$ $2,624$ Revenue $6,059$ $2,624$ Revenue $6,059$ $2,624$ Revenue $6,059$ $2,624$ Revenue $6,059$ $2,624$ </td <td>35.6 16.5 5.1 7.0 6.3 8.7 4.8 5.5 2.8 7.7 100.0</td>	35.6 16.5 5.1 7.0 6.3 8.7 4.8 5.5 2.8 7.7 100.0
Foodstuffs        I,003       435         Seeds        310       134         Manures         310       134         Manures         426       184         Rent and rates         380       164         Repairs and renewals         229         Depreciation on machinery, etc.        288       125         Fuel         331       143         Contract work         171       74         Sundries         465       201         TotAL Expenditure          Livestock output :        6,059       2,624         Revenue          455       197         Pigs          425       128	16.5 5.1 7.0 6.3 8.7 4.8 5.5 2.8 7.7 100.0
Seeds $310$ $134$ Manures $426$ $184$ Rent and rates $380$ $164$ Repairs and renewals $526$ $229$ Depreciation on machinery, etc. $288$ $125$ Fuel $331$ $143$ Contract work $465$ $201$ Total Expenditure $465$ $201$ Total Expenditure $6,059$ $2,624$ Revenue $6,059$ $2,624$ Revenue $455$ $197$ Pigs $295$ $128$	5 · I 7 · 0 6 · 3 8 · 7 4 · 8 5 · 5 2 · 8 7 · 7 100 · 0 9 · I
Seeds $310$ $134$ Manures $426$ $184$ Rent and rates $380$ $164$ Repairs and renewals $526$ $229$ Depreciation on machinery, etc. $288$ $125$ Fuel $331$ $143$ Contract work $465$ $201$ Total Expenditure $465$ $201$ Total Expenditure $6,059$ $2,624$ Revenue $6,059$ $2,624$ Revenue $455$ $197$ Pigs $295$ $128$	5 · I 7 · 0 6 · 3 8 · 7 4 · 8 5 · 5 2 · 8 7 · 7 100 · 0 9 · I
Manures        426 $1\overline{84}$ Rent and rates $3\overline{80}$ $164$ Repairs and renewals $526$ $229$ Depreciation on machinery, etc. $2\overline{88}$ $125$ Fuel $331$ $143$ Contract work $171$ $74$ Sundries $465$ $201$ TOTAL EXPENDITURE         Livestock output : $6,059$ $2,624$ Revenue       Livestock output : $641$ $277$ Sheep and wool $455$ $197$ Pigs $295$ $128$	7·0 6·3 8·7 4·8 5·5 2·8 7·7 100·0
Rent and rates $380$ 164         Repairs and renewals $526$ $229$ Depreciation on machinery, etc. $288$ $125$ Fuel $331$ $143$ Contract work $171$ $74$ Sundries $465$ $201$ TotAL EXPENDITURE $6,059$ $2,624$ Revenue         Livestock output : $641$ $277$ Sheep and wool $455$ $197$ Pigs $295$ $128$	6·3 8·7 4·8 5·5 2·8 7·7 100·0
Repairs and renewals $526$ $229$ Depreciation on machinery, etc. $288$ $125$ Fuel $331$ $143$ Contract work $171$ $74$ Sundries $465$ $201$ TOTAL EXPENDITURE         Livestock output :         Cattle          Cattle $6,059$ $2,624$ Revenue         Livestock output : $641$ $277$ Sheep and wool $455$ $197$ Pigs $295$ $128$	8.7 4.8 5.5 2.8 7.7 100.0
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	4 · 8 5 · 5 2 · 8 7 · 7 100 · 0
Fuel          331       143         Contract work         171       74         Sundries         465       201         TOTAL EXPENDITURE        6,059       2,624         Revenue         641       277         Sheep and wool         455       197         Pigs         295       128	5 · 5 2 · 8 7 · 7 100 · 0
Contract work         171       74         Sundries         465       201         TOTAL EXPENDITURE        6,059       2,624         Revenue        6,059       2,624         Revenue         641       277         Sheep and wool         455       197         Pigs         295       128	2·8 7·7 100·0
Sundries	7·7 100·0
TOTAL EXPENDITURE         6,059         2,624           Revenue         Livestock output :         641         277           Sheep and wool          455         197           Pigs           295         128	<u> </u>
REVENUE         641         277           Cattle          455         197           Pigs          295         128	9·1
Livestock output :       641       277         Cattle       641       277         Sheep and wool       455       197         Pigs       295       128	
Livestock output :       641       277         Cattle       641       277         Sheep and wool       455       197         Pigs       295       128	
Cattle          641       277         Sheep and wool         455       197         Pigs         295       128	
Sheep and wool           455         197           Pigs            295         128	
Pigs	6.4
	4.2
	3.1
TOTAL LIVESTOCK 1,609 696	22.8
Milk 2,775 1,202	39.3
Crops 2,260 979	32.0
Fruit 73 32	. ĭ•o
Hops $ -$	
Government grants 63 27	0.0
Sundries	4.0
TOTAL REVENUE <u>7,062</u> <u>3,058</u>	100.0
PROFIT : Realized 486 211	<del></del> '
Unrealized 517 223	
	<u> </u>
TOTAL I,003 434	
Capital invested <u>5,947</u> <u>2,575</u>	·
Cost of new machinery and implements591256Sales of machinery and implements8436	
Sales of machinery and implements 84 36	
Revenue per £100 labour 327 —	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
No. of farms showing a profit 115 —	
No. of farms showing a loss 46 —	

		Per	farm		· Pe	er 100 acr	es (adjuste	ed)		Per	cent.	
Size-group (adjusted acres)	up to 100	101 to 250	251 to 400	over 400	up to 100	101 to 250	251 to 400	over 400	up to 100	101 to 250	251 to 400	over 400
No. of farms in group	52	62	20	27								-
Average size of farms (adjusted acres)	62	164	322	642								
EXPENDITURE : Labour : Hired Family Farmer	£ 496 35 225	£ 1,466 13 123	£ 3,266 11 166	£ 5,015 73 102	£ 799 57 363	£ 895 8 75	£ 1,013 3 52	£ 781 11 16	21·7 1·5 9·8	31·3 0·3 2·6	35·9 0·1 1·8	35·3 0·5 0·7
TOTALFoodstuffsSeedsManuresRent and ratesRepairs and renewalsDepreciation on machineryFuelContract work	756 647 76 95 131 149 91 103 82 159	1,602 905 228 293 250 385 237 250 146 389	3,443 1,325 516 608 514 767 383 485 393 663	5,190 1,672 797 1,232 1,058 1,399 716 841 236 1,085	1,219 1,042 123 154 211 241 146 165 133 256	978 553 139 179 152 235 144 153 89 237	1,068 411 160 189 159 238 119 151 122 205	808 260 124 192 165 218 111 131 36 169	$ \begin{array}{c} 33 \cdot 0 \\ 28 \cdot 3 \\ 3 \cdot 3 \\ 4 \cdot 2 \\ 5 \cdot 7 \\ 6 \cdot 5 \\ 4 \cdot 0 \\ 4 \cdot 5 \\ 3 \cdot 6 \\ 6 \cdot 9 \end{array} $	34.2 19.4 4.8 6.3 5.3 8.2 5.1 5.3 3.1 8.3	37.8 14.6 5.7 6.7 5.7 8.4 4.2 5.3 4.3 7.3	36.5 11.9 5.6 8.7 7.4 9.8 5.0 5.9 1.6 7.6
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	2,289	4,685	9,097	14,226	3,690	2,859	2,822	2,214	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

٠

## TABLE II

### General Mixed Farm Results for 1951 by Size Groups

. Ĭ2

		Per	farm		Pe	er 100 acr	es (adjust	ed)		Per	cent.	
Size-group (adjusted acres)	up to 100	101 to 250	251 to 400	over 400	up to 100	101 to 250	251 to 400	over 400	up to 100	101 to 250	251 to 400	over 400
REVENUE : Livestock output : Cattle Sheep and wool Pigs Poultry and eggs	53 190	£ 478 320 255 200	£ 920 567 417 133	£ 1,675 1,459 499 34 <sup>8</sup>	£ 304 86 306 331	£ 292 195 156 122	£ .286 .176 .129 .41	£ 261 227 78 54	7·9 2·2 8·0 8·6	9·2 6·2 4·9 3·8	8·3 5·1 3·8 1·2	9.6 8.4 2.9 2.0
Тотац Milk Crops Fruit Hops Government grants Sundries	1,308 309 -34 -80 -80	$ \begin{array}{r}     1,253 \\     2,528 \\     1,119 \\     31 \\     \\     227 \\     36 \\ \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{r} 2,037\\ 4,084\\ 4,362\\ 73\\ -\\ 429\\ 73\\ \end{array} $	3,981 5,203 7,079 246 	1,027 2,110 498 54 	765 1,542 683 19  139 22	$ \begin{array}{r}                                     $	620 810 1,101 <u>38</u> <u>-</u> 107 33	$ \begin{array}{r} 26.7 \\ 54.9 \\ 13.0 \\ 1.4 \\ \hline{} \\ 3.3 \\ 0.7 \\ \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{r}     24 \cdot 1 \\     48 \cdot 7 \\     21 \cdot 5 \\     0 \cdot 6 \\     \\     4 \cdot 4 \\     0 \cdot 7 \end{array} $	$     18 \cdot 4 \\     36 \cdot 9 \\     39 \cdot 4 \\     0 \cdot 7 \\     \hline     3 \cdot 9 \\     0 \cdot 7 $	$ \begin{array}{r} 22 \cdot 9 \\ 29 \cdot 9 \\ 40 \cdot 6 \\ 1 \cdot 4 \\ - \\ 4 \cdot 0 \\ 1 \cdot 2 \end{array} $
TOTAL REVENUE	2,384	5,194	11,058	17,406 .	3,843	3,170	3,430	2,709	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Profit	95	509	1,961	3,180	153	311	608	495				
Capital invested	1,901	4,620	8,976	14,542	3,065	2,819	2,784	2,264	i			1
Cost of new machinery and implements Sales of machinery and implements .		543 57	833 106	1,375 259	239 26	332 35	258 33	214 40				
Revenue per £100 labour	315	324	321	335	4. <sup>7</sup> .							·
No. of farms showing a profit		43 19	18 2	23 4					· · · · ·			

## TABLE II—continuedGeneral Mixed Farm Results for 1951 by Size Groups

## TABLE III

Results for the Same 147 General Mixed Farms over	Two Years
Per 100 acres (adjusted)	

			IÇ	50	19	95I
•	•		Per 100 acres	Per cent.	Per 100 acres	Per cent.
verage Acreage (adjusted)	•• ••		······			
Expenditure :			£		(	
Labour: Hired			- <sup>z</sup> 823	34.4	£ 859	22.0
Family			16	0.7	11	33.0
Farmer			63	2.6	69	0·4 2·7
	-	_				2.7
TOTAL			902	37.7	939	36 • 1
Foodstuffs	••	• • •	352	¥4·7	432	16.6
Seeds	•• ••		122	5.1	132	5.0
Manures	•• ••		152	ŏ٠4	183	7.0
Rent and rates			154	6.4	164	6.3
Repairs and renewals	•••		208	8.7	222	8.5
Depreciation on machine	ry, etc.		138	5.8	121	4*7
Fuel			116	4.8	142	
Contract work	•• ••		72	3.0	73	5·5 2·8
Sundries	•••••	••	178	7.4	195 .	7.5
TOTAL EXPENI	DITURE	••	2,394	100.0	2,603	100.0
Revenue Livestock output : Cattle	•					<u></u>
	•• ••	• •	222	8.2	284	9.3
Sheep	•••	• •	136	5 · 1	179	5.8
Pig	•• • •	• •	83	3.1	120	3.9
Poultry and eggs	••	• •	74	2.8	90	2.9
TOTAL	•• ••		515	19.2	673	21.9
Milk	•• ••	• • •	1,150	42.7	1,219	39.7
Crops (including fruit)	•• ••	• •	885	32.9	1,027	33.4
Sundries	•• ••	• • •	III	4.1	124	4.0
Government grants	••	••	31	1.1	27	1.0
TOTAL REVENT	JE	·	2,692	100.0	3,070	100.0
ROFIT	•• ••	[	298		467	
Capital invested	•••••	[	2,253		2,566	
ost of new machinery and i	mplements	[	236		237	
ales of machinery and impl	ements	•• _	24		34	· .
Revenue per £100 labour	•• ••	[	298		327	
No. of farms showing a profi No. of farms showing a loss	t		109	-	106	
	••	••	38		41	

.

## TABLE IV

Average Results for 1951 Specialist Farms

		•		Fruit farms			Hop farms		•	Market garde	ns
No. of farms Average acreage (total) Average acreage (adjusted)	•••	  		7 132 125			14 223 216		• •	14 42 41	
			Per farm	Per 100 acres (adjusted)	Per cent.	Per farm	Per 100 acres (adjusted)	Per cent.	Per farm	Per 100 acres (adjusted)	Per cent.
EXPENDITURE Labour: Hired Family Farmer	  		3,529 65	$\frac{\underbrace{f}_{2,813}}{\underbrace{52}}$	41·8 0·8	£ 5,010 27 134	£ 2,321 13 62	42.8 0.2 1.0	£ 1,359 15 233	£ 3,320 37 570	38·3 0·4 6·6
TOTAL Foodstuffs Seeds Manures Rent and rates Repairs and renewals Depreciation on machiner Fuel Contract work Sundries Stores	•••	· · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		2,865 454 247 579 268 467 409 279 233 409 498	42.6 6.8 3.7 8.6 4.0 7.0 6.1 4.2 3.5 6.1 7.4	5,171 1,179 417 728 488 839 435 674 202 772 840	2,396 546 193 337 226 389 202 313 94 358 389	44.0 10.0 3.6 6.2 4.2 7.1 3.7 5.7 1.7 6.6 7.2	1,607 361 175 208 124 176 162 203 63 329 134	3.927 883 428 509 302 429 396 497 153 803 327	45°3 10°2 5°0 5°9 3°5 5°0 4°6 5°7 1°8 9°2 3°8
Total Expend	ITURE	•••	8,416	6,708	100.0	11,745	5,443	100.0	3,542	8,654	100.0

## TABLE IV—continued

## Average Results for 1951 Specialist Farms

	Fruit farms			Hop farms			Market gardens		
	Per farm	Per 100 acres (adjusted <u>)</u>	Per cent.	Per farm	Per 100 acres (adjusted)	Per cent.	Per farm	Per 100 acres (adjusted)	Per cent.
REVENUE Livestock output : Cattle	£ 209	£ 167	2.0	£ 621	£ 288	4.6	£ 85	£ 208	2.5
Sheep and wool Figs Poultry and eggs	555 538 125	442 429 100	$5 \cdot 3$ $5 \cdot 2$ $1 \cdot 2$	307 728 165	142 337 77	2·3 5·4 1·2	59 423 124	145 1,034 3 <sup>0</sup> 3	2·5 1·7 12·4 3·6
TOTAL </td <td>1,427 507 1,859 6,374 </td> <td>1,138 404 1,482 5,080 —</td> <td><math display="block">   \begin{array}{r}     13.7 \\     4.9 \\     17.9 \\     61.2 \\     \hline     0.2   \end{array} </math></td> <td>1,821 1,550 2,095 1,422 6,105</td> <td>844 718 971 • 659 2,830</td> <td>13.5 11.5 15.5 10.5 45.4</td> <td>691 2,288 356</td> <td>1,690 5,591 870</td> <td>20·2  67·1 10·4 </td>	1,427 507 1,859 6,374 	1,138 404 1,482 5,080 —	$   \begin{array}{r}     13.7 \\     4.9 \\     17.9 \\     61.2 \\     \hline     0.2   \end{array} $	1,821 1,550 2,095 1,422 6,105	844 718 971 • 659 2,830	13.5 11.5 15.5 10.5 45.4	691 2,288 356	1,690 5,591 870	20·2  67·1 10·4 
Sundries	23 217 10,407	19 173 8,295	2·I 100·0	46 447 13,486	21 207 6,250	0·3 3·3 100·0	15 65 3,415	36 158 8,345	0·4 1·9 100·0
PROFIT: Realized Unrealized	1,373 618	1,094 493		I,540 201	714 93		(-)227 100	(-)554 245	
Total	1,991	1,587		1,741	807		(-)127	(–)309	
Capital invested	7,869	6,295		8,241	3,819		2,254	5,507	
Cost of new machinery and implements	1,014 210	808 167		755 125	350 58		192 25	469 61	
Revenue per £100 labour	290			261	·		212		·
No. of farms showing a profit No. of farms showing a loss	7			11 3		,	8 6		



HEADLEY BROTHERS LTD 109 Kingsway London WC2 and Ashford Kent