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IITTRODUCTION

## Method of Study

The Divisions of Agricultural Economics and of Animal Husbandry of the Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station cooperated with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture in a threemyear ancounting study of tyenty-four farms in Rock and Nobles Counties in Southwestern Minnesota. This study was started March 1, 1929 and was continued through 1931. The farms were selected in cooperation with the county agricultural agents in the respective counties,-Mr. C. G. Gaylord in Rock County and Mr. C. J. Gilbert in Vobles County. Farms on which some type of beef production was a major enterprise were chosen. The farmers cooperating in this work kept complete records of cash receipts and cash expenditures, a daily record of the labor used on each crop and aach class of livestock, a record of the farm produce used in the house and other letailed information regarding their busincss. These records were checked at Least twice a month by the route man and suplemented with inventories, livestock feed records, reports of crop yields and practices and other significant facts about the farm operations. The livestock invontories were taken by a committee of three, consisting of Professor Peters, in charge of the Animal Husbandry livision at University Farm, the county agent and the farmer. Professor Peters also issisted in outlining and conducting the study. The data collected were sent to the central office at University Farm, St. Paul, where a detailed set of records :or each farm was kept. From these records, the costs presented in this report lave been computed. This preliminary report presents the average costs and returns in 1929, 1930, and 1931 for the different classes of livestock kept and the crops grown on these farms, and also n partial analysis of the data sccured.

## Description of Area

Rock and Nobles Counties are located in the southwestern corner of Minnesota. The soil in Rock County and the wostern edge of Nobles County is a Wind-blown loess. This is one of the most fertile soil types in the state. Ths balance of Nobles County is covered with a glacial till, the prevailing soil type of the southern ma central part of the state. This, too, is a productive type woll suppliod with lime.

Both counties are level to gently rolling with practically all of the lend tillable. There are some sections, especially in southern Nobles County, that need drainage to insure regular cropping. In Rock County, there are limited areas of rock outcrop and also limited areas where the surface soil is shallow and underlain by a gravelly subsoil. These latter soils are inclined to be droughty in a dry senson. The annual rinfall averages between 26 and 28 inches and the average growing season is from 130 to 140 days. According to the 1930 census, the average size of farms in Rock County was 220 ard in Noblcs County 208 acres. Forms between 100 and 174 acres in size are tho most common in these counties, with those between 260 and 499 ncres the second in number. In 1930 the average value of farm land per acre, including buildings, was $\$ 103$ in Nobles County and $\$ 107$ in Hock County. Only eight counties in the state reported a higher value per acre and seven of these are located close to Vinncapolis and st. Paul. The svernge value of all farm land in the state whe $\$ 69$ per acre. According to the 1930 census, $67 \%$ of all farm lend in Nobles County end $70 \%$ of the 1 nd in Rock County was operated by tenants. Both cash and share leases are employed. Beef cattle and hogs are the principal elasses of livestock ruised. Corn, oats, and barley are the principal grain crops. They are raised primarily for feed altho there is a considerable surplus available for sole on many farms. The landord's shere of the crop is usuelly sold off the farm. Alfrife :nd wild hay are the principal rougheges grovi.

## Description of the Farms Studied

The average size of the farms studied in 1931 was 346 acres, in 1929 323, and in 1930,360 ncres. This is approximately $62 \%, 51 \%$ and $68 \%$ iorger respectively than the average size of the farms in these two counties as reported in the 1930 census.

Corn, oats, barley, flax, alfalfa hay, and wild hay were the principal crops grown on the farms studied. Most of the feed raised on these forms, with the exception of the landlord's share of the crop, was fed on the farm only tro of the frrms studied in 1931 were orined entirely by the operator. Eleven farms Fere partly owned and partly rented by the operator. Only $34 \%$ of the land operated was owned by the operator. Both share end cash rental leeses were employed. More facts about the organization of the farms sre presented on page 17.

## Crop Rotation and Cropping Practices

With the high percentage of tencncy, the two yeur rotation of corm and small grain has persisted. Either Imdords have not seen any bencfit to bo dem rived from a rotition which tends to conscrve soil fertility, or satisfactory lense arrangements permitting the adoption of a more diversified cropping progrsm have not been worked out. Approximetely $45 \%$ of the crop acreage on these ferms was in corn, $36 \%$ in oats and barley, $5 \%$ in wild hay, and $6 \%$ in flax, a totnl of $92 \%$. This leaves a possible maximum of $8 \%$ in legume crops. The proportion of the ncreage in legume crops wes actually much less then this. These proportions
egree ciosely with the figures for all fams in these counties as given in the 1930 census. According to the census, $43 \%$ of the crop land in these two counties was in corn, $49 \%$ in small grain, emd $5 \%$ in wild hay.

On all of the farms studied in 1931, cattle, hogs, and chickens were kept and on five, small flocks of sheep also. In 1931 an average of approximately 18,200 pounds of cattle and 34,500 pounds of hogs per farm was produced. ifighteen cows and a flock of 214 chickens were kept. On two of the five farms having sheep, feeder lambs were bought. In $1931,40 \%$ of the cash receipts mas from eattle sold, $4 \%$ from dairy products, $32 \%$ from hogs, $2 \%$ from sheep and $4 \%$ from poultry, a total of $82 \%$ from livestock end livestock products. Fourteen per cent of the receipts was from crops, chiefly corn, oats, and flax. The corresponding percentages in 1930 were, respectively, $40,5,30,3$, and 3 , a total of $81 \%$ from Iivestock and livestock products; in 1929 the percentages were, respectively, 35, 7, 32, 3, and 4, a total of 81. The receipts from crops were $13 \%$ of the total in 1930 and $15 \%$ in 1929.

Weath er
The weather in 1929 mas very favorable to crop produetion and yields were above average. The 1930 crops were seeded under very favorable conditions but the musually hot and dry summer that followed resulted in a considerable reduction in yields of harvested crops and a shortage of pasture. Oats and flax escaped with relatively less damage than corn and barley. The drouth was even more pronounced in 1931, and as a result pastures mere very poor and crop yields were generally the lorest for ten years. The disadvantage of poor sumer pastures in 1930 was partly offset by the unusually good fall pasture and mild open Finter which follomed. The effect of the weather on crop yields is indicated in Table 1.

Table 1
Crop Yílds in Rock and Nobles Counties

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average } \\ & \text { 1922-31* } \end{aligned}$ | Route hverage |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |
| Corn, bu. | 30.3 | 38.0 | 31.9 | 23.8 |
| Oats, bu. | 35.8 | 50.7 | 53.7 | 32.1 |
| Barley, bu. | 29.8 | 33.0 | 29.0 | 21.9 |
| Flax, bu. | 10.6 | 11.2 | 13.0 | 6.0 |
| Wild hay, ton | . 9 | 1.1 | 1.2 | . 6 |
| Alfalfa, ton | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 1.1 |
| Corn silage, ton | 6.0 | 7.3 | 5.1 | 6.2 |
| Corn fodder, ton | 2.2 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 1.6 |

[^0]From the standpoint of the livestock enterprises, the hot dry weather in the summers of 1930 ond 1931 was very favorible to the control of diseuses, especially disenses of swine and poultry. The mild open winter of 1930-31 resulted in a lower feed consumption and a better condition of the 11 yestock. The decreased yields of crops also resulted in a decrease in the amount of livestock fed.

## Frice Conditions

Generally speaking, price conditions were very favorable for livestock production in 1929, less favorable in 1930 and very unfavorable in 1931. The average price recelved for livestock and livestock products sold by these farmers is presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Average Price Received for Livestock and Livestock Products

|  | Rock and Nobles Counties |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\$ 11.50$ | $\$ 8.70$ | $\$ 5.79$ |
| All cattle, per cwt. | 9.53 | 7.81 | 4.42 |
| Hogs, per cwt. | 11.91 | 7.42 | 5.30 |
| Sheep, per cwt. | .19 | .14 | .14 |
| All chickens, per lb. | .43 | .35 | .25 |
| Butterfat, per lb. | .28 | .20 | .16 |
| Eggs, per doz. | .28 | .16 | .10 |
| Wool, per lb. |  |  |  |

The severe decline in prices extending over the three-year period has resulted in decreasing cash incomes from the same physical amount of production.

Prices for the crops commonly grown in these : counties became increasingly unfavorable during the three-year period, The December 1 crop prices are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

| Crop | County Average 1922-31* | Route Farms |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |
| Corn, bu. | \$. 58 | \$.56 | \$. 48 | \$. 41 |
| Oats, bu. | . 32 | . 36 | . 24 | . 22 |
| Barley, bu. | .50 | . 49 | . 38 | . 38 |
| Flax, bu. | 2.05 | 2.83 | 1.48 | 1.23 |

*Compiled from publicntions of the State Depsirtment of hgricul ture.

> NETHODS OF COMPUTING AND PRESENTING DATA

## Financial Statement

Most of the farms studied were either partly or entirely rented, with the rental contracts varying from farm to farm. In order to have the data for tiese farms comparable, all the farms have been adjusted to a streight ownership basis. The inventories include all of the farm property regardless of ownership and the receipts and expenses include the share of the landlord as well as that of the tenant. For purposes of these statements, the 1930 value of the bare land was placed at $86 \%$ of $i t s$ value in 1929 and for 1930 its value was placed at $66 \%$ of the 1929 value. The decrease in the value of land is not included in the inventory decrease in the financial statement. The only effect on the earnings as
fculated here is in the decreased interest charge. The volue of the house the operrtor lives in wes excluded from the walue of the farm buildings and all repairs and expenses on the house were omitted from the farm expenses. These expenses on the house are listed in the household account.

Board for hired lnbor was cherged at $\$ 28$ per month in 1929, 敬25 per month in 1930, and $\$ 20$ in 1931. Unpaid family labor was estimated at 25 cents per hour in 1929, 20 cents in 1930, and 15 cents in 1931. 411 cash rent and interest actually paid have been omitted and interest at $5 \%$ charged on the average total investment.

## Livestock

The comparative costs and returns for each of the different classes of livestock produced ere presented in this preliminary report. Insofar as possible, local prices were used in determining the costs and returns. Nerketable feeds rere charged a.t local prices and non-marketable feeds on a compata-tive-fecding-velue basis. Man labor mas figured at 30 cents per hour in 1929 and 1930 and 20 cents in 1931. Horse work was charged to the individual farm nt the rate determined for that farn. The shelter charge mas based on the annual cost of the buildings housing livestack, prorated on the basis of space occupied. The equipment charge is based on the annual cost of the particul 7 r class of equipment used by that class of livestock. Miscellaneous cash costs include veterinary fees, medicine, salt, minerals, etc. The manure credit is basod on a value of 75 cents per ton in the barnyard. Only the amount of the manure actually spread on the fields was credited to the livestock.

In studying the tables and in considering the income from livestock, one should keep in mind that these nre compurative figures and represent charges which are not all actucl cash expenses. All man lobor and horse work, interest on the investment, and the use of the buildings and equipment, as mell as the feed have been charged to the enterprise. Therefore, a minus return means that the particular class of livestock has failed to pay the prices charged for the different factors. There may be no other more profitable altermative use for the buildings, much of the labor, or for the non-marketable feeds. A return above the price of marketable feeds and cash expanses may justify continued production although these figures fail to show a net return.

All tables have been computed on the basis of one hundred pounds gain in weight, or of one animal, or on some similar basis, ill corn has been reduced to a shelled corn basis. The returns have been expressed in several ways. The gain or return over all costs is the amount left after deducting all the charges listed in the table. The return over $f \in e d$ cost is whet is left after deducting zed from the total incone; or in other words, it is wat is left to pry for the labcr, shelter, equipment; interest, and miscellaneous cash costs. The return per hour represents what the onterprise returned for each hour of ran labor used in it, after allowance had been made for all charges except labor. The return per 56 pounds of grain represents what was left to pay for each 56 pounds of farm grain fed after making allowance for all other feed and all of the other charges. The unit of 56 pounds of grain was used because that corresponds to the weight of one bushel of corn.

Feeder Cattle. This closs of cattle includes sll cattle being fatten. ed for market and covers only tho feeding period. The return per 56 pounds of farm grain is obtained by deducting from the selling price all charges except that for from grains fed. The result is then dirided by the number of pounds of farm grains fed and multiplied by 56. Due to the inpossibility of determining the pork credit for the feed picked up behind cattle, this item was omitted
from all calculations. This fact should be kept in mind when studying the statements both for cattle and for hogs.

Breeding Herd. The broeding herd includes the bull as well as all of the cows. Insofar as was possible, decreases in inventory values due to changes in the price level have been eliminated for the cows which were listed on both the opening and closing inventory. The cost per calf was obtained by dividing the total cost of the herd by the number of calves raised. The calves raised per cow was obtained by dividing the number of cal ves raised by the average number of cows in the herd for the year. An average of more than one calf per cow may be obtained either by raising twin calves or by raising calves from cows which rem main in the herd less than a full year.
$\dot{A}_{s}$ presented in this statement, the cost per calf is only the share of the cost of maintaining the breeding herd chargeable to the calf. It does not include any supplementary grain or pasture the calf may have received. on the farms with beef herds, the calves were allowed to run with the covis for six or seven months and they received all the milk the coms gave. On the farms with dual-purpose herds, the calves were meaned from wholemilk within two or three weeks after birth and from skinmilk at from one to two months of age. For this reason, the contribution of the beef cows was larger than that of the dual purpose cows. However, the relative contribution could not be definitely determined because the amount of whole milk the calves received while nursing could not be determined.

Generally spealing, only the cows that rere being milked received any grain. As no division was made on the individual farms between the cows being milked and those not being milked, the feeds reported fed to the beef herds includes some grain. The cows in the dual purpose herds quite generally received grain.
all Cattle. Three more or less distinct types of beef production were found on the farms studied and sverages are presented for each type. Group A is composed of the farms on which dairy and beef production were combined. Group $B$ is composed of the farms on which more cattle were fattened than were raised in one year. The additional nurber was obtained either by purchase or by accumulation from past years. Group $C$ is composed of the farms on which breeding herds Fere maintained for raising calves. They are primarily baby beef producers. The "value of animal product" was obtained by deducting the value of the purchases and opening inventory from the relue of the sales, products used in the house, and the closing inventory. The low ralue of animal product (in some cases a minus) is largely due to the decline in the price of cattle. The average value per hundred pounds of cattle on these farms March 1, 1931 was $\$ 7.09$ and on March 1, 1932 it was $\$ 4.75$, a drop of $\$ 2.30$. In 1931, the average inventory weight wis approximately twice the weight produced whica rieans that each 100 pounds of cattle produced was charged with a loss in inventory value of $\$ 4.60$. The data for the individual farms varied from these averages. No attempt was mede to eliminate the decreaso in inventory values due to the price decline, as was done with the breeding herd, becguse of variations in kind and quality of stock on hand at the end of the year as compared with the beginning.

Hogs. It is a comon practice on these farms to heve hogs following the cattle. However, due to the methods of handing the cattle and the practice of supplementary feeding, it was impracticable to obtain any estimate of the feed salvaged in this wfy. The amounts and the costs of feed presented are in addim tion to any salvaged behind cattle. The number of pigs raised per litter mas calculated by dividing the number of pigs raised to market neight by the number of farrowings. The return per 56 pounds of grain was calculated in the same manner as for fecder cattle.

Sheep. The tilue of the product in sheep was colculated in the sinc manner as for all cattle, narely, by deducting the mluc of the purchases end beeinning inventory from the value of the sheep and lambs sold, butchared, and on the ending inventory. The number of lambs per ewe mas obtained by dividing the number of laribs raised by the number of ewes in the plock. The per cent of death loss of limbs is for lambs up to six months of age. duter six nonths of aee, they Fere considered as shgep. The large decline in larib end wool prices resulted in losses.

Poultry. In the dite presented, the number of ducks, geese, and turkeys are reported on a "chicken-equivelent" basis. One duck vas considered equal to one hen, one goose equal to two hens, end one turkey equal to three hens. Two birds under six months of age were considered equal to one rature bird.

Vork Horses. The farrs mere divided into two groups for the presentation of mork horse costs. One group corprises the farms on wich tractors mere used for drawbor mork and the other group comprises the farrs on which tractors were not used for drawbar work.

Tractor. Tractor costs are presented for both two-plon and three-plow trantors. In these steterents, gesoline is charged at a price which did not include the three cent state tax, even though some fareers did not clain the tax refund.

Auto. Auto costs are presented for 1930 and 1931. These costs do not include a charge for shelter.

Crops. Comparative costs and returns for the eight principal crops grown on the fams studied are presented in this report. The physical quantities of man labor and horsc and tractor work used per acre for each of the crops are 0lso presented. The man labor mote of 30 cents per hour in 1929 and 1930, and of 25 cents in 1931 is based on rages paid to hired men. It includes an allowance for boerd. Horse work was charged at 12 cents per hour in 1929, $10 \frac{1}{2}$ cents in 1930 , and $8 \frac{1}{2}$ cents in 1931. Two-plow tractors were charged at 75 conts per hour in 1929 and 1930, and 65 cents in 1931; three-plow tractors were charged nt $\$ 1.00$ per hour in 1929 and 1930 and 85 cents in 1931. The seed charge for hay is based on the cost of seeding divided by the expected life of the stand. Nanure mas charged at 75 cents per ton plus the cost of hauling and spreading. Fifty per cent of this was charged against tho crop to Which the nanure was applied end the bnlonce ris prorated to the other crops in the rotation on all acre basis. Machinery was charged at a flat rate which includes an allowance for interest, depreciation, reprirs, and other costs. The land charge vas based upon the prevailine cash rental rates paid by the cooperators. The local market price on Decenber 1 was used in conputing the returns from the various crops. All costs, except those for flax, are fizured at the farm. Marketing charges for flax, when it ras haulad cirect to watket at threshing tixe, have been included. The costs co not include any labor for hauling hay fror the stack nor focier fror the shock since hauling practices and size of loass vary so ruch. The credits incluie stubble or stalk phsture, and com picked up behinc the binder.

The returns have been computed on the basis of the return per acre and return per hour of mat labor used in praducing the crop. The not return is the gain or loss left after subtracting from the walue of the crop the itoms of cost that are presented. The return per man hour is the amount left to pay for the labor used after all charges except labor have been met. The returns are not calculated for the hay crops, corn fodder, and silage es these crops re fed on the farm.
$\Delta s$ rith livestock, the costs presented are reletive rether than absom Lute costs and inclu己e other than "out-of-pocket" cesh expenses. Uniform cash rental rates are used for each crop, since the varied rental systeras on the different farms, including cesh rented, share rentore and concid land, would tend to obscure these comparisms. Uniform machinery, labor and horse and tractor wror rates have olso been used. hll crops have been creiited at uniform prices, except ns they vnry in quality. Some farmers undoubtediy received differont priccs and also had laber and machinery costs differing from those used. The reacer, in interpreting these fisures, rust make such adjustments in the returns as are necessury to fit the virying conditions.

## FARTI EARNINGS

is a result of the drastic decline in the prices of farm products, farm earnings declined rapidly. Cash receipts fell from $\$ 9339$ in 1929 to $\$ 8088$ in 1930 and $\$ 5328$ in 1931, a decrease, respectively, of 13 and 34 per cent. Cash expenscs declined from $\$ 5134$ in 1929 to $\$ 4833$ in 1930 , and $\$ 3306$ in 1931 , a dem crease, respectively, of 6 and 31 per cent. Two very dalinite steps mere taken to adjust the farm business to the low income. The first of these was a reduction in machinery and equipment expense of over 70 per cent, effocted largely through the elimination of purchases of new imploments. The second was a reduction in buildings and fence expense of over 60 per cent, also effected largely through the pestponement of the erection of new buildings or fences and other than thi absolutely neccssary repoirs. Other expenses, except taxes, were also reduced, but to $n$ lesscr degree. The amount of taxes paid increased. iltho expenses were reduced, they were not reduced in proportion to the reduction in receipts.

The severe decline in prices also reduced the earnings on these farms t:rough the reduction in inventory values. This reduction amounted to on average of ${ }_{j}^{4} 1844$ in 1930 and $\$ 2810$ in 1931. Part of this was due to a smaller amount of feeds and livestnck on hand but the major portion was due to the decline in prices.

SECURING MEXIMUM RETURNS
Two things ere necessary in order to secure maxiriun returns fron a
farr. These are (1) the selection of the rost profitable enterprises, and (2) the adeption of prefitable practices in the hondling of the enterprises chesen.

## Selection of Profitoble Enterprises

No two forns ar famers are exactly alike. Fems very in soll type, fertility, and drainge, in the ornount of pasture available, in the armunt and kind of crops grown, in the amount of shelter avnilrble for livestock, in the water supply, end in the adequacy rf the fencing. Further, farmers vary in their likes and dislikes end in their ability to handle the cifferent kinds of livestock and crops. For these reasons, the best selection of the particular kinds md combinations of kinds of crop and livestock enterprises will vary with the indiviauel farm and ferm operator. However, the rosults of this three-yenr study will give inf ormation uscful in the orgunizing and operating of any indivicunl farm.

Selection of Livestack. In general, these receris indicate that the hog enterprise was consistently the nost profitable major livestock enterprise; that the brby-beef type of production ries the nost profitable type of beef production; that the combination of rilk and beef prociuction found on these frims wes consistently the lenst profitable type of beef production; and that poultry p:operly handled are a profitable pirt of the farr: busincss. sltho the fetten-

1ng of purchased cattle was the most profitable type of beef production in 1931 and the second in profitableness in 1929 and 1930, the skill in buying and selling which it requires and its highly speculative nature are such as not to recommend this type of beef production for general adoption on any very large scale. However, farmers who are particularly capable in buying and selling and who are good feeders may find the feeding of purchased cattle very profitable.

Selection of crops. In selecting the crops and in planning the cropping program, it is well to consider whether the crops are to be for feed or for sale, or for both. If the crops are to be fed, the selection should be based on the amount and quality of digestible nutrients producod per acre. The rocords secured in this study furnish the basis for such a selection. The production per acre and the relative cost per hundred pounds of digestible nutrients for Rock and Nobles Countics, based on ten year average yields and average route costs are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

| Crop | ```iverage yield 1922-31 bu.``` | Total <br> digestible <br> nutrients <br> lbs. | ```Protein % of total nutrients``` | Cost per 100 lbs. of total nutrients |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grains |  |  |  |  |
| Corn | 30.3 | 1386 | 8.7 | \$1.18 |
| Barlcy | 29.8 | 1135 | 11.4 | 1.19 |
| Oats | 35.8 | 806 | 13,8 | 1.73 |
| Roughagcs | tons |  |  |  |
| ilfal fa | 1.8 | 1836 | 20.8 | .78 |
| Corn fodder | 2. $2^{*}$ | 1924 | 7.7 | . 94 |
| Wild hay | . 9 | 868 | 6.2 | . 94 |
| Silage | 6.0 | 2021 | 7.2 | 1.16 |

*Nutrients are calculated on the basis of 2.0 tons yield since there is considorable shrink and woste under tho usual methods of feeding fodder.

The above data shows that the lowest cost feed grain crop is corn. It produces more nutrients per acre and at a loricr cost than either oats or barlcy. Barley is next to corn in cost but produces less feed per ecre. Oats produces decidedly less nutrients par ecre than the other two creps and has the further disadvantage of a much higher cost.
alfalfa, on the basis of the above data, is the cheapest source of roughage. slfalfo hns $n$ n aditicnal advantage in that it is high in protein, the element most likely to be lacking in the ration and most expensive to buy. Its chenpness and its high protein content make olfalfa the most dosirable rughoge. ulthough corn fodder produces slichtly more feed per acre then alfalfa, it has the disadvantaga of $:$ hizhor cost and a decidedily lorer protein content. Wild hay has the disadvantages of both a low yield of food nutricnts and a higher unit cost. Honever, rild hay is usually grovn on land not suitable for other creps and honce the cutting of rild hey is a metter of securing seme feed frem what rould etherwise be waste land. Silage has tro di sadventriges, nomcly, high cost and low protein content. The frect thnt silngo is used as extensively as it is indicatos that foeders heve felt that it has a valua gronter thon that indicated by its nutrient content. It offers a method of saving the entiro cora crop.

The profitableness of raising cash crops depends to a large extent upnn the pricesreceived. at this time it is impessible te predict, with any assurance, what the prices of the crops will be in the future. It is possible, hezever, to indicate the relative profitableness of these crops in the pest years. The conparative returns from the varicus grain crops cemputed upen the basis of ten year average Rock and Nobles Ccunties yields and prices and three year average costs adjusted to the ten year average yields are presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Comparative Returns per Acre of Crops
Rock ond IJobles Ccunties

|  | Corn | Oats | Barley | Flax |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost per acre | \$16.39 | \$13.92 | \$13.46 | \$16.12 |
| Yield, average 1922-31 | 30.3 | 35.8 | 29.8 | 10.6 |
| Cost per bushel | \$. 54 | \%. 39 | \$. 45 | \$1.52 |
| Dec. 1 price, average 1922-31 | 1.58 | . 32 | . 50 | 2.05 |
| Net return per acre | 1.18 | -2.46* | 1.44 | 5.62 |

*it minus ( - ) incicates a loss.
As an average of the past ten years, barley and flax have been the most profitable cash crops, with corn next. Oats was the least profitable. Ono would expect corn to continue to be cne of the high profit crops and oats to be one of the lowest profit crops.

## sdopting Good Practices

The second thing necessary for obtaining high returns is the adoption of profitable practices. * study of the records indicate the following results of different practices.

## Livestock Practices

Cattle: 1. Breeding strek of gock beef conformation and type required nc nore foed thon lor grade breeding stock but ot sale time the celves from the well bred stock commanded on appreciable premium cver the calres from the low grade stock.
2. Therc was e fice variation between farms in the amount of grain ond hay fed to breeding stock. The data would indicate that feed in excess of enough to keep the breeding stock in fair flesh, but not fat, brought little or no return.
3. The formers who fed oilmeal tr fattening cattle secured more ecenornical eains than those not feeding cilmeal. A. cormprison of the feed expenditures is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

| amount of oilmeal fed per 100 lbs. gain in weight | No. of farm years | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Oil- } \\ & \text { meal } \\ & \text { Ibs. } \end{aligned}$ | Grain lbs. | Dry rough age 1bs. | Pasture days |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 lbs . or less | 14 | 3 | 986 | 370 | 10 |
| Over $10 \mathrm{lbs}$. | 13 | 27 | 824 | 266 | 2 |

Lt 1931 prices, the difference in total feed cost per one hundred pounds gain in weight is $\$ 1.34$ in favor of those feeding oilmenl.

Hogs: 1. Where complete swine sonitation was properly carried out, unit ensts were materially reduced. The date for one farm illustrates what is possible in same cases (Table 7). Sanitation, to be successful, must be carries out completely.

Table 7

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Man } \\ & \text { hrs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grain } \\ & \text { Ibs. } \end{aligned}$ | Skimmilk lbs. | Pas <br> tur <br> day | Feed cost* | Pigs raised per litter |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1929, without sanitation | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 646 | 50 |  | \$6.48 | 3.8 |
| 1930, complete sanitation | 1 1 2 | 485 | 131 | 28 | 5.14 | 6.7 |

*at average prices for 1930.
2. Hogs raised under a one-litter a year system used less feed and labor per one hundred pounds gain in weight than hogs raised under a system involving both spring and fall farrowing. (See Table 8.)

Table 8
Feed and Labor Used per 100 Pounds Gain in Weight for Hogs Raised under One-Litter and Two-Litter per Year Systens

| System | No. 0 f farm years | Total .concentrates 1bs. | Skimmilk lbs. | Pasture days | Man hours |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| One-litter per year | 42 | 457 | 46 | 26 | $2 \frac{1}{4}$ |
| Two-litter per year | 23 | 490 | 59 | 25 | 2 |

3. When the pigs were pushed along, thereby securing more rapid gains, less feed was used for a hundred pounds gain in weight than where gains were slower (Table 9).

Table 9

| Rate of Gain in Weight and Feed and Lebor Used per 100 Pounds Gain in Weight for Hoss - 1929, 1930, 1931 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gain in weight per mature* hog day | Farm record years | ìverage <br> s̃ain <br> lbs. | Totol <br> concen- <br> trates <br> lbs. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Skim- } \\ & \text { milk } \\ & \text { lbs. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pas- } \\ & \text { ture } \\ & \text { days } \end{aligned}$ | Nan hours |
| Loss then . 9 lb . | 23 | . 84 | 505 | 52 | 34 | 2 |
| .9 to $1.20 \mathrm{lbs}$. | 21 | 1.11 | 460 | 55 | 23 | 2 |
| 1.21 lbs,\& over | 21 | 1.32 | 438 | 45 | 20 | $1 \frac{3}{4}$ |

*Two pigs under 6 months equal to 1 mature hog.
4. Less feed find labor per pound of gain tias used when from 5 to 6.9 pigs were raised per litter than when less than 5 were raised (Teble 10).

Teble 10
Plgs Raised per Litter and Feed Consumption per 100 Pounds Gein in Weight for Hogs 1929, 1930, 1931

|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1929, |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pigs raised | No. of | Pigs | Total Skim- Prsture Nan |  |  |  |
| per litter | farm | per | grain milk days | hours |  |  |
|  | yonrs* | litter | lbs. | lbs. |  |  |


| 3 | to 4.9 | 23 | 4.2 | 492 | 70 | 27 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 to 6.9 | 27 | 6.0 | 456 | 39 | 27 | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ |

*Farms on which feeder pigs were bought Fere excluded from this comparison.

Sheep: 1. The lergest returns from sheep were received from small flocks which obtained a large part of their feed from the yards, rosd, end other plnces where this feed mould not have otherwise been utilized.
2. Flocks that rere culled regulexiy and the ewes sold before they becane ared geve the grer.test returns. High deeth loss due to old nge resulted in lerge losses on soma farms.

Poultry: 1. thigh death rate due to disease, largely as a result of lack of sanitation, whs an important cause of low returns.
2. The raising of chickens added to the profit from the poultry enterprise. The fermers raising a lerge number of chickens relative to the number of laying hens hed larger net returns froc the poultry enterprise than those raising relatively. fewer chickens.
3. High egg production per hen was an important cause of high returns from the poultry enterprise. Good breeding, careful culling, and heary feeding of mash and skimilk are necessary for high ogg production.

## Crop practices

One of the most important factors affocting the returns fron any crop is the yield. Costs are also important but do not vary as much as yields and. hence have less influence on returns. The relationship between yield and cost and return per acre is indicated by the data for oats presented in Table 11.

Table 11
Relation between Yield snd Cost and Return

| Yield | No. of farrs | $\begin{gathered} \text { iverage } \\ \text { yield } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total cost | Cost por bu. | Net. return |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 26 bu. | 6 | $21 \frac{3}{4}$ | \$12.18 | \%. 56 | -\$7.39 |
| 26 and under 36 | 9 | 32 | 11.82 | . 37 | -4.78 |
| 36 and under 46 | 4 | $38 \frac{3}{4}$ | 13.12 | . 34 | -4.59 |
| 46 and over | 3 | $48 \frac{3}{4}$ | 13.75 | . 28 | -3.02 |

as the yield per acre increased, the cost per bushel decreased and the loss per acre decreased. Of course, yield per acre can not be increased indefinite1. Without evontually involving an expense which is greater than the value of the incresse in yield. However, few, if nny of the farmsstuided have reached this point.

Practices Influencing Yields. Since yield par acre has such an important bearing on cost and returns, further study was made in order to determine some of the inportant factors affecting yields. The factors studied are selection of variety of seei, tirie of seeding, and rate of seening.

In studying the effect of variety on yield, it was found that Gopher oats outyielded the other varieties by a consideroble mrgin. The losest yields were secured from comon sced of unknown veriety. The comion seed generally represented onts that had been grom on the farm so long that the fariety had been forgotten, or thet had been purchased as seed fithout any knowledge of the variety it represented. Velvet barley gave the highest yields of berley over the three yesr perjod. Here again cormon seed gave lower yields. There nere so mny varieties of flax and corn erom thet it wim impossible to eet enouch fielels of any two varieties to make comperisons. There were ten different varieties of com grown on these farms and almost as many varieties of flnx as there wore farms growing flnx. It would seem plausible that the yields of corn amd flax, as well as of oats and barley, could be materinlly increaser by the sceding of the variety best adapted to this aren.

Tho records on these firrs derionstrate that one is not alvays able to : :Zge the rolative yielinic ability of two varieties merely by their appearance in the fielc. Just one illustration to exphasize this point. is field of Green Russian oats and a fiold of Gopher orts fere grown siac by side on the sarie from. Tho green Russion field hed more and ruch lareer shocks and looked as though it would yield zuch more then the ficid of Gopher onts. However, when the tro fields were threshed, the Gopher octs yielded 13 bushols more to the acre than the Green Russion. The point of this is that in compring nny two verieties of eny crop, it is ebsolutely necessary to rensure the area and carefully weigh the yiold. The difference in yicld between varicties is enough to justify consicerable attention to securing goo? seed on high yielding varieties.

Time of seeding is ulso important in sccuring good yields. The records obtsined on these farms indiante that the farmers who procticer early seeding were the ones who received the kigher yielis. Spr:ce will not percit the presentation of tables for all crors. It is not possible to set any definite seeding dates becruse sensons vary fron year to year. In any season, generally syeaking, the early seecing and high yields heve jone together.

The records indicate a vide range in the anount of seed plented per ecre. The variations, the average for the three yenrs, and the smount which the recoris would incicate as lesircble are presented in Table 12. If the secd is cood cleen seed, there is nothing to be Enined by plenting more than the maximum incicetch as cesirible.

T-ble 12.
dmount of Seed Planted per acre
Rock anc Nobles Counties, 1929-31

|  | Husked corn, 1bs. | Oats bu. | Brley bu. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Flax } \\ & \text { lbs. } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Least seed | 4.6 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 21 |
| Most sced | 17.4 | 7.0 | 4.1 | 75 |
| averuge | 8.0 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 41 |
| Desirrble | 7-9 3 | 3-3.5 | 2-2.2 | 36-44 |

The records indicate that the farms with the most legumes end livestock are the ones with highest yields. Llfslfa, clover, and sweet clover deserve $n$ lereer plece in the cropping plan of those forms than they hove been occupyine.

## LIBOR ND HORK ST:ND:RDS FOR CROPS

Lnbor is one of the lrgest itens of cost in raising crops, and hence any saving in labor will be reflected in loتier costs. There are two ways of reducing labor costs, noriely, by eliminating unnecessary crop operations and by performing the necessary operetions morc efficiontly. The crop crerations are fairly frell stancirdized mid therefore saving must eere rilly cone through increcised officioncy in the indivic.unl operotions.

The rnage in the hours of min labor and horse sne trector work used per acre for each of the comion crop onerrions, the aferfge for three jerirs, and e standnre for esch sperrition are presenter in Table 13. The strarinis represcnt mproxiaitcly the accomplishriant of the farrcrs who were 25 fer cent above the e.veraze in the scale of afficiency as measured by low labor expeniitures. They assume zverace soil, wenther concitions, and yicles. With higher yields, rore tinc ny be required for harvestinc enc with lower yields, less
time. These standards are suggested as a basis which the individual farmer may use in determining the effectiveness with which he is utilizing his labor and po..cr.

Table 13
Hours of Mnn Labor and. Horse and Tractor Work Used per here for Crop Operations Rock and Nobles Counties, 1929-1931

|  | Range 1929-31 |  | $\therefore$ Aerage |  | Standard |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Men | Horse | $\overline{\mathrm{Mnn}}$ | Horse | Man | Horse |
| Scedbed preparation: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| plowing:-. 4 horses | 1.9 to 4.1 | 7.5 to 16.4 | 2.8 | 11.2 | 2.1 | 8.4 |
| 5 horses | 1.8 to 3.2 | 8.8 to 15.7 | 2.3 | 11.5 | 2.0 | 10.0 |
| 6 horses | 1.3 to 5.5 | 7.9 to 31.6 | 2.3 | 13.3 | 1.7 | 10.2 |
| 2-plow tractor | 1.2 to 2.1 | * | 1.7 | * | 1.6 | * |
| 3-plow tractor | . 8 to 1.9 | * | 1.2 | * | 1.0 | * |
| Disking: 4 horses | .3 to 8 | 1.2 to 3.3 | . 5 | 2.0 | .4 | 1.6 |
| 5 horses | .3 to .6 | 1.3 to 2.8 | . 5 | 2.2 | . 4 | 2.0 |
| Harroning: 4 horses | .1 to . 5 | .6 to 2.1 | . 2 | 1.0 | . 2 | . 8 |
| 6 horses | .2 to .3 | .8 to 1.6 | . 2 | 1.1 | . 2 | 1.2 |
| Seeding \& harvesting grain: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drilling | .3 to . 8 | 1.2 to 3.0 | .5 | 2.0 | . 5 | 2.0 |
| Brosdeasting | .2 to . 6 | .2 to 1.6 | . 3 | . 7 | . 2 | . 4 |
| Oats: Cutting | .5 to 1.2 | 2.0 to 4.8 | . 7 | 2.7 | . 6 | 2.4 |
| Shocking | .4 to 2. 2 | - | 1.1 | - | . 8 | - |
| Threshing | 1.2 to 5.7 | 2.5 to 11.3 | 2.8 | 5.3 | 2.5 | 4.5 |
| Barley: Cutting | . 4 to 1.4 | 1.6 to 5.2 | . 8 | 3.0 | . 6 | 2.4 |
| Shocking | .6 to 2.3 | $\cdots$ | 1.2 | - | . 9 | - |
| Threshing | 1.0 to 6.3 | 1.8 to 11.6 | 2.9 | 5.4 | 2.4 | 4.7 |
| Flax: Cutting | .3 to 1.6 | 1.2 to 6.2 | . 9 | 3.6 | . 7 | 2.8 |
| Shocking | . 4 to 2.0 | - | 1.1 | - | . 8 | - |
| Threshing | 1.3 to 5.0 | 2.6 to 8.4 | 3.2 | 5.6 | 2.9 | 4.6 |
| Plenting \& harvestins corn: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plonting | .5 to 1.0 | . 9 to 2.0 | .7 | 1.4 | .6 | 1.2 |
| Cultivating (2mow) | . 6 to 1.2 | 2.4 to 3.9 | . 8 | 3.1 | . 8 | 3.2 |
| Cutting | .9 to 3.7 | 2.8 to 11.0 | 1.8 | 5.3 | 1.5 | 4.5 |
| Shocking | 1.2 to 9.4 | - | 3.5 | $\cdots$ | 2.5 | - |
| Filling silo | 3.9 to 14.9 | 4.9 to 23.6 | 8.1 | 11.9 | 7.8 | 12.7 |
| Husking - hand | 2.8 to 9.2 | 5.1 to 17.4 | 6.1 | 11.1 | 4.7 | 9.4 |
| mrchine | 2.5 to 7.4 | 6.0 to 20.8 | 4.2 | 12.9 | 3.7 | 11.4 |
| Has hervesting: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mirclfa (lst cutting) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cutting | .5 to 2.3 | 1.1 to 4.6 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| Raking | .3 to 1.8 | .6 to 3.6 | . 7 | 1.4 | ${ }^{5}$ | 1.0 |
| Heuling to barn | .9 to 8.0 | 1.2 to 16.2 | 3.4 | 5.0 | 2.3 | 3.1 |
| Stacking | .5 to 5.4 | 1.0 to 6.2 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 1.8 | 2.1 |
| blfelfa (2nd cutting) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cutting | . 5 to 2.5 | .9 to 5.0 | 1.1 | 2.1 | . 9 | 1.8 |
| Raking | .1 to 2.9 | .2 to 5.5 | .7 | 1.3 | . 4 | . 8 |
| Hauling to barn | .3 to 9.3 | .3 to 13.7 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 1.4 | 2.0 |
| Stacking | .4 to 4.4 | .5 to 7.5 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.1 |
| Wild hay (1 cutting) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cuttins | . 7 to 2.7 | 1.4 to 5.4 | 1.3 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| Raking | .2 to 1.2 | .5 to 2.4 | .7 | 1.3 | . 9 | 1.8 |
| Hauling to bern | .8 to 6.7 | 1.2 to 11.1 | 3.0 | 4.4 | 2.0 | 2.8 |
| Stacking | 1.2 to 5.0 | 1.8 to 11.8 | 2.8 | 4.2 | 2.3 | 2.8 |

[^1]
#### Abstract

summary of the standard lubor and power expenditures by operitions for each of the eight common crops is presented in Table 14. The cperations are those cencrally performed and the hours are based on the standards for the size of implements and power units most of ten used. The expenditures for other combinations of operations and sizes of power units may be computed from the data prescnted in Table 13.


Treble 14
Standerds for Ficld Operations Performed with Horse Power in Rock onc Nobles Counties

| Operation | Husked Ccrn |  |  | Frader Corn |  |  | Silage Corn |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Times crer | $\frac{\text { Hrs.per icre }}{\text { Mon Horse }}$ |  | Tines over | Hrs.per Acre |  | Times over | Hrs, por acre |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\operatorname{Man}$ | Herse | Man |  | Horse |
| Plowing |  | 1.7 | 10.2 |  | 1 | 1.7 | 10.2 | 1 | 1.7 | 10.2 |
| Disking | 1 | .4 | 1.6 | 1 | . 4 | 1.6 | 1 | . 4 | 1.6 |
| Herroming | 1 | . 2 | . 8 | 1 | . 2 | . 8 | 1 | . 2 | . 8 |
| Planting | 1 | .6 | 1.2 | 1 | . 6 | 1.2 | 1 | . 6 | 1.2 |
| Harrowing | 1 | . 2 | . 8 | 1 | . 2 | . 8 | 1 | . 2 | . 8 |
| Cultivating | 4 | 3.2 | 12.8 | 4 | 3.2 | 12.8 | 4 | 3.2 | 12.8 |
| Cutising | - | - | - | 1 | 1.5 | 4.5 | 1 | 1.5 | 4.5 |
| Shocking | - | - | - | 1 | 2.5 | - | - | $\cdots$ | - |
| Eilling silo | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | - | - | - | 1 | 7.8 | 12.7 |
| Hand husking | 1 | 4.7 | 9.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Totrl |  | 11.0 | 36.8 |  | 10.3 | 31.9 |  | 15.6 | 44.6 |



Hay Crods


[^2]FACTS ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FARMS

|  | $\begin{gathered} 1929 \\ \text { Average } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Per Farm |  | 1931 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1930 |  |  |  |
|  |  | hverage | Average | High | Low |
| acros in corn | 105.7 | 116.3 | 122.1 | 195.7 | 38.5 |
| acres in oats | 56.5 | 61.3 | 59.3 | 120.1 | 21.5 |
| acres in barley | 20.3 | 21.9 | 21.5 | 89.2 | - |
| Acres in flax | 9.5 | 15.2 | 18.0 | 59.4 | - |
| acres in other grains \& grain mixtures | 11.3 | 14.3 | 4.5 | 92.8 | - |
| acres in alfalfa | 11.6 | 12.2 | 11.7 | 39.3 | - |
| Acres in tame hay | 4.1 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 40.4 | - |
| Acres in wild hay | 14.2 | 14.6 | 12.8 | 53.3 |  |
| Acres in miscellaneous hay | 6.2 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 10.1 | - |
| Acres in miscellaneous crop's | 1.8 | 4.4 | 2.8 | 18.7 |  |
| Total crop acres | 241.2 | 268.8 | 260.8 | 423.8 | 95.1 |
| hcres in pasture | 63.8 | 69.7 | 62.7 | 161.4 | 13.1 |
| Acres in farmstead, roads, waste, etc. | 17.8 | 21.5 | 20.9 | 66.9 | 8.3 |
| Total acres per farm | 322.8 | 360.0 | 344:4 | 652.0 | 155.6 |
| Number of cows | 19 | 19 | 18 | 36 | 4 |
| Number of pounds cattle produced | 18683 | 22416 | 18179 | 89520 | 2955 |
| Number of pounds pork produced | 28414 | 31288 | 36165 | 86750 | 9210 |
| Number of sheep | 31 | 24 | 23 | 181 | - |
| Number of chickens | 255 | 261 | 214 | 419 | 39 |
| Number of laying hens | 132 | 139 | 125 | 276 | 36 |
| Total hours man labor | 8456 | 7747 | 7218 | 12585 | 4569 |
| Total hours livestock labor | 3866 | 3348 | 3291 | 6868 | 1990 |
| Total hours crop labor | 3138 | 2946 | 2754 | 5674 | 1180 |
| Total hours miscellaneous labor | 1452 | 1463 | 1173 | 2359 | 236 |
| Total hours hired labor | 2656 | 2807 | 2870 | 7590 | - |
| Total hours unpaid family labor | 1492 | 2166 | 1498 | 4743 | 180 |
| Total hours proprietor labor | 2882 | 3128 | 2806 | 4176 | 1338 |
| Hour's per man per work day | 9.8 | 9.4 | 8.9 | 12.1 | 6.0 |
| Hours per man per Sunday | 3.3 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 7.4 | 1.5 |
| Tractor farms: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of farms using tractors | 10 | 12 | 11 |  |  |
| Total crop acres | 276 | 287 | 285 | 424 | 180 |
| Number work horses per farm | 9.7 | 10.0 | 9.6 | 19.4 | 5.4 |
| Avarge hours worked per horse | 885 | 815 | 753 | 945 | 513 |
| Number of crop acres per horse | 28.9 | 28.7 | 31.2 | 40.8 | 21.8 |
| Non-tiractor farms: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of farms using horses only | 11 | 11 | 11 |  |  |
| Total crop acres | 222 | 249 | 237 | 376 | 95 |
| Number of work horses per farm | 8.5 | 8.9 | 8.5 | 11.8 | 4.0 |
| Aserage hours worked per horse | 945 | 917 | 825 | 1102 | 538 |
| $\cdots$ Number of crop acres worked per horse | 28.2 | 28.2 | 28.0 | 41.2 | 15.8 |

## FINANCIAL STATEMETT



## AVERAGE FARM INVENTORIES

```
Land
Build ings
Work horses
Other horses
Cattle
Hogs
Sheep
poul try
Machinery
Auto (farm share)
Feeds
Total
```

| 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -11 | 411 | 4.11 | Five | Fiv |
| farms | farms | farms | highest | lowest |
| \$32182.95 | \$26587.00 | \$19786.00 | \$12953.16 | \$26548.63 |
| 3620.66 | 3482.69 | 3718.42 | 2745.80 | 4178.55 |
| 918.01 | 853.58 | 836.64 | 599.70 | 1192.00 |
| 94.77 | 97.39 | 94.50 | 44.50 | 183.50 |
| 4177.35 | 3562.19 | 2343.58 | 1168.34 | 3078.35 |
| 1503.79 | 1310.03 | 814.44 | 616.34 | 1519.09 |
| 277.50 | 264.13 | 118.02 | 213.30 | - |
| 204.28 | 175.15 | 131.14 | 112.22 | 205.77 |
| 1811.21 | 1943.55 | 1911.09 | 1783.57 | 2570\%50 |
| 155.82 | 85.38 | 72.88 | 66.17 | 142.28 |
| 2543.52 | 2091.41 | 1570.74 | 1175.95 | 2481.97 |
| 47489.86 | 40452. 50 | 31397.45 | 21479.05 | 42100.64 |

FARMT PROLUCE USED IN THE HOUSE

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1929}{\text { i11 }} \\ & \text { farms } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1930}{411} \\ & \text { farms } \end{aligned}$ | 1931 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 411 | Five | Five |
|  |  |  | farms | highest | lowest |
| Cream | \$47.10 | \$30.78 | \$26.59 | \$23.50 | \$16.54 |
| Farm churned butter | 29.57 | 20.43 | 20.49 | 33.10 | 13.71 |
| Whole milk | 34.96 | 33.07 | 23.23 | 24.68 | 30.33 |
| Skiramilk | . 83 | . 39 | . 96 | . 90 | . 07 |
| Hogs | 107.68 | 73.14 | 43.48 | 27.19 | 46.98 |
| Cattle | 21.71 | 29.88 | 14.82 | 9.05 | 17.50 |
| Sheep | . 47 | . 63 | . 66 | - | - |
| Poultry | 25.75 | 28.66 | 24.46 | 15.68 | 31.61 |
| Eggs | 45.65 | 36.87 | 28.97 | 24.30 | 33.12 |
| Potatoes | 25.20 | 28.08 | 16.21 | 14.07 | 18.39 |
| Fruits, vegetables | 31.23 | 31.23 | 12.82 | 7.20 | 17.40 |
| Value of fuel saved | 61.70* | 61.70 | 78.55 | 76.60 | 97.00 |
| Total | 431.85 | 374.86 | 291. 24 | 256.27 | 322.65 |
| Size of Family (man equivalent) | 4.41 | 4.80 | 4.67 | 4.18 | 4.33 |

[^3]

Cost per Head for Breeding Herd


Cost and Return for All Cattle
(Per 100 pounds gain in weight)

|  | 4. 11 Farms |  |  |  | Group 4* |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 year | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 | 3 year | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |
| Number of farms |  | 22 | 24 | 23 |  | 11 | 9 | 11 |
| Pounds produced | 19759 | 18683 | 22416 | 18179 | 11438 | 14359 | 12803 | 7152 |
| Man labor, hours | 15 $\frac{1}{4}$ | 142 | 14 | $17 \frac{1}{4}$ | 21-1 | 1912 | 1818 | 26 ${ }^{\frac{1}{7}}$ |
| Horse work, hours | $1{ }^{\frac{3}{4}}$ | 112 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 24 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feed | \$10.58 | 311. 58 | \$9.67 | \$10.49 | \$11.41 | \$12.28 | \$10.01 | w11.93 |
| lan labor and horse Fork | 4.07 | 4.67 | 3.90 | 3.64 | 5.78 | 6.08 | 5.79 | 5.46 |
| Shel ter | . 99 | . 90 | . 80 | 1.27 | 1.25 | . 96 | 1.00 | 1.80 |
| Equipment | .17 | . 14 | . 16 | . 20 | . 19 | . 16 | . 15 | . 28 |
| Interest (1) 5\% | .99 | 1.20 | . 83 | . 85 | 1.03 | 1.23 | . 93 | . 94 |
| Miscellaneous cash | . 16 | . 12 | . 15 | . 20 | . 16 | . 12 | . 10 | . 25 |
| Total cost | 16.96 | 18. 61 | 15.61 | 16.65 | 19.81 | 20.83 | 17.98 | 20.63 |
| Credits: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nanure | . 76 | . 88 | . 69 | . 70 | . 95 | 1.12 | . 85 | . 89 |
| Dairy products | 4.30 | 5.26 | 3.87 | 3.77 | 7.17 | 7.94 | 6.95 | 6.62 |
| Total credit | 5.06 | 6.14 | 4.56 | 4.47 | 8.12 | 9.06 | 7.80 | 7.51 |
| Net $\cos t$ | 11.90 | 12.47 | 11.05 | 12.18 | 11.69 | 11.77 | 10.18 | 13.12 |
| Value of animal product** | 4.99 | 11.15 | 4.37 | -. 54 | 3.24 | 9.11 | 3.35 -6.83 | -2.73 -15.85 |
| Return over all costs*** | -6.91 | -1.32 | -6.68 | $-12.72$ | -8.45 | -2.66 | -6.83 | $-15.85$ |
| Average selling price, per cwt. | 8.66 | 11.50 | 8.70 | 5.79 | 7.55 | 10.95 | 7.18 | 4.51 |
| Feeds: Corn, 1 b | 369 | 332 | 375 | 401 | 334 | $318{ }^{\circ}$ | 355 | 329 |
| Small grain, 1b. | 202 | 175 | 206 | 226 | 235 | 200 | 211 | 293 |
| Commerci al feed, lb. | 6 | 7. | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Hay and fodder, 1 lb . | 519 | 438 | 466 | 652 | 665 | 513 | 587 | 894 |
| Silege, lb. | 262 | 234 | 137 | 414 76 | 190 | - 203 | 141 86 | 99 |
| Pasture, days | 61 | 44 | 64 | 76 | 79 | . 9 | 86 |  |

[^4]Costs and Returns for ill Cattle (cont.)

|  | Group ${ }^{*}$ |  |  |  | Group C* |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 year | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 | 3 year | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |
| Number of farms |  | 6 | 8 | 5 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Pounds produced | 33048 | 28045 | 29262 | 41838 | 20047 | 17423 | 23437 | 19282 |
| Man labor, hours | $10 \frac{3}{7}$ | 131 | 11 | 8 | 93 | 12 | 7 | 1017 |
| Horse work, hours | $1 \frac{3}{4}$ | $1 \frac{3}{4}$ | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | $1 \frac{3}{1}$ | $1 \frac{1}{4}$ | $1 \frac{1}{4}$ | 1 | $1{ }^{\frac{3}{4}}$ |
| Costs: Feed | $\$ 10.64$ | \$12.36 | \$10.50 | \$9.07 | \%8.82 | \$9.52 | \$8.11 | \$8.82 |
| Man labor and horse wark | 3.16 | 4.28 | 3.43 | 1.76 | 2.50 | 3.15 | 2.19 | 2.18 |
| Shelter | . 67 | . 75 | . 74 | .51 | . 79 | . 71 | . 67 | . 98 |
| Equipment | . 16 | . 13 | . 18 | . 16 | .14 | . 13 | . 16 | . 12 |
| Interest (a) 5\% | . 88 | 1.17 | . 92 | .56 | . 93 | 1.04 | . 89 | . 86 |
| Miscellaneous cash | . 14 | . 13 | . 19 | . 11 | . 09 | . 07 | . 10 | . 11 |
| Total cost | 15.65 | 18.82 | 15.96 | 12.17 | 13.27 | 14.62 | 12.12 | 13.07 |
| Credits: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lianure | . 68 | . 89 | . 62 | . 52 | . 62 | . 78 | . 55 | . 54 |
| Dairy products | 3.05 | 4.88 | 2.89 | 1.39 | 1.59 | 2.47 | 1.21 | 1.08 |
| Total credit | 3.73 | 5.77 | 3.51 | 1.91 | 2.21 | 3.25 | 1.76 | 1.62 |
| Net cost | 11.92 | 13.05 | 12.45 | 10.26 | 11.06 | 11.37 | 10.36 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 11.45 |
| Value of animal product** | 5.35 | 12.89 | 3.84 | 2.31 | 6.56 | 11.76 | 6.44 | $\begin{array}{r}1.47 \\ \hline 0.98\end{array}$ |
| Return over all costs*** | $-5.57$ | -. 16 | -8.61 | -7.95 | -4.50 | . 39 | -3.92 | -9.98 |
| Average selling price, per cwt. | 9.00 | 11.65 | 9.28 | 6.08 | 9.74 | 11.91 | 9.86 | 7.44 |
| Feeds: |  |  |  |  |  | 287 | 344 | 428 |
| Corn, 1b. | 456 | 408 | 423 | 537 169 | 158 | 147 | 344 166 | 160 |
| Small grain, lb. | 199 15 | 174 14 | 255 | 169 19 | 158 | 147888 | 16 | 5 |
| Commercial feed, 1 lb . | 15 406 | 14 423 | 11 388 | 407 | 402 | 379 | 382 | 444 |
| Silage, 1b. | 338 | 377 | 173 | 463 | 187 | 0 | 0 | 560 |
| Pasture, days | 43 | 32 | 54 | 44 | 82 | 52 | 47 | 57 |

*Group B - Farmers fegding more cattle than are raised on their farms; Group C-Farmers specializing on baby-beef production.
**Value of animal products is the net value of animals produced after allowing for differences in inventory values.
*** ${ }_{\text {a }}$ minus ( - ) indicates a failure to cover the expenses charged.

Cost end Return per 100 Pounds Pork Produced

|  | liveryege |  |  |  | Range for each 1tem-1931 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 year | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |  |
| Number of farms |  | 22 | 24 | 23 |  |  |  |
| Pounds produced | 31414 | 28414 | 31238 | 34541 | 9210 |  | 86750 |
| Man labor, hours | $2 \frac{1}{4}$ | $2 \frac{3}{7}$ | 2 | 2 |  |  | 3 $\frac{3}{1}$ |
| Horse work, hours | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{8}$ |  |  |  |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feed | \$5.20 | -7.14 | §5.18 | 43.27 | 41.38 |  | . 44.42 |
| I'on labor and horse work | . 62 | . 84 | . 62 | . 40 | . 19 | to | . 79 |
| Shelter | . 22 | . 24 | . 21 | . 20 | . 03 | to | . 62 |
| Equipment | . 08 | . 09 | . 08 | . 06 | 0 | to | . 20 |
| Interest @ 5\% | . 21 | . 32 | . 20 | . 11 | . 04 | to | . 18 |
| Miscellaneous cash | . 21 | . 27 | . 20 | . 15 | 0 | to | . 61 |
| Total cost | 6.52 | 8.90 | 6.49 | 4.19 | 1.87 | to | 5.15 |
| Manure credit | . 08 | . 09 | . 07 | . 09 | 0 | to | . 62 |
| Net cost | 6.44 | 8.81 | 6.42 | 4.10 | 1.84 | to | 5.05 |
| average selling price, per cwt. | 7.25 | 9.53 | 7.81 | 4.42 | 3.48 | to | 5.49 |
| Return per $56 \mathrm{lbs}$. | . 67 | . 74 | . 71 | . 40 | . 22 | to | . 66 |
| iverage weight of hogs sold | 270 | 274 | 275 | 260 | 216 | to | 342 |
| Pigs rnised per litter | 5.4 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 5.7 | 3.4 | to | 7.5 |
| Feeds: |  |  |  |  |  | to | 522 |
| Corn, 1b. | 374 | 445 | 339 | 339 101 | 21 | to | 208 |
| Small grain, lb. | 116 | 106 | 142 | 101 | 21 | to | 11 |
| Commercial feed, lb. | 4 | 6 | 4 6 | 3 | 0 | to | 19 |
| Tankage, $1 \mathrm{~b}^{\text {. }}$ | 6 | 5 | 6 52 | 57 | 0 | to | 188 |
| Skimmilk, lb. | 50 | $\frac{41}{23}$ | 52 31 | 26 | 8 | to | 46 |
| Pasture, days | 27 | 23 | 31 | 26 | - |  |  |

Cost and Return per Sheep

|  | Average |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Range for each } \\ & \text { item }-1931 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3. year | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |  |
| Number of farms |  | 7 | 7 | 5 | - to 181 |  |  |
| Number of sheep ( 2 lambs equal to one sheep) | 90 | 106 | 80 | 84 |  |  |  |
| Man labor, hours | $1 \frac{3}{4}$ | 2 | 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ | $2 \frac{1}{4}$ |  |  | 4 |
| Horse work, hours | $\frac{3}{4}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 |  |  | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feed | \$2.81 | \$3.49 | \$2.43 | \$2.50 | \%2.15 | to | 83.36 |
| Man 1 ebor and horse work | . 55 | . 66 | . 45 | . 54 | . 40 | to | . 84 |
| Shelter | . 26 | . 21 | . 14 | . 42 | . 02 | to | 1.63 |
| Equipment | .11 | . 26 | . 02 | .07 | 0 | to | . 25 |
| Interest © 5\% | . 43 | . 50 | . 48 | . 31 | .27 | to | . 35 |
| Viscellaneous cash | . 19 | . 16 | . 20 | . 20 | . 03 | to | . 54 |
| Total expense | 4.35 | 5.28 | 3.72 | 4.04 | 3.05 | to | 5.49 |
| Credits: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| kanure | . 13 | . 03 | . 18 | . 16 | 0 | to | . 46 |
| Broeding fees | . 01 | . 03 | . 01 | 0 | 0 | to | 0 |
| Total credit | . 14 | . 06 | . 19 | . 16 | 0 | to | 1.47 |
| Net expense <br> Value produced: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sheep | 1.27 | 3.22 | . 56 | . 04 | -1.60 | to | . 81 |
| Wool | 1.05 | 1.34 | . 96 | . 85 | . 60 | to | 1.38 |
| Total product | 2.32 | 4.56 | 1.52 | . 89 | -. 22 | to | 1.49 |
| Return over all costs* | -1.89 | -. 66 | -2.01 | -2.99 | -3.61 | to | -2.04 |
| Return over feed cost* | -. 49 | 1.07 | -. 91 | $-1.61$ | -2:56 | to | 2.32 |
| Average selling price of sheep, per ert. | 8.21 | 11.91 | 7.42 | 5.30 | 4.28 | to | 6.44 |
| Average selling price of wool, per 1 b . | .18 | . 28 | .16 | . 10 | . 09 | to | . 11 |
| Lambs raised per ewe | 1.0 | 1.0 | . 9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | to. | 1.1 |
| Per cent death loss, lambs | 13.1 | 12.0 | 17.0 | 10.4 9.0 | 5.6 0 | to | 18.3 |
| Per cent death loss, sheep | 12.0 | 16.C | 11.0 | 9.0 | C | to | 18. |
| Feeds: | 76 | 120 | 58 | 50 | 0 | to | 83 |
| Grain, lba ${ }^{\text {Hay }}$ fodder, $1 b^{\text {a }}$ | 140 | 113 | 101 | 205 | 14 | to | 457 |
| Hay and fodaer, ${ }^{\text {Silage, }} \mathrm{l}$. | 148 | $\underline{29}$ | 35 | 51 | C | to | 252 |
| Pasture, days | 242 | 251 | 227 | 247 | 226 | +o | 266 |

*a minus (-) indicates failure to cover the costs charged.

Cost and Return per 100 Chickens

|  | iverage |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Range for each } \\ & \text { item - } 1931 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 year | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |  |
| Number of farms |  | 22 | 23 | 22 |  |  |  |
| Number of chickens | 242 | 250 | 261 | 214 | 39 |  | 419 |
| per cent laying hens | 59 | 57 | 57 | 62 | 36 | to | 89 |
| Man labor, hours | $136 \frac{3}{4}$ | $166 \frac{1}{4}$ | 125 | $119 \frac{1}{4}$ | 49 | to |  |
| Horse work, hours | $3 \frac{1}{4}$ | 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ | $1 \frac{1}{4}$ | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | to | 431 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feed | \$44.80 | \$59.67 | \$45.27 | \$29.45 | \$7.72 |  | \$65.19 |
| Man labor and horse work | 37.42 | 50.46 | 37.66 | 24.15 | 9.98 | to | 47.72 |
| Shelter | 16.34 | 16.92 | 14.78 | 17.31 | 0 | to | 82.91 |
| Equipment | 6.12 | 6.39 | 6.27 | 5.70 | 0 | to | 15.58 |
| Interest @ 5\% | 3.56 | 4.15 | 3.51 | 3.02 | 1.73 | to | 4.24 |
| Miscellaneous cash | 5.28 | 4.61 | 7.42 | 3.82 | 0 | to | 10.67 |
| Total cost | 113.52 | 142.20 | 114.91 | 83.45 | 29.99 | to | 145.49 |
| Manure credit | 3.35 | 3.96 | 2.40 | 3.69 | 0 | to | 14. 53 |
| Net cost | 110.17 | 138.24 | 112.51 | 79.76 | 28.85 | to | 140.0 |
| Value of product: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poultry* | 29.03 | 46.40 | 21.19 | 12.49 | -106.45 | to | 125.15 |
| Eggs | 73.65 | 94.75 | 68.90 | 57.30 | . 26.05 | to | 108.35 |
| Total product** | 102.68 | 141.15 | 90.09 | 76.79 | -36.16 | to | 159.55 |
| Return over all costs** | -7.48 | 2.91 | -22.42 | -2.87 | -176.20 | to | 80.41 |
| Return per man hour. | . 22 | .31 | . 12 | . 18 | 0 | to | 1.23 |
| \&-verage sclling price of eggs. per doz. | .21 | . 28 | . 20 ' | .16 | .13 | to | . 22 |
| Eggs 19id per hen | 75 | 74 | 76 | 76 | 44 | to | 130 |
| Feeds: Grain, lb. | 3179 | 3700 | 3060 | 2777 | 954 | to | 4819 |
| Grain, $\mathrm{Commercial} \mathrm{f} \in \mathrm{ed}, \mathrm{lb}$. | 3179 389 | 402 | 395 | 370 | 0 | to | 1315 |
| Skimmilk, 1b. | 904 | 479 | 1027 | 1207 | 0 | to | 3639 |

- 27 -

|  | Average |  |  |  | Range for each item - 1931 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 year | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |  |
| Farms Using Tractors for Drawbar Work |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of farms |  | 10 | 12 | 11 |  |  |  |
| lian labor, hours | 4914 | $57 \frac{3}{4}$ | 48 | $41 \frac{3}{4}$ | 23 | to | 60 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feed | \$44.94 | \$59.55 | \$ ${ }^{\text {P }} 1.03$ | \$34. 24 | \$20.74 |  | \#46.91 |
| Man labor | 13.36 | 17.32 | 14.40 | 8.35 | 4.59 | to | 12.01 |
| Shelter | 5.93 | 5.48 | 6.00 | 6.31 | 1.60 | to | 10.36 |
| Equipment | 4.35 | 5.25 | 3.73 | 4.07 | 2.08 | to | 9.32 |
| Interest (25\% | 4.62 | 4.82 | 4.73 | 4.31 | 2.69 | to | 6.18 |
| Miscellaneous cash | . 43 | . 49 | . 47 | , 34 | 0 | to | 1.84 |
| Depreciation | 8.87 | 8.67 | 8.18 | 9,76 | 2.51 | to | 19.00 |
| Total cost | 82.50 | 101.58 | $\overline{78.54}$ | 67.38 | 54.55 | to | 88,80 |
| Credits: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manure | 3.60 | 4.41 | 3.75 | 2.63 | 1.29 | to | 5.02 |
| Miscellaneous | . 50 | . 22 | 1.12 | . 18 | 0 | to | 2.06 |
| Total credit | 4.10 | 4.63 | 4,87 | 2.81 | 1.29 | to | 5.02 |
| Net cost | 78.40 | 96.95 | 73.67 | 64.57 | 51.33 | to | 86.23 |
| Hours worked | $817 \frac{1}{2}$ | $884 \frac{1}{2}$ | $814 \frac{3}{4}$ | $753 \frac{1}{4}$ | $513 \frac{1}{4}$ |  | $944 \frac{3}{4}$ |
| Cost per hour; cents | 9.6 | 11.0 | 9.1 | 8,6 | 6.2 | to | 12,3 |
| Crop acres per horse | 29.6 | 28.9 | 28.7 | 31.2 | 21.8 | to | 40.8 |
| Feeds: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grain, lb. | 2993 | 3382 | 3115 | 2483 | 622 | to | 4695 |
| Hay, 1 lb . | 2994 | 3229 | 2642 | 3111 | 1999 | to | 4832 |
| Pasture, days | 158 | 139 | 162 | 172 | 129 | to | 220 |
| Farms not Using Tractors for Drawbar Work |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of farms |  | 11 | 11 | 11 |  |  |  |
| Man 1 abor, hours | $49 \frac{1}{4}$ | 47 | 531 | $47 \frac{1}{2}$ | 33 | to | $68 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Costs: Feed | \$51.96 | \$67.61 |  |  |  | to |  |
| Man labor | 14.30 | 17.38 | 16.02 | 9.49 | 6.63 | to | 13.70 |
| Shelter | 7.83 | 7.95 | 6.75 | 8.78 | 3.07 | to | 19.22 |
| Equipment | 4.75 | 6.73 | 3.75 | 3.77 | 1.84 | to | 7.66 |
| Interest © 5\% | 5.02 | 5.50 | 4.92 | 4.64 | 3.14 | to | 5.71 |
| Miscellaneous cash | . 56 | . 67 | . 38 | . 64 | . 05 | to | 4.07 |
| Depreciation | 9.44 | 11.67 | 7.97 | 8.68 | 2.53 | to | 25.77 |
| Total cost | $\overline{93.86}$ | 117.51 | $\overline{89.26}$ | 74.81 | 53.64 | to | 101.56 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manure | 4.98 | 5.05 | 4.64 | 5. 24 | .84 | to | 12.39 |
| Miscellaneous | . 77 | 1.52 | . 48 | . 31 | 0 | to | 2522 |
| Total credit | 5.75 | 6.57 | 5.12 | 5.55 | . 84 | to | 12.39 |
| Net cost | 88.11 | 110.94 | 84.14 | 69.26 | 51. 64 | to | 100.72 |
| Hours worked | 89512 | 94.5 | $916 \frac{1}{2}$ | 825 | 537 | to | 1101 $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Cost per hour; cents | 9.8 | 11.7 | 9.2 | 8.4 | $6.3{ }^{\text {² }}$ | to | 10.5 |
| Crop acres per horse Feeds: | 28.1 | 28.2 | 28,2 | 28.0 | 15.8 | to | 41.2 |
| Grain, $1 b^{\text {a }}$ | 3737 | 3582 | 3766 | 3862 | 2417 | to | 5702 |
| Hay, 16 , | 3611 | 4094 | 3504 | 3235 | 2316 | to | 4315 |
| Pasture, days | 139 | 125 | 148 | 144 | 25 | to | 179 |

Cost of Practor Work

|  | Averace |  |  | Range for each item－ 1931 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 year | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |  |
| Two－Plow Tractors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of farms |  | 6 | 5 |  |  |  |
| Ccsts： |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lian labor | \＄4．94 | \％6．88 | \＄3．01 | \＄1．20 | to | \＄8．00 |
| Auto use | ． 28 | ． 48 | ． 07 | 0 | to | ． 37 |
| Fuel and oil | 99.11 | 115.61 | 82，61 | 55.50 | to | 109.73 |
| Miscellaneous cash | 5.26 | 4.68 | 5.84 | 0 | to | 14.60 |
| Interest © 5\％ | 23.83 | 20.23 | 27.43 | 15.88 | to | 36.25 |
| Uepreciation | 91，34 | 81.67 | 101．00 | 150.00 | to | 50.00 |
| Total cost | 224.76 | 229． 55 | 219．96 | 153.07 |  | 292.48 |
| Hours worked： |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drawbar | 3061 | 3092 | 303 | 1293 ${ }^{\frac{3}{7}}$ | to | $426 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Belt | $57 \frac{1}{4}$ | $53 \frac{1}{2}$ | 603 | $40 \frac{3}{4}$ | to | 901 $\frac{1}{4}$ |
| Total hours | 363年 | 363 | $363 \frac{3}{4}$ | 190 | to | $472 \frac{1}{4}$ |
| Cost per hour | \％． 62 | \％． 63 | \＄．60 | \％．39 | to | \％． 85 |
| Fuel per 10 hours，gal． | 17.0 | 18：0 | 16：0 | 14．． 6 | to | 20：0 |
| 011 per 10 hours，gal． | ． 8 | ． 9 | ． 8 | ． 4 | to | 1.0 |
| Fuel and oil： |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gasoline，gal． | 547 | 530 | 564 | 480 | to | 761 |
| Kerosene，gal． | 34 | 45 | 22 | 0 | to | 70 |
| Distillate，gal． | 37 | 75 | 0 | 0 | to | 0 |
| Oil，gal． | 303 | 34 | 27⿺ | 14 | to | 45 |
| Three－Plow Tractors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of farms |  | 8 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Costs： |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nan labor | \＄12．98 | 319．50 | \＄6．47 | \＄2．10 | to | \＄13．40 |
| Auto use | 3.65 | 5.64 | 1.65 | 0 | to | 4.16 |
| Fuel and oil | 166.16 | 173．48 | 158．84 | 77.38 | to | 242.80 |
| Viniscellaneous cash | 16.46 | 16．38 | 16.55 | 0 | to | 27.75 |
| Interest＠5\％ | 30.83 | 31.58 | 30.08 | 11，25 | to | 43.00 |
| Depreciation | 126．15 | 125.63 | 126.67 | 50.00 | to | 200.00 |
| Total cost | 356.23 | 372．21 | 340.26 | 248．83 | to | 480.00 |
| Hours worked：248．83 to 480．00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drawbar | 205 $\frac{1}{2}$ | $218 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1923 | 362 | to | 403妾 |
| Belt ． | 256 | $253 \frac{1}{4}$ | 258 | 14 $\frac{3}{5}$ | to | 417 素 |
| Total hours | $461 \frac{1}{2}$ | 471 ： | $451 \frac{1}{2}$ | 185 $\frac{1}{\text { 晨 }}$ | to | 748 |
| Cost per hour | \％． 77 | \％．79 | \％．75 | \％． 48 | to | \％1．38 |
| Fuel per 10 hours，gal． | 25.0 | 22.0 | 29.0 | 24．0 | to | 39．0 |
| Oil per 10 hours，gal． | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.1 | ． 6 | to | 2.8 |
| Fuel and oil： 1.2 .0 ． 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gasoline，gal． | 520 | 396 | 645 | 33 | to | 1622 |
| Kerosene，gal． | 339 | 324 | 354 | 0 | to | 789 |
| Distillate，gal． | 312 | 322 | 302 | 0 | to | 886 |
| Oil，gel． | $62 \frac{3}{4}$ | 75 | 5012 | 16 |  | 804 |

## Cost of Auto Operation

|  | Average |  |  | Range for each item - 1931 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 year | 1930 | 1931 |  |
| Number of farms |  | 22 | 21 |  |
| Niles driven | 6667 | 6812 | 6522 | 817 to 14465 |
| Gasoline, eal. | 482 | 490 | 474 | 106 to 1101 |
| Oil, gal. | 16 | 15 | 16 | 4 to 45 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |
| Man labor | \$5.03 | \%5.06 | \$5.00 | \% 0 to ${ }^{3} 24.69$ |
| Gasoline | 81.66 | 88.74 | 74.57 | 16.25 to 158.09 |
| 011 | 12.05 | 13.03 | 11.07 | 3.14 to 25.29 |
| Miscellaneous cash | 73.43 | 83.64 | 63,22 | 13.00 to 159.61 |
| Interest © $5 \%$ | 20.74 | 23.07 | 18.41 | 2.50 to 41.25 |
| Depreciation | 131,05 | 142.34: | 119.76 | 0 to 275.00 |
| Total cost | 823.96 | 355.88 | 292.03 | 91.89 to 652.59 |
| Cost per mile, cents | 4.9 | 5.2 | 4.5 | 3.0 to $\because 11.2$ |
| Miles per gal. of gasoline | 13.7 | 13.9 | 13.4 | 6.9 to 17.5 |

Cost per acre of Producing Husked Corn

|  | Average |  |  |  | Range for each item in 1931 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Three years | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |  |
| Number of farms | 24 | 24 | 24 | 23 |  |  |  |
| acres per farm | 90 | 96 | 97 | 78 | 38 | to | 162 |
| All work up to harvest: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man hours | 7.7 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 4.8 | to 1 | 11.8 |
| Horse hours | 25.8 | 28.0 | 25.0 | 24.5 | 9.7 | to 3 | 37.4 |
| Tractor hours | . 6 | . 4 | . 8 | . 7 | - to | to | 2.1 |
| Harvesting: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ling hours | 5.0 | 5.7 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 2.3 | to | 6.8 |
| Horse hours | 11.0 | 12.9 | 10.2 | 9.8 | 2.0 | to | 15.0 |
| Tractor hours | . 1 | . 1 | . 1 | . 1 | - to | to | 1.0 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nen, horse end tractor | \$8.06 | ¢9.45 | 8.27 | \%6.46 | . 4.79 | to | 4.8.86 |
| Seed | . 40 | . 42 | . 42 | . 37 | . 27 | to | . 52 |
| franue | . 38 | 1.75 | 1.90 | 1.40 | . 55 | to | 2.92 |
| Mechenical picker | 1.68 | . 37 | .47 | . 30 | - | to | . 70 |
| Other machinery | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | to | . 95 |
| Land | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | to | 6.00 |
| Total | 17.47 | 18.94 | 18.01 | 15.48 | 13.66 | to | 19.18 |
| Credit (pasture \& ins urance) | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.06 | 1.00 | to | 1.46 |
| Net cost | 16.45 | $\underline{17.94}$ | 17.01 | 14.42 | 11.42 | to | 18.18 |
| Yield, bu. | 31.2 | 38.0 | 31.9 | 23.8 | 16.5 | to | 37.9 |
| Cost per bu. | . 53 | $\bigcirc .47$ | ช. 54 | \%. 61 | . .43 | to | 8.99 |
| December 1 price | . 48 | . 56 | . 48 | . 41 | . 41 | to | . 41 |
| Crop value at December 1 price | 14.98 | 21.28 | 15.31 | 9.76 | 6.76 | to | 15.54 |
| Net return | -1.47 | 3.34 | -1.70 | -4.66 | -10.64 | to | . 71 |
| Return per man hour | . 17 | . 54 | . 17 | mone | none | to | .31 |

Cost per acre of Producing 0ats


Cost per acre of Producing Barley

|  | Average |  |  |  | Range for each item in 1931 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Three yenrs | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |  |  |  |
| Number of farms |  | 16 | 15 | 15 |  |  |  |
| acres per farm | 31 | 50 | 31 | 32 | 15 | to | 89 |
| cil work up to harvest: Man hours | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.5 | . 7 | to | 2.3 |
| Horse hours | 5.8 | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.9 | 1.8 | to | 7.5 |
| Tractor hours | . 2 | . 1 | . 2 | . 2 | - | to | 1.7 |
| Eurvesting: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men hours | 4.8 | 5.4 | 8.8 | 4.2 | 2.5 | to | 5.5 |
| Horse hours | 8.1 | 9.0 | 8.4 | 7.0 | 4.5 | to | 9.6 |
| Tractor hours | - | - | - | . 1 | - | to | . 5 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man, horse and tractor | \%3.42 | \$4.04 | \$3. 53 | \$2.65 | \%1.74 | to | \$4.08 |
| Sced | 1.19 | 1.47 | 1.06 | 1.04 | . 67 | to | 1.34 |
| Twine | . 32 | . 34 | . 34 | . 29 | .18 | to | . 37 |
| Threshing | . 81 | 1.03 | . 80 | . 60 | . 24 | to | . 97 |
| Manure | . 77 | . 94 | . 73 | . 65 | . 27 | to | 1.27 |
| Nachinery | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | . 96 | . 95 | to | 1.07 |
| Land | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | to | 6.00 |
| Total | 13.46 | 14.77 | 13.41 | 12.19 | 10.42 | to | 13.58 |
| Yield, br. | 28.0 | 33.0 | 29.0 | 21.9 | 8.2 | to | 35.8 |
| Cost per bu. | 3. 48 | \%. 45 | i3. 46 | 4.56 | \%. 36 | to | \%゙1.39 |
| December 1 price | . 42 | . 49 | . 38 | . 38 | . 38 | to | . 38 |
| Crop value at December 1 price | 11.76 | 16.17 | 11.02 | 8.32 | 3.14 | to | 13.59 |
| Net return | -1.70 | 1.40 | -2.39 | -3.87 | -8.36 | to | . 65 |
| Return per man hour | . 02 | . 50 | mone | none | none | to | . 35 |

Cost per Acre of Producing Flax

| Number of farms |  | 8 | 13 | 14 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| acres p cr farm | 29 | 28 | 30 | 28 | 14 | to 59 |
| ill work up to harvest: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man hours | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 1.3 | to 10.1 |
| Horse hours | 11.1 | 12.8 | 10.0 | 10.4 | 3.6 | to 46.8 |
| Tractor hours | . 3 | .1 | . 6 | . 2 | - | to 1.7 |
| Harvesting: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minn hours | 5.1 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 4.7 | 2.7 | to 6.1 |
| Horse hours | 8.9 | 10.2 | 8.7 | 7.8 | 3.8 | to 10.6 |
| Tractor hours | . 1 | - | - | . . 2 | - | to . 7 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nan, horse and tractor | \% 4.57 | 今5.16 | \%4.85 | 33.71 | 2.23 | to \$8.69 |
| Seed | 2.18 | 2.21 | 2.57 | 1.75 | 1.19 | to 2.85 |
| Twine | . 22 | . 22 | . 26 | . 17 | - | to .38 |
| Threshing | 2.33 | 1.64 | 1.65 | .71 | . 21 | to 1.40 |
| Manure | . 87 | .77 | . 72 | 1.11 | . 30 | to 4.79 |
| Machinery | . 97 | . 99 | . 94 | . 98 | . 93 | to 1.26 |
| Land | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | to 6.00 |
| Total | 16.14 | 16.99 | 16.99 | $\overline{14.43}$ | 11.69 | to 19.55 |
| Yicld, bu. | 10.1 | 11.2 | 13.0 | 6.0 | 1.6 | to 8.5 |
| Cost per bu. | \$1.60 | 41.50 | \$1.31 | \$2.40 | \$1.57 | to 12.50 |
| Uecember 1 price | 1.85 | 2.83 | 1.48 | 1.23 | 1.23 | to 1.23 |
| Crop value at December 1 price | 18.68 | 31.79 | 19.24 | 7.38 | 1.97 | to 10.46 |
| Net retura | 2.54 | 14.71 | 2.25 | -7.05 | -17.58 | to -2.79 |
| Return per man hour | . 61 | 2.09 | . 58 | nono | none | to none |

Cost per icre of Producing ilfalfa Hay

| i.vergge |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Three | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |
| years |  |  |  |

Range for each item 1931

Number of farms
weres per farm
Non hours Horse hours

Costs:
Man and horse seed
hanure
Bachinery
Land
Total
Yield, tons Cost per ton

| Number of farms |  | 15 | 12 | 14 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| acres per farm | 23 | 22 | 27 | 20 | 3 | to 44 |
| Man hours | 4.8 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 3.9 | 2.3 | to 5.4 |
| Horse hours | 8.2 | 9.2 | 8.8 | 6.6 | 4.2 | to 10.6 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man and horse | \$2.28 | 42.79 | \%2. 49 | \%1.55 | 家. 93 | to 32.26 |
| Machinery | . 86 | . 89 | . 85 | . 85 | . 85 | to . 95 |
| Land | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | to 5.00 |
| Total | 8.14 | 8.68 | 8.34 | 7.40 | 6.78 | to 8.11 |
| Yield, tons | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.2 | . 6 | . 2 | to 1.1 |
| Cost per ton | ¢ 8.14 | \$7.89 | \$6.95 | \%12.33 | 87.10 | to 35.05 |

Cost per Acre of Producing Corn Fodder

|  | average |  |  |  | Range for each item 1931 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Three years | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |  |
| Number of farms |  | 12 | 18 | 18 | $\cdots$ |
| Leres per farm | 12 | 8 | 13 | 16 | 3 to 46 |
| ¿ill mork up to harvest: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man hours | 7.7 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 7.5 | 3.3 to 12.2 |
| Horse hours | 25.9 | 28.0 | 24.4 | 25.2 | 6.3 to 37.3 |
| Tractor hours | . 7 | . 4 | . 9 | . 7 | - to 2.9 |
| Harvesting: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man hours | 5.6 | 6.5 | 5.6 | 4.6 | 2.8 to 7.4 |
| Horse hours | 5.8 | 5.2 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 3.5 to 10.9 |
| Costs: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man, horse and tractor | \$7.46 | \$8.36 | \$7.88 | \$6.13 | \$3.63 to 9.08 |
| Seed | . 74 | 1.01 | . 63 | . 57 | . 29 to 2.31 |
| Twine | . 49 | . 63 | . 50 | . 34 | .17 to . 55 |
| - Manure | 1.81 | 1.58 | 1.69 | 2.17 | . 20 to 8.77 |
| Nachino | 1.65 | 1.65 | 1.65 | 1.65 | 1.65 to 1.65 |
| Land | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 to 6.00 |
| Total cost | 18.15 | 19.23 | 18.35 | 16.86 | 13.04 to 23.01 |
| Credit* | . 05 | $\underline{-}$ | . 09 | . 05 | - to . 86 |
| Net cost | $\overline{18.10}$ | 19.23 | 18.26 | $\overline{16.81}$ | 13.04 to 23.01 |
| Yield, tons | 2.3 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 1.6 | $.9^{-}$to 3.2 |
| Cost per ton | $\$ 7.87$ | \$5.83 | \$10.52 | \$10.50 | \$5,00 to 20.40 |

## Cost per Acre of Producing Corn Silage

| Number of farms |  | 8 | 6 | 7 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| acres per farm | 21 | 16 | 21 | 25 | 9 | to | 53 |
| All work up to harvest: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man hours | 8.0 | 7.9 | 8.5 | 7.7 | 4.0 | to | 10.5 |
| Horse hours | 27.6 | 27.8 | 28.3 | 26.7 | 11.5 | to | 36.2 |
| Tractor hours | . 6 | . 5 | . 8 | . 6 | - | to | 1.9 |
| Harvesting: 0 . 0 , 1.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mian hours | 7.4 | 13.1 | 9.0 | 10.1 | 7.5 | to | 13.1 |
| Horse hours | 18,0 | 21.8 | 15.5 | 16.7 | 11.6 | to | 21.6 |
| Tractor hours | .1 | . 2 | - | . 2 | - | to | 1.2 |
| Costs: .1 .2 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Man, horse and tractor | \$10.69 | \$12. 82 | 圐10.49 | \$8.75 | \$6.84 | to | \% ${ }_{\text {W }} 9.91$ |
| Seed | . 61 | . 69 | . 60 | . 55 | . 34 | to | . 77 |
| Twine | . 41 | . 51 | . 40 | . 33 | - | to | . 57 |
| Manure | 2.01 | 2.15 | 1.72 | 2.15 | . 40 | to | 3.76 |
| Silo filling | 9.31 | 2.52 | 1.95 | 2.46 | 1.88 | to | 3.47 |
| Machinery | 1.55 | 1. 56 | 1.53 | 1.55 | . 95 | to | 1.65 |
| Land | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | . 6.00 | to | 6.00 |
| Total | 23.58 | 26.25 | 22.69 | $\overline{21.79}$ | 19.19 |  | 23.72 |
| Credit*. | . 23 | . 14 | . 54 | - | 19.10 |  | . |
| Net cost | 23.35 | 26.11 | 22.15 | $\overline{21.79}$ | 19,19 | to | 23.72 |
| Yield, tons | 6.2 | 7.3 | 5.1 | 6.2 | 4.5 | to | 8.4 |
| Cost per ton | \$3.77 | \$3.58 | \$4.34 | \$3. 51 | \$2.46 | to | \$5.16 |

*Credit for corn picked up after binder.
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[^0]:    *Calculated from reports of the State Department of ingriculture, except in the case of alfalfa, corn silagc, amd corn fodder, for which the State Department gives no date. Average yields for these crops estimated from their relation to the other crops.

[^1]:    *ractor hours the same as man hours.

[^2]:    *Threshing hours for oots and borloy include the hours hauling grain to the bin. The threshing hours on flax do not include hours for hauling to the bin or to market because most of the flax was trucked direct from the machine to market.
    **Total if alternetive mether of seeding is used.

[^3]:    *Same as for 1930. Not sumarized for 1929.

[^4]:    *Group n - Farmers combining dairying and beef production.
    **Valu; of a nimal product is the net value of animals produced cer allowing for differences in inventory values
    *** $A_{\text {- }}$ minus ( - ) ind icates a failure to cover the expenses charged.

