# CHAPTER VI

\_\_\_\_\_

WORKSTOCK AND OTHER LIVESTOCK Specified Farm Machinery and Facilities Business With or Through Cooperatives

(77)

# Contents

Workstock and other livestock	Page 79
Farms reporting horses, mules, cattle, and/or hogs	
Workstock and tractors	79
Cattle	79
Cows milked	79
Hogs	80
Specified farm machinery and facilities	80
Automobiles, motortrucks, and tractors	80
Electric distribution lines and dwellings lighted by electricity	80
Telephones	80
Business with or through cooperatives	81

# TABLES

Farms reporting specified classes of power and specified classes of livestock, 1940, classified by total value of	
farm products, 1939; for the United States and divisions	82
Farms reporting cattle, 1940; and farms reporting cows milked, by number of cows milked, 1939; classified by total	
value of farm products, 1939; for the United States and divisions	85
Farms reporting hogs, 1940; and farms reporting sows farrowing, 1940, by number farrowing; classified by total value	
of farm products, 1939; for the United States and divisions	88
Specified farm machinery and facilities, 1940; and farm operators reporting business with or through cooperatives, 1939;	
classified by total value of farm products, 1939; for the United States and divisions	91
(78)	

.

# Workstock and Other Livestock Specified Farm Machinery and Facilities Business With or Through Cooperatives

### WORKSTOCK AND OTHER LIVESTOCK

In addition to presenting previously unpublished tabulations of the livestock data contained in chapter VII, volume III, General Report on Agriculture, this chapter furnishes four entirely new counts that had not been made previously. They include the following: (1) Farms reporting horses and/or mules and tractors, (2) farms reporting horses and/or mules but no tractors, (3) farms reporting tractors without horses or mules, and (4) farms reporting horses, mules, cattle, and/or hogs. The first three tabulations furnish a much better picture of the distribution of horse and mechanical power on farms than has been available. The fourth tabulation is intended to indicate the proportion of farms having livestock other than poultry, and its data are comparable to those presented in table 13, chapter VII, volume III, General Report on Agriculture, except for the inclusion of sheep in table 13.

## FARMS REPORTING HORSES, MULES, CATTLE, AND/OR HOGS

Nine-tenths of the classified farms in the United States reported one or more of these classes of livestock-horses, mules, cattle, and/or hogs. The Pacific Division had the lowest proportion reporting, 70 percent; and the West South Central Division the highest, 94 percent. In all divisions, the two lowest-value-of-products groups, below \$250, had a considerably lower proportion of farms reporting these items than the average for their division. In three divisions the proportion of farms reporting these classes of livestock in the highestvalue-of-products group was somewhat lower than the division average. A low proportion of farms reporting livestock indicates the presence of types of farms on which livestock frequently are not found, such as specialized poultry, fruit, truck and cash-grain farms, and retirement and residence units.

One-tenth of all farms do not report any horses, mules, cattle, and/or hogs and one-fourth of these farms without livestock have less than \$100 value of products. More than threefifths of the farms not reporting any of these classes of livestock had less than \$400 value of products, but no value group had less than 4 percent of its farms in this category.

The difference between the count of farms reporting horses, mules, cattle, sheep, and/or hogs, and the number reporting these classes, except sheep, can be taken to represent the number of farms having sheep but none of the other specified classes of livestock. There are approximately 10,000 such farms, half of which are in the 2 North Central Divisions and more than a fourth in the Mountain and Pacific Divisions.

#### . WORKSTOCK AND TRACTORS

Almost one-fourth of all farms in the United States reported neither horses, mules, nor tractors. For the lowest-value-ofproducts group this proportion was two-thirds; for the value group from \$100 to \$249, nearly half were without workstock or tractors. For the value-of-products groups of \$1,000 and over, the proportion without these types of power was less than 10 percent. For all divisions except the Mountain Division, less than half the farms in the lowest-value-of-products group reported animal or tractor power. In the New England and Pacific Divisions less than half the farms in the four value-ofproducts groups under \$600 reported workstock or tractors. These four groups constitute 46 percent of all classified farms in the New England Division and 40 percent of all classified farms in the Pacific Division.

Geographic divisions and value-of-products groups which were high in the proportion of farms without workstock or tractors were also high in the proportion of farms without livestock.

Of all farms in the United States 53 percent reported horses or mules but no tractors, 4.5 percent reported tractors but no horses or mules, and 19 percent reported both. Less than 1 percent of the farms in the East South Central and South Atlantic Divisions reported tractors without workstock and about twothirds of the farms in the three Southern Divisions used only horses or mules.

The proportion of farms reporting tractors and the proportion reporting both tractors and workstock are larger for the higher-value-of-products groups. In general, this is true for all geographic divisions. Only about one-fourth of the farms reporting tractors are in the value-of-products groups below \$1,000 but these groups contain two-thirds of all the farms in the United States.

#### CATTLE

The proportion of farms reporting cattle on April 1, 1940 varies from 60 percent in the Pacific Division to 89 percent in the West North Central Division. The proportion of farms reporting cattle tends to be somewhat higher in the middle-valueof-products groups. With a very few exceptions the proportion of farms in any geographic division reporting cattle was less than half in the value-of-products group of less than \$100, and over half in all other value groups. In all divisions except New England and the Pacific more than two-thirds of the farms in all value-of-products groups over \$250 reported cattle.

#### COWS MILKED

About three-fourths of the farms in the United States reported cows milked during some part of 1939, but approximately one-half of these milked only 1 or 2 cows. The proportion of farms with cows milked varies from 57 percent in the Pacific Division to 86 percent in the West North Central. The proportion of farmers milking cows tends to become larger with an increase in the value-of-products groups up to the medium-value groups, and to diminish somewhat for groups above that level. This general pattern applies to all geographic divisions except the Pacific, in which the proportion of farms reporting cows milked in 1939 is about the same for the largest-value-ofproducts groups as for those in the medium-value brackets.

(79)

More than half the farms in all value-of-products groups over \$100—except for the \$100 to \$249 groups in the New England and Mountain Divisions—reported cows milked. Over twothirds of the farms in groups above \$250 except in the New England, Mountain, and Pacific Divisions reported cows milked. Distribution of farms milking at least one cow is therefore very general throughout the geographic divisions and value groups.

In the lower-value-of-products groups, however, most of the farms report only 1 or 2 cows milked. For the groups below \$400, 83 percent of the farms with cows milked reported 1 or 2 cows. For the groups with \$400 to \$999 value of products, 55 percent of the farms that reported cows milked were milking 1 or 2 cows and for all farms in the groups above \$1,000 those milking 1 or 2 cows were only 26 percent of the farms reporting cows milked.

HOGS

Fewer farms reported hogs in 1940 than reported cows milked in 1939. About three-fifths (62 percent) of all farms reported hogs on hand April 1, 1940. The number of farms having hogs at some time during 1939 was larger than the number reporting hogs on April 1, 1940, since 67 percent of all farms reported the butchering of hogs or pigs in 1939 (table 38, ch. VII, vol. III-General Report on Agriculture). Some farmers who raise hogs do no butchering, therefore the proportion of farms raising or butchering hogs must have been somewhat over 67 percent. Variations in the proportion of farms reporting hogs in the different divisions are marked; between 64 and 70 percent of the farms in the 2 North Central and the 3 Southern Divisions reported hogs, but in New England only 18 percent reported. The proportion of farms reporting hogs and reporting sows in the different value-of-products groups follows the same pattern as for cows milked, increasing toward the middle of the value groups and decreasing in the higher brackets,

For the United States as a whole, more than half the farms in each value-of-products group above \$250 reported hogs. In the New England and Pacific Divisions, no value-of-products group had hogs on as many as one-third of the farms. In the three Southern Divisions only the value-of-products group below \$100 had hogs on less than half the farms.

One-third of all farms in the United States reported sows and all value-of-products groups except the two groups below \$250 reported sows on at least 20 percent of the farms. Less than one-third of the farms in all groups up to \$750 reported sows. The proportion of farms reporting hogs which have sows is much greater in the higher-value brackets. For the groups below \$400 value of products, 34 percent of the farms with hogs, reported sows. For the groups from \$400 to \$999 the proportion was 47 percent; it was 68 percent for the groups from \$1,000 to \$2,499, and 75 percent for the groups above \$2,500.

Most of the farms with sows in the lower-value groups reported having only 1 or 2 sows. Of the farms with sows in the groups with less than \$400 value of products 85 percent had 1 or 2 sows. In the groups from \$400 to \$999 the proportion was. 72 percent. For the groups from \$1,000 to \$2,499 and \$2,500 and over, the percentages were 44 and 23, respectively.

#### SPECIFIED FARM MACHINERY AND FACILITIES

All of the items contained in this tabulation are available by States and divisions in chapter VI, volume III—General Report on Agriculture.

#### AUTOMOBILES, MOTORTRUCKS, AND TRACTORS

Almost 3 out of 5 farm operators in the United States reported automobiles in 1940; less than one-fourth reported tractors and about one-sixth reported motortrucks. There is considerable variation in the proportion of farms having these items in the different geographic divisions. The proportion having automobiles varies from 82 to 26 percent, the proportion reporting motortrucks from 32 to 7 percent, and tractors from 45 to 4 percent.

The East North Central and West North Central Divisions were highest in the proportion of farms reporting automobiles and tractors, but were fifth and sixth, respectively, in the proportion reporting motortrucks. The New England Division was first in the proportion of farms reporting motortrucks, and sixth in the proportion reporting automobiles and tractors. The three Southern Divisions were lowest for all three items.

In all divisions, mote farmers reported automobiles than either motortrucks or tractors. In 5 divisions more farms had motortrucks than tractors.

The proportion of farms reporting these items of equipment was greater in the upper-value-of-products groups. This tendency was much more pronounced for motortrucks and tractors than for automobiles.

Two-fifths of the farms in the United States, in value-ofproducts groups under \$600, reported automobiles in 1940. More than four-fifths of the farms in value groups over \$1,000 reported automobiles. In the Middle Atlantic, East North Central, and Pacific Divisions, the proportion of farms having automobiles was more than 50 percent in all value groups. In the New England and West North Central States there were automobiles on more than half the farms for all value groups above \$100. In the South Atlantic and East South Central Divisions less than half the farms in all value groups below \$1,000 reported automobiles. In the West South Central Division this was true for groups below \$750, and in the Mountain Division for the two groups below \$250.

In all geographic divisions, less than 15 percent of the farms in the two lowest-value groups reported motortrucks and tractors. In the South Atlantic and East South Central Divisions, less than 10 percent of the farms reported motortrucks and 6 percent or less reported tractors in all value groups below \$1,000.

### ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION LINES AND DWELLINGS LIGHTED BY ELECTRICITY

Of all farms in the United States 46 percent reported that they were within one-quarter mile of an electric distribution line in 1940, and one-third of the farms reported dwellings lighted by electricity. A greater proportion of farms is served by electricity in the New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, and Pacific Divisions than in the others. A much greater proportion of farms with high value of products is served by electricity than of the lower-value groups, and a greater proportion of the higher-value groups is within onequarter mile of a distribution line. In the lower-value groups the farms reporting dwellings lighted by electricity are only 60 to 70 percent of the farms within one-quarter mile of an electric distribution line. In the Southern Divisions this proportion is generally less than 50 percent. In the highervalue groups a much larger proportion of the farms within onequarter mile of a distribution line has dwellings lighted by electricity. In some divisions, the upper 2 or 3 value groups report more farms with dwellings lighted by electricity than are within one-quarter mile of a distribution line. This may be due to the use of individual generating plants.

#### TELEPHONES

Only one-fourth of all farms in the United States reported telephones in 1940. About 10 percent of the farms in the 3

Southern Divisions reported telephones compared with 50 percent in New England. The proportion of farms having telephones varies with the value of farm products per farm, the proportion being about five times as great in the highest group as in the lowest, for the country as a whole. The proportion of farms having telephones in the low-value groups is higher in the New England, Pacific, and the two North Central Divisions than in the other divisions.

#### BUSINESS WITH OR THROUGH COOPERATIVES

Between 20 and 40 percent of the farm operators in the New England, Middle Atlantic, Mountain, Pacific, and the two North Central Divisions reported business with or through cooperatives in 1939, compared with about 10 percent in the 3 Southern Divisions.

As a rule, the proportion dealing with cooperatives tends to become larger in the higher-value groups. The proportion of farms in the lowest-value-of-products groups doing business with cooperatives is quite low in all divisions, for most divisions being less than 10 percent for the value groups below \$250. For the 3 Southern Divisions, only 25,835 farms out of 664,790 with products valued at less than \$250, reported business with cooperatives.