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# Business Review and Prospect 

General

Two noteworthy reports bearing on the same general subject were made public during February. These were the Baruch-Hancock report on "War and Post-War Adjustment Policies" and the report of the George Committee on "Post-War Economic Policy and Planning." Although there are points of difference in the two sets of proposals, the similarities of the two programs and their broad areas of agreement are far more impressive than their differences. Both are based upon the principle that the great need in the demobilizaiton period will be to get people back to work on peacetime jobs. To that end both would get the Government out of business promptly by having it pay its debts, move war materials out of plants, and sell its surpluses; and both would preserve and strengthen the system of free enterprise.

One of the main themes of the Baruch-Hancock report is that the size of the post-war conversion problem should be reduced and the war effort itself speeded by tightening up efficiency during the war. It states forcefully that scrutiny of war requirements to avoid waste, such as accumulating excess stocks of weapons which rapidly become obsolete, should be intensified.

The report objects to the making of goods no longer needed simply to provide employment or profit, either in the war or post-war period. It argues for an early effective review of the programs for the production of raw materials, for stockpiling, for imports, and for subsidies, premiums, or lother devices for stimulating marginal production. Wherever practicable it would use materials left after the war needs are met to fulfill civilian requirements. It calls for making necessary decisions promptly; otherwise later decisions will be more difficult. Where there have been war expansions far beyond any possible post-war future, it will be better to cancel war contracts earlier and begin reducing the bloat than to wait until it has to be done all at once.
This emphasis on speed in shifting from war to peace runs throughout the report. It applies to cutbacks in production, to settlement of contracts, and to handling of surpluses. The report says:

[^0]The same philosophy is carried over into proposals for disposal of surplus property. The first suggestion made is that the Surplus Property Administrator "sell as much as he can as early as he can without disrupting normal trade." The points are made that during the months immediately ahead the surplus war goods can most readily be sold, market conditions will be at their best, and an ixomediate start on the problem would reduce enormously the likely surpluses that would be left for the more difficult months after the war.

As principles to govern sales the report urges, among others: no sales to speculators or promoters; use of regular channels of trade; proceeds of all sales to go to reduce national debt; equal access to surpluses for all businesses and all sizes of businesses with size of lots to be detcrmined accordingly; no' creation of monopoly.

To promote reconversion the Baruch-Hancock report recommends advance planning jointly by military and civilian agencies for the unknown day on which Germany is defeated. The plan would seek to estimate in advance the cancellations, the industries affected, and the resources likely to be relcased. It would make tentative selections of the industries and plants to be freed all for the purpose of speeding reconversion and reëmployment and increasing the supply of civilian goods early. It recommends an advance listing of civilian needs which have been restricted during the war and which should have preference in the opening up of civilian supply, giving highest priority to such things as vital repairs, expanded transportation or improved maintenance. It advises that industries which will need to retool for peacetime work be permitted to secure their tools before the end of the war. It would guide cancellations to permit the earliest release of small concerns which can convert back to peacetime production. "Nuisance" production controls affecting only small quantities of materials would be relaxed early under the plan and all materials limitations would be brought under early review.

The report recommends that "as far as possible no manufacturer should be permitted to jump the gun on his competitors," but; it states, "it may not always be possible to do so, and industrialists must understand that this objective cannot be allowed to interfere with war requirements or hold back the production of needed civilian items and so contribute to inflation and unemployment."

With reference to the return of the Armed Forces to civilian life, the report states that demobilization will be gradual and absorption into industry will be aided by several factors, such as: the giving up of war jobs by many women; the retirement of older workers; the increase of travel and recreation time; the return of many younger workers to school; the resumption of college and professional training by many now in the services or in war industry; the renewal of many professional and service businesses that have stopped during the war; the starting of new enterprises; the business involved in meeting the needs of the world; the reduction in work week; the normal enforcement of child labor laws. While acknowledging the difficulty of the problem the report states: "considering the factors mentioned above the problem of demobilization is soluble if we create the atmospherc in which private initiative and resourcefulness-the traditional American spirit-can again take hold."

Both the Baruch-Hancock report and the George Committee report state without qualification that there should be no government operation of plants to compete with private industry. Both agree that in the case of synthetic rubber and other industries whose fate will
be decided by disposition of government-owned plants a formulation of public policy by Congress is called for.
That leading American industrialists were aware of the responsibility resting upon them even before the appearance of the Baruch and George reports is evidenced by the following passage from an address by Alfred P. Sloan, Chairman of the Board of the General Motors Corporation, at the forty-sixth meeting of the National Association of Manufacturers:
"Out of all the circumstances existing today, this fact stands out crystal clear. American business men will be directly challenged by the post-war era. That challenge must be aggressively met, There, will be a demand for a morc complete utilization of the mation's economic resources. The abundance of the early 'forties in contrast with the shortage of the 'thirties constitutes a political demand that no administration will ignore. Wc of industry must assmme a constructive attitude. We must take the initiative in both planning and action for the post-war period."

In the February issue of The Review it was pointed out that business men and forward-looking citizens generally in both the large centers of population and in the small communites throughout. Texas appear to be giving increasing thought and attention to post-war economic problems in their respective areas. This fact, together with what has been said above of those who are viewing the problem from a nation-wide perspective, is indicative of a determination not to repeat the errors of indifference toward post-war problems which prevailed during World War I.

## Texas Industry in Relation to the BáruchHancock Report

Since a large percentage of Texas industry is carried on in small establishments and distributed over the entire State, some of the provisions of the Baruch-Hancock report have a special interest to this State and the Gulf Southwest as a whole. Among these provisions are the following:

1. That surpluses (of war materials) be disposed of in small lots to permit small as well as large business to participate.
2. Effective representation of small business on Industry Advisory Committees.
3. Provision for special credit to assist small business in the changeover and to encourage new enterprises. a. Extension of the lending authority of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, at present restricted to purposes of war production, to cover financial assistance for changeover problems.
b. Expansion and liberalization of the Federal Reserve System's authority to make industrial loans permitting one-half billion dollars of such loans outstanding at any one time.
c. These two additional sources of credit to sup-plement-not compete with-the enormous volume of savings in the hands of individuals and banks which await tapping.
The Baruch-Hancock report will doubtless exercise a great deal of influence in shaping the policy of the government toward industry and trade during the period of transition from war to peace and long after peace has been finally established. Texas industrial, business,

Iabor and civic leaders will therefore wish to become thoroughly familiar with the report because of the practical bearing government policy will have on the affairs of industrial concerns, and on community development throughout the State. Those wishing details may obtain a copy of the complete report upon application to the Office of War Mobilization, 323 Washington Building, Washington 25, D.C.

The influence of the report is in fact already apparent in the appointment of Mr. William L. Clayton to the position of Surplus Property Administrator and in the realignments which are taking place in War Production Board policy and procedure. Both Donald Nelson, chairman, and Charles E. Wilson, vice-chairman, of the Board, are expected personally to play an important part in establishing industry reconversion policics.

Groups throughout Texas planning post-war programs for their respective communities will do well to keep in tune with national governmental policy in the transition from a war to a peace conomy. In the meantime every community should intensify its efforts in developing its own program so that definite action may be taken as soon as conditions permit.

## Indexes of Curbent Business in Texas

After a brief post-holiday dip, the Texas business index is again pointing upward. The February composite index rose 3.3 points from the January figure of 198.6 or nearly 2 per cent; and the year to year gain was 14 points or approximately 8 per cent. Each of the component indexes except carloadings and department store sales show a gain over February a year ago; and all but the employment and carloadings indexes are above the January figure.

## FEBRUARY INDEXES OF BUSINESS AGTIVITY IN TEXAS

| Feb., 1944 | Feb., 1943 | Jent, 1944 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employment .... .-.-------....-----------152.4 | 139.3 | 153.6 |
| Pay Rolls .----------------------------1261.6 | 210.3: | 252.3 |
| Miscellaneous Freight Carloadings (Southwest District) $\qquad$ | 142.2 | 145.1 |
| Runs of Crude Oil to Stills .- ... 247.4 | 189.6 | 241.7 |
| Department Store Sales ---......- 209.8 | 226.7 | 190.9 |
| Electric Power Consumption --.- 301.0 | 265.3 | 246.2 |
|  | 187.9 | 198.6 |

No important changes in the employment and pay roll indexes are expected to occur during the months immediately ahead or as long as virtually full employment prevails with overtime pay for hours in excess of the standard week. The other four components are likely to show temporary fluctuations with a gradual upward tendency in the component index.

## Agriculiture

The agricultural production plant from the livestock standpoint is numerically in a somewhat more favorable position now than it was a year ago both for Texas and the nation. Moreover, abundance of moisture in Texas during the past two months insures good range and pasture conditions for the coming season although planting of feed crops is being greatly retarded.

Inventories of hogs, cattle, and horses in Texas as of January 1, 1944, were above those of the corresponding date of the preceding year, but the total numbers of sheep, goats, and mules were under those of last year.

Cattle numbers at $7,669,000$ were up 1 per cent; hogs, 3,106,000 head, were 17 per cent larger; and the 588,000 horses represented an increase of 1 per cent; chicken numbers increased 4 per cent to $38,495,000$.

On the other hand the $10,339,000$ sheep indicated a 5 per cent decline; the $3,200,000$ goais, a decline of 4 per cent; and the 400,000 mules, a drop of 12 per cent.

The national figure on cattle inventories reached a new record high of $82,192,000$, an increase of 4 per cent over January l, 1943; hogs, 83,736,000 head, were nearly 14 per cent above the record of a year ago; but sheep, at $51,718,000$, showed a decrease of approximately 7 per. cent from last year. The number of chickens rose from 541 million to 573 million, or nearly 6 per cent.

## Farm Casi Income During February

Cash income in Texas from agriculture totalled $\$ 55$ million during February, an increase of more than 9 per cent over the corresponding month last year, while aggregate cash income during the first two months was $\$ 122$ million, an increase of nearly 13 per cent over the corresponding period a year ago.

Substantial gains in income from fruits and vegetables, milk products, rice and hogs were only partly offset by declines in income from cattle, calves, and a few other products of minor importance at this season of the year, resulting in the net gain indicated in comparison with a year ago.
INDEXES OF AGRICULTURAL CASH INCOME IN TEXAS

| Diatricta | Feb., 1944 | Jani. 1944 | Feb:, 1943* | Actual Cash Income (Cumulative) (In Thousands of Dellaxs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | January | to March |
|  |  |  |  | 1944 | ${ }^{1943}$ |
| 1-N | 174.5 | 154.1 | 244.8 | \$8,346 | \$11,682 |
| 1-S | - 491.0 | 400.8 | 478.2 | 14,001 | 13,053 |
| 2 | 298.2 | 220.7 | 320.8 | 10,883 | 11,893 |
| 3 | 26.3 .8 | 229.8 | 288.6 | 4,396 | 4,382 |
| 4 | - 248.4 | 255.2 | 195.4 | 16,257 | 12,405 |
| 5 | -. 261.3 | 224.7 | 223.8 | 5,498 | 4,847 |
| 6 | - 251.7 | 228.5 | 429.8 | 5;741 | 8,322 |
| 7 | - 265.7 | 248.4 | 336.8 | 4,281 | 4,962 |
|  | - 299.3 | 289.6 | 293.8 | 8,137 | 8,001 |
| 9 | -- 358.8 | 574.5 | 286.0 | 15,271 | '11,948 |
| 10 | -. 210.2 | 3100 | 334.1 | 2,671 | 3,468 |
| 10-A | -- 797.7 | 648.5 | 453.2 | 26,999 | 13,775 |
| STATE | 337.9 | 307.7 | 309.3 | \$122,481 | \$108,738 |

*Rerised.
Nork: Farm cash income as somputed by this Bureau understated sctual farm cash income by from sir to ten per cent. This situstion rebulta from the fact that means of securing complete lacal marketings, especially by truck, have not yet benn fully developod. In addition, mana lave not yet ben developed for computing cash income from all agticultural specialities of loesl importance io ecettered areat thronghout the State, This silustion, bowaver, doet not impair the atcuracy of the findezer to any apprecizble extent.

The index numbers clearly reflect the enormous increase in farm cash income currently received in certain crop reporting districts, notably in district 1-S, the southern High Plains, and in $10-\mathrm{A}$, the Lower Rio Granide Valley. The rise in the index is, moreover, very substantial in all of the other districts and for the State as a whole. These indexes show the marked percentage rise in farm cash income in the State in comparison with the average monthly cash income from 1928-1932, adjusted for seasonal variation. Only a few years ago the level of average monthly farm cash income upon which the indexes are based was regarded as about normal,
since the five-year period embraced two relatively good and two poor years with one average year.

## Trends of Farm Casif Income in Crop Reporting

## Districts 2 and 3

Readers of the Review have requested that tabulations showing trends of farm cash income in Texas similar to those contained in the January and February issues be included in future issues if possible for other crop reporting districts in the State. We are accordingly including corresponding figures for districts 2 and 3 in this issue.

In connection with the quantitative data on farm cash income for the State and for each of the crop reporting districts, it is suggested that the reader refer to the article on Crop Reporting Districts in Texas by Elmer H: Johnson in the March, 1941, issue of the Review. In this article Mr. Johnson defines a Natural Region, and it is upon the basis of his analysis of the Natural Regions of Texas that the present crop reporting districts were delineated in the early 1930's by the United States Department of Agriculture. Space permits only a few quotations from this article:
> "The crop reporting districts of Texas, are sor laid out as to include within each the greatest degree of agricultural and range homogentity possible in the limited number of districts practicable for the purposes concerned.
> "It is to be kept in mind, however, that within each district oceur areas of considerable size, either individually or in aggregate, whose special characteristics depart markedly from the general environment of the district.
> "Knowledge of basic features concerning the physical environment of these various districts make possible and is an essential requisite to a common sonse interpretation of the agricultural or range utilization of the lands involved."

In the February issue of the Review, indexes of seasonal variation of farm cash income were given for the State as a whole and for crop reporting districts $1-\mathrm{N}$ and 1-S. The following table gives corresponding indexes for districts 2 and 3 . The delineation of all of the crop reporting districts may be seen on the outer cover page of the November, 1943, Review or in the March 1941, issue referred to above.

INDEXES OF SEASONAL VARIATION

|  | District 2 |
| :--- | :--- | District 3

The difference in the seasonal distribution of income in these two adjacent districts, it will be noted, is quite striking. In district 2 approximately two-thirds of the annual farm cash income is received during the three fall months of September, October, and November. In district 3 only a little more than one-third of the annual farm cash income is received during these three months.

F. A. Buechel.

DISTRICT 2-TRENDS OF FARM CASH INCOME BY PRODUCTS

| Prodect | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 | 1932 | 1933 | 1934 | 1935 | 1936 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cootton --- | 97,547 | 67,365 | 57,072 | 19,987 | 20,391 | 32,234 | 44,046 | 15,942 | 29,878 | 1936 23,110 | 1937 31,029 | 1938 21,126 | 1939 15,256 | 1940 21,407 | 1941 58109 | 1942 59885 | 1943 |
| Cotton Seed | 15,792 | 12,116 | 10,362 | 4,598 | 3,116 | 4,081 |  | 15,942 4,156 | 29,878 8,379 | 23,110 | 31,029 | 21,126 | 15,256 | 21,407 | 58,109 | 58,585 | 39,834 |
| Wheat | 1,756 | 532 | 581 | 299 | 3,116 839 | +824 | 5,517 762 | 4,156 1,087 | 8,379 2,382 | 6,139 1,123 | 7,512 | 5,461 | 3,869. | 5,108 | 16,114. | 14,755 | 10,350 |
| Rice |  |  |  | 29 | 839 | 824 | 762 | 1,087 | 2,382 | 1,123 | 2,396 | 3,275 | 1,167 | 1,893 | 2,769 | 4,390. | 6,639 |
| Grain Sorghum - | 2,611 | 2,219 | 1,497 | 1,453 | 370 | 557 | 667 | 586 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn -------....--- | 225 | 123 | 183 | 1,49 | 35 | -58 | 667 29 | 586 41 | 680 104 | 1,096 152 | 1,464 135 | 826 66 | 1,103 35 | 1,416 94 | 1,895 | 2,435 | 3,821 |
| Oats | 211 | 347 | 101 | 112 | 143 | 69 | 53 | 99 |  |  | 135 | 66 122 | 35 133 | 94 103 | 145 | 163 | 251 |
| Cattle | 14,964 | 16,300 | 14,724 | 10,259 | 6,023 | 4,241. | 4,205 | 99 6,850 | 200 6,685 | 6,731 | 213 10,558 | 10,597 | 1, 133 | 11203 | 116 13523 | 172 21.937 | 258 |
| Calves | 494 | 3,308 | 3,493 | 2,550 | 1,532 | 1,057 | 4,133 | 6,850 | 6,685 | 6,731 1,202 | 10,558 1,302 | 10,597 1,361 | 11,458 1,568 | 11,285 1,596 | 13,523 | 21,937 | 23,502 |
| Hogs ------------------ | 675 | 1,030 | 868 | 2,660 | 1,562 | 1,057 | 1,133 556 | 1,094 414 | 1,051 594 | 1,202 1,063 | 1,302 1,032 | 1,361 | 1,568 828 | 1,596 589 | 1,510 | 1,908 | 2,089 |
| Sheep --.....-.-.-. | 264 | 364 | 437 | 222 | 308 | 312 | 248 | 314 | 594 484 | 1,063 359 | 1,032 877 | 730 817 | 828 890 | 589 949 | +999 | 1,943 | 3,076 |
| Poultry ---.-.-. | 1,655 | 1,695 | 2,144 | 1,758 | I,792 | 982 | 951 | 301 977 | 1,181 | 359 988 | 877 1,313 | 817 1,010 | 890 803 | 949 901 | 1,031 | 1,661 | 1,592 |
| Wool | 338 | 500 | 450 | 309 | 233 | 129 | 336 | 293 | 1,181 | 988 | 1,313 | 1,010 867 | 803 1.084 | 901 1.649 | 886 | 1,019 | 1,026 |
| Mohair ----.....-.- | 130 | 195 | 150 | 50 | 18 | 12 | + 40 | 293 | 268 48 | 860 | 1,145 | 867 | 1,084 | 1,649 | 2,210 | 2,366 | 2,444 |
| Eggs | 1,681 | 1,889 | 1,972 | 1,579 | 1,103 | 819 | 432 | 1,116 | 1,508 | 1.454 | 1301 | 81 I 178 | 115 | 146 | 151 | 255 | 260 |
| Milk Products --- | 1,358 | 1,404 | 1,654 | 1,368 | 1,244 | 1,070 | 432 | 1,116 | 1,508 | 1,454 | 1,322 | I,178 | 1,424. | 1,590 | 3,207 | 5,396 | 4,621 |
| Fruits, vegetables Canning $\qquad$ |  |  | 1,654 | 1, | 1,24 | 1,070 | , | 1,997 | 2,522. | 2,824 | 2,708 | 2,695 | 2,748 | 3,211 | 4,179 | 6,152 | 7,011 |
| Peanuts ...----- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | --...-- | --...- | $\cdots$ | ----- | ---* |  |  |  |
| TOTA | 701 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,18 |
|  |  |  | 95,588 | 45,343 | 37,509 | 46,710 | 60,652 | 34,978 | 55,965 | 47,345 | 63,107 | 50,212 | 42,481 | 5I,937 | 106,844 | 124,352 | 108,958 |

DIS'TRICT 3-TRENDS OF FARM CASH INCOME BY PRODUCTS

| Product | 1927 | 1929 | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 | 1932 | 1.933 | 1934 | 1935 | 1936 | 1937 | 1939 | 1939 | 1940 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cotton | 14,022 | 12,444 | 9,106 | 3,139 | 3,868 | 3,973 | 6,662 | 4,101 |  |  |  |  | 1159 | 1940 | 1941 | 1942 | 1943 |
| Cotton Seed | 2,170 | 2,196 | 1,584 | 1,250 | 3,868 | 3,973 $\cdot 608$ | 6,662 862 | 4,101 1,124 | 6,149 1,690 | 4,236 1,102 | 3,047 706 | 1,322 | 1,159 | 2,406 | 3,381 | 4,924 | 2,974 |
| Wheat | 1,160 | 2,64 | 83I | - 308 | 571 | 511 | 403 | 1,124 | 1,690 586 | 1,102 | 706 1.778 | 303 | 269 | 552 | 948 | 1,238 | 765 |
| Rice |  |  |  |  | 571 | 511 | 403 | 719 |  |  | 1,778 | 1,924 | 1,003 | 1,976 | 1,076 | 594 | 1,682 |
| Grain Sorghum '.. | 355 | 223 | 119 | 223 | 120 | 78 | 72 | 101 | 143 | 76 | 149 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn ---------------- | 640 | 326 | 170 | 358 | 140 | 129 | 138 | 138 | 101 | 76 333 | 149 | 109 | 38 116 | 142 | 190 | 209 | 419 |
| Oats | 520 | 1,021 | 465 | 322 | 471 | 226 | 1313 | 1388 | - 642 | 3396 | 560 | 201 | 116 | 167 | 230 | 279 | 403 |
| Cattle | 12,219 | 15,024 | 13,147 | 8,542 | 5,097 | 3,680 | 3,269 | 5,400 | 7,645 | 7,047 | 12,612 | 292 10,499 | 317 10437 | 318 9.477 | 370 12 | ${ }^{3} 30$ | 252 |
| Calves -----------.- | 629 | 3,070 | 2,980 | 2,427 | 1,227 | 1,256 | 1,257 | 1,344 | 2,4,4 | 2,547 | 12,612 3,724 | 10,499 3,249 | 10,437 3,564 | 9,477 3,446 | 12,351 | 21,791 | 19,843 |
| Hogs | 604 | 868 | 829 | 544 | 275 | 1,204 | 1,207 | 1,322 | 2,429 | +1,234 | 3,191 | 3,249 851 | 3,564 845 | 3,446 752 | 4,233 | 5,201 | 5,094 |
| Sheep | I28 | 232 | 220 | 240 | 279 | 253 | 127 | 165 | 322 | 1,234 223 | 1,191 | 851 435 | 845 | 752 | 1,366 | 2,571 | 3,541 |
| Poultry | 1,440 | 1,456 | 1,873 | 1,867 | 1,188 | 628 | 596 | 608 | 859 | 734 | 352 887 | 4354. | 449 | 296 | 408 | 674 | 847 |
| Wool | 204 | 336 | 346 | 294 | 1259 | 145 | 494 | 608 456 | 779 | 734 612 | 887 773 | 794 | 726 | 542 | 673 | 716 | 874 |
| Mohair | 168 | 255 | 193 | 218 | 131 | 66 | 222 | 137 | 248 | 358 | 375 | 271 | 703 | 928 | 1,21.l | 1,783 | 1,818 |
| Egge | 958 | 491 | 1,172 | 925 | 605 | 502 | 522 | 669 | 862 | 858 | 375 760 | 671 | 361 | 598 | 622 | 1,028 | 1,047 |
| Milk Products | 610 | 632 | 744 | 880 | 709 | 533 | 555 | 659 | 806 | 916 | . 760 | 695 | 618 | 554 | 770 | 1,101 | 1,458 |
| Fruits, Vegetables Canning |  |  |  | 88 | 76 | 533 | 555 | 659 | 806 | 916 | 1,002 | 910 | 844 | 1,206 | 1,471 | 2,501 | 2,830 |
| Peanuts .----...--- |  |  |  | 4 | 2 | - | ---- | 1 | ----- | 4 | ----- | ---- | ----* |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 35,827 | 39,218 | 3377 | 1 | 15,553 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | ------ | --- | 6,421 | 8,043 |
|  |  | 35,218 | 35, | 21,541 | 15,553 | 12,792 | 15,999 | 16,282 | 23,935 | 21,539 | 28,402 | 22,406 | 21,449 | 23,360 | 29,300 | 51,361 | 51,890 |

## Maximum Values From Cotton in 1944

Planting time is a critical period in determining farm cash income in Texas. Crop acreages and, to a substantial extent, qualities of products are now being determined by varieties planted; the latter is especially true in the case of cotton.

Cotton is our major crop. It is preëminently a raw material producing plant. It yields two major products, cotton lint and cottonseed. Both are basic raw materials for laxge manufacturing industries.

Qualities of both of these products, but more especially the lint, vary widely. Likewise, the proportion of seed to lint, and the yield per acre, vary as between climatic zones, soil types and conditions, and also as between different varieties and strains of cotton. All of these variations are further complicated by varying costs of production as between regions and varieties.

Cotton lint and cottonseed are produced to sell. Farmers are interested in securing the greatest net return for the two products combined. The value of lint per pound is about 8 times the value of seed in the case of M. $15 / 16$, but only 4 times as valuable per acre where the weight of seed is $2 / 3$ that of lint.

The major factors to be evaluated in determining the relative profitableness of growing different varieties of cotton are (1) yield per acre of lint (2) yield per acre of seed (3) staple length (4) grade and character of lint (5) quick fruiting (6) size of bolls (7) stormproofness (8) and adaptability to mechanical harvesting where this method of harvest is used.

The object of the following analyses is to convert as many of the above factors into lint yield per acre equivalents as possible to facilitate accurate comparisons. -

The market discount for $3 / 4$ inch staple is about 225 points off $15 / 16$ inch. This means, for example, that if a farmer is getting 200 pounds of lint per acre from a variety of cotton that produces $15 / 16$ inch staple, he should get at least 224 pounds per acre from a variety that produces only $3 / 4$ inch staple, and the amount of seed for the short staple should be at least equal to the other.

In order to determine yield value equivalents of staple lengths in terms of a given length, e. g. 15/16, it is only necessary to follow the following simple procedure. First, get the percentage relationship between the price of the staple length in question in relation to $15 / 16$. That is, divide the price of $15 / 16$ into the price of the staple length in question. Divide this quotient into 100 , and multiply that result by the yield expected from $15 / 16$ to get the necessary yield from the variety in question. For example, the premium for middling $11 / 8$ inch cotton is now 460 on middling 15/16. The price of middling $15 / 16$ at Dallas is 21 cents per pound. This means that the price of middling I $1 / 8$ inch is 25,60 cents, 25.60 cents divided by 21 cents equals 122 . This figure divided into 100 equals .82 . Now, suppose the farmer has been getting 200 pounds per acre of lint cotton from his $15 / 16$. He would have to get 164 pounds from a variety that would yield $11 / 8$. This is arrived
at by multiplying the .82 by 200 , the yield from $15 / 16$.
The value of cottonseed is now approximately $\$ 56$ per ton to the farmer. If a farmer is producing a variety of cotton which yields a lint percentage of $331 / 3$, and is getting 200 pounds of lint per acre, he would get approximately 400 pounds of seed- 400 pounds of seed at 2.3 cents a pound would be $\$ 11.20$ for seed.

Now, if the farmer changed from the above variety to one with a lint per cent of 40 , and got 200 pounds of lint, he would get only 300 pounds of seed, which, at 2.8 cents per pound, would bring only $\$ 8.40$ per acre. What would be the relative values of these two varieties, assuming that yield of lint and staple length in each case is the same, i.e., 200 pounds of $15 / 16$ ? The gross value difierence is $\$ 2.80$ in favor of the high seed producing variety. The farmer must pick 100 more pounds of seed cotton in the case of the high seed producing variety. Assuming the price of picking each variety per hundred is $\$ 1.00$, and that ginning is charged on the weight of the lint, then the high seed yielding varicty would be the better by $\$ 1.80$ per acre, the high lint per cent variety would need to produce about 8 pounds per acre more than the high seed yielding variety to produce the same net value per acre from both lint and seed.
The significant fact brought out by these calculations is that at present prices of coitonsecd they yield a net return to the farmer above cost, and that, other things being equal, it will pay the farmer to grow high seed producing varieties.

The next question to be answered is, do the varieties producing high lint percentages produce more lint per acre? The answer to that question must come from the scientific tests made by the experiment station and checked by the farmer's own experience.

Let me illustrate. In a five year test of 22 varieties at the Black Land Experiment Station at Tcmple, the variety with the highest lint percentage was eighth in yield of lint per acre, twenty-first in bolls per pound, twentieth in value of lint, and twentieth in value of seed. The number one variety in yield of lint per acre had a lint percentage of 36.5 .

The average difference in the amount and value of the seed produced at Temple, at present prices of seed, between Acala, the Lowest lint percentage producing variety, and half-and-half, the highest, is $\$ 5.79$. During this same period Acala 11.1 had an average lint yield of 304 pounds of $1 \mathrm{I} / 32$ inch cotton worth $\$ 81.14$ per acre at present prices; and half-and-half produced 279 pounds of 13/1.6 inch worth $\$ 53.85$.
The cost of picking cotton is an important factor to be considered, and costs are determined by such factors as (1) yield per acre, (2) size of bolls, and (3) fruiting habits. If we assume yield per acre to be the same, then the number of bolls required to be picked per pound is perhaps the leading factor determining cost of picking. This varies very widely. Generally it may be said that the weight of bolls varies inversely with the
lint ratio. That is, the higher the xatio of lint to seed, the lighter the weight of bolls. It is also generally true, although there are some important exceptions, that the lint percentage varies inversely with the length of staple. This means to say that as a rule the shorter stapled varieties have the highest lint percentages. Cértainly, at
present prices of cottonseed, the farmer is justified in shifting to varieties that produce the largest amount of seed, provided those same varieties equal the others in lint produced per acre.
A. B. Cox.

## COTTON BALANCE SHEET FOR THE U.S. AS OF MARCH 1, 1944

(In Thousands of Running Ḅsles Except as Noted)

| $\mathrm{Y}_{\text {ear }}$ | Carryover Augurt 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Imports } \\ & \text { to March } 1^{*} \end{aligned}$ | Gov, Est. as of Dee. 1* | Total | Cons. to March 1 | Exports to March 1 |  | March 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1934-1935 | 7,746 | 56 | 9,731 | 17,533 |  | March 1 $2.865$ | Total | Balance |
| 1935-1936 | 7,138 | 56 | 10,734 | 17,533 | 2,685 3,014 | 2,865 | 5,550 | 11,983 |
| 1936-1937 | 5,397 | 72 | 12,407 | 17,928 17,876 | 3,014 3,435 | 4,004 | 7,018 | 10,910 |
| 1937-1938 | 4,498 | 46 | 18,746 | 17,876 | 3,435 3,078 | 3,848 | 7,283 | 10,593 |
| 1938-1939 | 11,533 | 77 | 18,008 | 23,290 23,618 | 3,078 3,397 | 3,832 | 6,910 | 16,380 |
| 1939-1940 | 13,033 | 66 | 12,792 | 24,891 | 3,397 4,042 | 2,192 | 5,589 | 18,029 |
| 1940-1941 | 10,596 | 58 | 11,92 | 24,891 23,340 | 4,042 | 4,170 | 8,212 | 16,679 |
| ) 1941-1942 | 12,367 | $\dagger$ | 10,976 | 23,340 | 4,423 | 654 | 5,077 | 18,263 |
| 1942-1943 | 10,590 | + | 12,982 | 23,343 23,572 | 5,391 | 793 | 6,1,84 | 17,159 |
| 1943-1944 | 10,687 | $\dagger$ | 12,120 | 23,572 22,807 | 5,628 | 中 | 5,628 | 17,944 |
|  | 1,98 | 1 | 12,120. | 22,807 | 5,902. | 775 | 6,677 | 16,130 |
| The Cottoin year begins August 1. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| "Figures are in 500 -pound bales. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\ddagger$ New Yark Cotton Exchange estimate to March 1. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DaIRY PRODUCTS MANUFACTURED IN PLANTS IN TEXAS

| Product and Year CREAMERY BUTTER ( 1000 Ib.$)$ | Februaty | March | Aprll | May | J̦ung | July | August | September | Octaber | November | Deeember | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1944* --- 2,043 | 2,126 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1943* ---......----- $2,63 \mathrm{~L}$ | 2,743 | 2,724 | 3,446 | 4,740 | 4,275 | 4,051 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1930-39 average .-.-.... 2,074. | 2,109 | 2,392 | 3,138 | 3,556 | 3,166 | 4,113 | 2,867 | 2,513 | 2,581 2,608 | 2,236 2,301 | $1,924$ | $38,071$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1944** ---------.....-- 1,115 | 1,211 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1943* -----......--- 1,125 | 1,187 | 1,408 | 1,823 | 2,327 | 2,391 | 2,758 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1930-39 average ----- 1,215 | 1,262 | 434 | +570 | 2,752 | ${ }^{293}$ | 904 | 2,763 | 1,980 | 1,622 | 1,443 | 940 | 22,237 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1944* .....-.........-.-. 902 | 956 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1943* - - - - 914 | 948 | 1,108 | 1,633 | 2,120 | 1,943 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1930-39 average .-.---- 554 | 590 | 737 | 1,050 | 1,215 | 1,129 | 1,119 |  | 1,019 | 819 | 621 | 809 | 15,272 |
| MILK EQUIVALENT OF DAIRY PRODUCTS $\dagger$ ( 1000 lb.$)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1944** --..........----.-.-. 67,873 | 71,519 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1943* - ....-------......80,106 | 83,301 | 88,540 | 115,540 | 54,491 | 142,700 | 143,120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1930-39 average ----------74,675 | 57,139 | 67,456 | 89,641 | 104,323 | -97,562 | 143,120. | 124,558 89,185 | 93,186 76,165 | 85,084 | 73,290 60,119 | 62,253 55,872 | 1,271,809 |
| *Estimatec of production made by the Bureat of Buaincon Research, <br> tMilk Equivalent of Dairy productg was calculatẹd from production data by the Bureau of Buiriness Reaeareh. <br> \#Includes ice cream; shorbets, ices, etc.' <br> Note: 10-year average production on creamery bọter, ice cream and American pl!nese bund on data from-the Agricultural Marketing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

COMMODITY PRICES

| Wholesale Prices: | Felb, 1944 | Fel., 1943 | Jan., 1944 | (In Thousands of Barrels) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. Bureay of Labor Statistics $(1926=100 \%)$ | 103.6 | 102.5 | 103.8 | 「exas Plants | Jan., 1944 | 39!̣, 1949 | Dec., 1943 |
| Farm Prices: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics |  |  |  | - Production <br> Shipments | 430 449 | 809 668 | 534 409 |
| U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics <br> ( $1926=100 \%$ ) <br> -...--------.-.-.-.... | 122.5 | 119.0 | 121.8 | Stocks - | 1,116 | 872 | 1,135 |
| Retail Prices: |  |  |  | Whited States |  |  |  |
| Food (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics $\quad(1935-1939=100 \%)$ |  | 133.6 |  | Production ------------..---------- Shipments Stocks | 6,322 5,040 | 12,560 8,641 | 8,318 5,603 |
| Department Stores (Fairchild's Publications |  | 133.6 | 136.1 | Capacity Operated ------------------>- | 4,434, $30 \%$ | 21,347 $60.0 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23,134 \\ & 40.0 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| January, 1931=100\%) - | 113.3 | I13.3 | 113.3 | Nats: From U.S. Department of | Interior, Bur | of Mitres. |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cost of Eiving Index (1938-1939 } \\ & =100 \% \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | 123.7 | 120.9 | 124.1 | , | (1) | or Mines. |  |

# FEBRUARY, 1944, CARLOAD MOVEMENTS OF POULTRY AND EGGS <br> Shipments from Texas Stations 

| *Destination | Cars of Poultry |  |  |  | $-$ |  | Cara of Egga |  |  |  | Shell Eruivelent $\dagger$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Chickens |  | Turkeya |  | Shell |  | Frozen |  | Dried |  |  |  |
|  | 1944 | 1945 | 1944 | 1943 | 1944 | 1943 | 1944 | 1943 | 1944 | 1943 | 1944 | 1943 |
| TOTAL | 10 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 24 | 29 | 43 | 19 | 78 | 37 | 734 | 363 |
| rastate | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 18 | 26 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 152 | 32 |
| Interstate | 9 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 17 | 12 | 68 | 37 | 582 | 331 |
|  | Receip | at | xas | ation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TO'CAL | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 13 | 28 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 29 |
| Intrastate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 8 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 18 |
| Interstate | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 11 |

[^1]
## FEBRUARY SHIPMENTS OF LIVE STOCK CONVERTED TO A RAILCAR BASIS*

|  | Catite |  | Calves |  | Swino |  | Sheep |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1944 | 1943 | 1944. | 1943 | 1944 | 1943 | 1944 | 1983 | 1944 | 1943 |
| Total Interstate Plas Fort Worth | 2,196 | 4,120 | 518 | 687 | 1,438 | 1,134 | 228 | 657 | 4,380 | 6,598 |
| Total lntrastate Omitting Fort Worth --..----- - - - - | 533 | 792 | 123 | 215 | 93 | . 35 | 27 | 30 | 776 | 1,072 |
|  | 2,729 | 4,912 | 641 | 902 | 1.531 | 1,169 | 255 | 687 | 5,156 | 7,670 |

TEXAS CAR-LOT* SHIPMENTS OF LIVE STOCX FOR YEAR 1943

|  | Cattie |  | Cxivea |  | Swine |  | Sheep |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1944 | 1943 | 1944 | 1943 | 1944 | 1943 | 1944 | 1943 | 1944 | 1943 |
| Total Interstate Plus Fort Worth | 5,021 | 7,560 | 1,283 | 1,278 | 2,870 | 2,428 | 543 | 1,332 | 9,717 | 12,598 |
| Total Intrastate Omitting Fort Worth --- -...-- | 1,029 | 1,664 | 231 | 375 | 177 | 149 | 100 | 146. | 1,537 | 2,334. |
|  | 6,050 | 9,224 | 1,514 | 1,653 | 3,047 | 2,577 | 643 | 1,478 | 11,254 | 14,932 |

- Reil-tyar Basiu: Cattle, 30 thead par ear; qultes, 60; hogs, 80; and wheep, 250.

Fort Worth shiprient are combined with joterstate forwardigg to order chat the buik of market disappearance for the month may bo wow.
Nore: These data are furnighed the United States Bureau of Auricultural Economics by railway officisly through more than 1, Soo station afentar reprcsenting every livestock shipping poitt in the state. The data see compiled by the Burean of Business Research.

## february credit ratios in texas department and apparel stores



- Nors: The ratios shown for cach year, in the order in which they appear from laft to right are obtained by the followity computations: (1) Credit Salet divided by Net Sales, (2) Colfectons daring the month divided by the total eocounts unpaid on the first of the month, (3) Salurice of the credit departiocnt divided by credit sales. ' The data are reported to the Burean of Bukizess Rebearch by Tezas retail stores.


## EMPLOYMENT AND PAY ROLLS IN TEXAS

Februaxy, 1944



## ESTIMATED NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES IN NONAGRICULTURAL BUSINESS AND GOVE NMENT ESTABLISHMENTS ${ }^{(6)}$



[^2]
## FEBRUARY RETAIL SALES OF INDEPENDENT STORES IN TEXAS


${ }^{*}$ Group total includes kinds of business other than the classification listed.
*Group total includes kinds of business other than the classification of Business Research, coöperating with the U.S. Burcau of the Census,

## PETROLEUM

Daily Average Production (In Barrels)

|  | Feb., 1944 | Feb., 1943 | Jan., 1944 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Coastal Texas* | 516,600 | 320,450 | 520,800 |
| East Central Texas - | 111,900 | 100,550 | 116,400 |
| East Texas | 390,600 | 325,100 | 366,200 |
| North Texas | 139,950 | 135,350 | 140,200 |
| Panhandle $-102,000$ | 88,900 | 97,900 |  |
| Southwest Texas - | 288,250 | 162,150 | 293,550 |
| West Texas | 362,000 | 210,700 | 364,700 |
| STATE | $1,911,300$ | $1,343,200$ | $1,899,750$ |
| UNITED STATES $\quad 4,401,800$ | $3,867,900$ | $4,384,000$ |  |

Gasoline sales as indicated by taxes collected by the State Comptroller were: Jan, 1944, 92,864,246 gallons; Jan. 1943, $87,375,064$ gallons; December, 1943, $98,303,951$ gallons.


[^3]

[^4]Nots: Compiled from reports from Texas chambers of commerce to the Bu
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[^0]:    "Some" short-sighted persons will oppose" prompt decisions in the hope of continuing unnecessary production. We call them short-sighted because they are only borrowing. employment from the future when it will be needed and using it up in the present when there is more work than all of us can do. Unneeded stocks of raw materials beyond the margin of military safety will hang over the post-war market depressing future production, employment and prices. It will be stockpiling trouble for the future."

[^1]:    *The destination above in the first destination as ahown by the orisinal waybill. Changes in deatination broagh abont by diversion factora are not ahown,
     carloud of frozen eggane 2 carloads of ahell exgo.

    Notit: These data fumished to the Diviaion of Agrieultural Statiatice, B. A. E., by railroad officials through agents at all atations which orizinate atad rective carloail shipments of poultry end egge. The data ase tompiled by the Burcau of Business Research.

[^2]:    net Drofessional personmel. ${ }^{(1)}$ Revised.
    (2) Subjoct to revision.
    (a) No change.
    (a) Not avaifable.
    (e) Ba日ed on unwrighted figures.

    Burequ of Labor Statistics, IV, S. Department of warkers, ot domestic aspryants, and exelusive of military and maritime persounel. These figures are furnithed by Purequ of Labor Slatistics, U.S. Department of Tabor.
    Prepared from reporte from represmative Texan aptablishmente to tho Butean of Business Rebeareh coobperating with the Burcau of labor Statisticg,
    Due to the national emergenry, pablications of data for certain Industriea, is being withbeld until farthor notice.

[^3]:    Prepared from reports of 8 electric power companies to the Bureau of Business Research.

[^4]:    reau of Business Fesearch.

