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## STEER AND COW PRICES


prices of feeder steers at kansas city, slaughter steers and cows at chicago

Prices of Choice slaughter steers increased during July and in early August were above a year before. Feeder steer prices also rose during the month but remained a little below last year.

Fed cattle prices this fall are likely to retain much of their gain and to stay above last fall. Feeder prices are expected to decline seasonally but to
gradually narrow the gap with a year ago.
Prices of hogs in early August were equal last year's. They are expected to be higher this fall than last. Lamb prices also have been above a year ago, and may stay at least as high.

A downturn in meat production from past expansion underlies this improvemont in prices from last fall, when prices weakened severely.

## MARKET PRICES AND FEEDING MARGIN FOR CATTLE
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## RETURNS IN STEER FEEDING
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## SUMMARY

Prices of fed cattle have climbed above last year's prices, prices of lambs also are higher, and prices of hogs have reached their level of last year. Feeder cattle prices advanced in July but remain a little below a year ago.

This improvement in prices relative to last year, when general declines carried them to their lowest point in several years, reflects an ending of the huge meat supplies of past months. Total livestock slaughter and meat output for the rest of 1956 will be less than a year before. The downturn is the first since 1951. Meat production expanded more than ' 25 percent during the 5-year period.

Chief reduction this fall will be in slaughter of hogs. Following an 8 percent cut in the number of spring pigs saved, slaughter will increase less rapidly than last fall and will drop progressively farther below last year's slaughter rate.

Slaughter of cattle is expected to continue above last year. However, average welghts will be lighter and no more beef may be turned out than last fall. Fewer fed cattle may be slaughtered, as indicated by the 10 percent fewer on feed this July 1 than last, but slaughter of grass cattle will be larger. Calf slaughter in months to come may exceed a year before, sheep and lamb slaughter may drop below.

Prices of fed cattle are likely to stay above last year. Feeder cattle prices, while declining seasonally, may gradually close the gap with last year. Prices of hogs will decline seasonally but probably will be above a year before. They definitely are not expected to drop as low as they did last Dacember. Lamb prices may contimue to average as high or higher than last year.

Even though the letup in total slaughter and meat supply is appreciable and allows some recovery in prices, it is not of marked proportion. Meat output this fall will remain larger than in any year before 1955. Moreover, capacity for future production is not reduced as feed crops this fall promise to be large, though below last year's bumper harvests, while basic breeding herds of cattle remain undiminished. Slaughter of cows to date in 1956 has been less than in 1955. And the 1956 calf crop was indicated on July 30 as likely to be slightiy larger than the 1955 crop.

Beef steers are moving to slaughter at a faster rate than last year, perhaps fast enough to hold their year-end inventory about unchanged or reduce it slightly. This should prevent an overload of beef output such as the one that depressed fed cattle prices early in 1956. However, tonnage of beef may be great enough to result in seasonal price decilnes next winter from highs of this fall. The opportunities for realizing close to average profits in cattle feeding appear to be brighter than they were a year ago, but unusually large profits are not in prospect.

REVIEW AND OUTLOOR
Slaughter and Meat Production

## To Be Less This Fall than Last

Seasonal increases in livestock slaughter and meat production are underway with stepped-up marketing of spring pigs and expanded moveraent of cattle, calves, sheep and lambs from ranges and pastures. While the seasonal gain is significant, total meat output the rest of this year will fall short of a year before. The downturn is a striking departure from the successive expansions since 1951. During those 5 years, meat output rose more than 25 percent.

Beef production during the last half of this year is expected to total about the same as in the corresponding months of 1955. Lamb and mutton output may be down slightly. Pork output will be appreciably smaller, particularly late in the year.

Cattle Slaughter To Stay High
Cattle slaughter in commercial plants the first half of this year was $4 \frac{1}{2}$ nercent above a year earlier. Slaughter in July and early August, as ind_cated by weekly reports from inspected plants, continued above .las $\quad$ aar. Slaughter may remain above in remaining months.

Cattle slaughtered the rest of 1956 will include more off grass and fewer fro" feedlots than a year earlier. In 13 major feeding States on July 1 the :e were 10 percent fewer cattle on feed than a year before. The number in the Corm Belt was down 11 percent. Numbers on feed this July were about the same as two years earlier, Jvly 1954.

Marketings of fed cattle will nevertheless hold fairly close to last year because cattle are being moved into and out of feedlots at a faster pace and with shorter feeding. This is in contrast with last fall when cattle were held longer and marketings delayed. Placements on feed in April-June were up 5 percent from 1955, and feeder shipments from 10 markets in July were 80 percent above last year. Moreover, while a high percentage of the cattle on feed this July had been on feed less than 3 months ( 40 percent compared with 35 percent last year), producers planned to market even faster than last year. Their intentions were to sell 70 percent by October l, a rate slightly faster than the 68 percent planned a year earlier and considerably faster than actual July-September 1955 marketings of 60 percent of the July 1 inventory.

But lighter weights are a counter influence, for even if nearly as meny fed cattle should be slaughtered this fall as last, output of fed beef will be down appreciably. Slaughter weights were exceptionally heavy last fall and winter; they will be lighter this year.

Slaughter of grass cattle the rest of 1956 is expected to exceed last year. Last fall, slaughter of calves and steers off grass was relatively small -- small enough that 1-1/2 million were added to the inventory of those classes at the beginning of 1956. This fall, under the influence of relatively low prices of the past year and smaller feed supplies in several range and pasture areas, more of these young animals will be sent to slaughter and fewer, in all probability, will be retained in the January inventory。

Cow slaughter, however, is less predictable. Through May, inspected slaughter of cows was 10 percent under 1955. The June kill increased and was only 3 percent below June 1955. Prospects have been for slaughter of cows this fall to equal that of last fall. The actual slaughter rate will have much to do not only with beef output this fall but with the outlook for cattle production in the ensuing year.

Fed Cattle Prices Up,
Iikely to Retain Increase;
Feeder Prices Still Below 1955
Prices of fed cattle turned upward in July. Choice steers at Chicago entered that month at $\$ 21,00$ per 100 pounds, left it at $\$ 24.00$. The latter price was almost $\$ 2.00$ above a year before. It is the flirst time since March 1955 that Choice steer prices were above the previous year.

Prices of feeder cattle and calves responded to the long-awaited recovery in fed cattle prices. After declining seasonally for two months they advanced $\$ 1.00$ to $\$ 1.50$ during July. Early August prices were still a little below those of a year earlier.

Prices of fed cattle appear likely to retain most or all of their recent increase, as the period of largest supply is past. On the other hand, short feeding for quick marketing will probably maintain supplies well enough to prevent large further advances such as occurred in the fall of 1954.

Prices of feeder cattle are not likely to stay at their levels of early August. They usually decline seasonally until mid-fall, and probably will do so again this year. Low profits earned in feeding last winter will continue for some time as a depressing factor on feeder prices. On the other hand, feeder prices are not expected to decrease as fast or as far as last fall, and the gap with last year will likely be gradually closed. By the height of the marketing season prices may be around the level of a year before.

## Cattle Feeding to Stay Large

Gradual restoration of confidence following upturns in cattle prices and large harvests of feed crops will result in another large volume of cattle feeding this winter.

On August 1, a corn crop of 3,144 million bushels was reported in prospect. This would be 98 million bushels or 3 percent less than last year's large crop. For grain sorghums, indicated production is 21 percent below last year. The oats crop was 24 percent less than last year's near rocord harvest, and the barley crop was down 10 percent. For the four feed grains combined the prospective production is 8 percent below 1955. The hay crop is 4 percent under last year. With a record carryover of feed grains and with hog production down, feed supplies are fully ample for prospective numbers of livestock to be raised and fed.

Based on present prospects prices of feed the coming feeding season may average only a little above the past one. Increases are likely for prices of feed grains other than corn because their production is smaller and because support prices are up 4 cents per bushel for oats, 8 cents for barley, and 19 cents for grain sorghums. The support price for corn to producers in the Corn Belt who comply with allotments is $\$ 1.50$ per bushel, national average basis, 8 cents per bushel less than last year. To all producers outside the commercial area the average support price has been increased 5 cents from last year. In addition, producers in the comnercial area who do not comply with allotments are eligible for a loan of $\$ 1.25$ this year (national average basis). Last year they were eligible for no loan. This last provision affords the opportunity for considerable storage of com this year. However, the announced support prices apply to corn of
specified moisture content as deliverable next summer. The equivalent farm price in December would be 15 to 20 cents per bushel less. Hence the $\$ 1.25$ loan would not itself lift market prices above their average level of last fall. Its main effect is to set a floor to prevent any slide far below last year's prices. Compliance with allotments or with Soil Bank pricesupport requirements, by making producers eligible for $\$ 1.50$ support, would have more price-lifting effect, but it is not known how many producers will have qualified.

Moreover, prices of corn this fall will probably yield hog-corn and beef steer-corn price ratios, for the season as a whole, equal to or above average.

Range Feed Conditions

## Below Last Year

Drought has reduced the condition of range feed below last year. On August 1 the average condition in 17 Western States was 69 percent, compared with 79 percent for August 1955. Conditions are farthest below normal in Texas, Western Kansas, Western Nebraska, Colorado, Oklahoma and parts of South Dakota. Dryness has resulted in considerable movement of cattle but has not forced large early marketings to feedlots or slaughter.

## Profita Low in Cattle

Feeding in Past Year
Feeding of cattle returned less than average profits the past season. When fed cattle prices sank steadily the margins reallzed became small or even negative (see upper chart on inside cover page and table l). Profits were especially small in all short-term feeding. Price and cost comparisons given in lower inside cover chart and table 2 for short feeding of yearling steers in the Corn Belt show a profit margin of only $\$ 7 l .00$ per head. This was decidedly below average.

Similar. comparisons fox 6 different programs, to be published in the November 15, issue of this Situation, will probably reveal higher profits in long feeding than in short feeding this year. The recent rise in prices of fed cattle restored profits to long feeding, and in addition long feeding has taken best advantage of the lower prices of feed that prevailed during most of the past feeding season.

Table 1.- Price of Choice grade slaughter steers at Chicago and of all stocker and feeder steers at Kansas City, and

7 months lagged margin, by months, 1955 to date

|  | : | Price | 100 pounds | 8 | Margin betwee |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : |  | : | : | slaughter |
| Year | : | Choice | : | \% | sterrs, and |
| and | : | grade | : Stocker and | : | stockers |
| month | : | slaughter | - feeder steers, | : | and feeders |
|  | : | steers, | : Kansas City | : | 7 months |
|  | : | Chicago | : 1/ | : | previous 2/ |
|  | : |  | ; | : |  |
|  | 8 | Dollars | D0/1ars |  | Dollars |
| 1955 | : |  |  |  |  |
| January | : | 26.98 | 20.40 |  | 8.78 |
| February | : | 26.17 | 20.46 |  | 10.05 |
| March | : | 25.80 | 21.28 |  | 7.92 |
| April | : | 24.62 | 21.25 |  | 6.52 |
| May | : | 23.09 | 20.01 |  | 4.25 |
| June | : | 22.63 | 19.03 |  | 3.00 |
| July | : | 22.72 | 18.19 |  | 3.49 |
| August | : | 22.143 | 17.69 |  | 2.03 |
| September | : | 22.69 | 17.97 |  | 2.23 |
| October | : | 22.01 | 18.02 |  | . 73 |
| November | : | 20.83 | 16.92 |  | -. 42 |
| December | : | 20.35 | 15.89 |  | . 34 |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |
| 1956 | : |  |  |  |  |
| January | : | 20.02 | 17.13 |  | . 99 |
| February | : | 18.88 | 17.04 |  | . 69 |
| March | : | 19.41 | 17.44 |  | 1.72 |
| April | : | 20.56 | 17.81 |  | 2.59 |
| May | : | 20.70 | 17.68 |  | 2.68 |
| June | : | 21.05 | 17.02 |  | 4.13 |
| July | : | 22.37 | 17.36 |  | 6.48 |
| August 3/ | : | 24.99 | 17.40 |  | 7.86 |

1/ Average for all weights and grades.
2/ Margin between prices of Choice grade slaughter steers at Chicago for current month shown and of stocker and feeder steers at Kansas City 7 months previously.

3/ Average for week ended August 9.

Market price data compiled from Market News, Livestock Division.

Table 2.-Average prices and costs in feeding steers in the Corn Belt, 1946 to date


1/ Average all weights and grades.
$\overline{2}$ /Prices for 1946 and 1947 estinated from price paid for baled alfalfa hay, United States.
3 / Prior to July 1950, 41 percent protein.
I/ Does not include overhead costs, cost of pasture or other feed ingredients and death loss, or credits for manure and for hogs following steers. The feed ration and prices shown are designed to be fairly representative of average feeding experience in the Corn Belt, but do not necessarily coincide with the experience of individual feeders.

1956 Calf Crop up 1 Percent
Consideration of probable supplies and prices of cattle next spring starts with a comparison of production and slaughter rates.

The 1956 calf crop is expected to total 43.3 million head, 1 percent more than the 43.0 millition calves born in 1955. This advance estimate, published in a mid-sumner report issued for the first time this year, is subject to later revision since it necessarily includes an allowance for calves to be born this fall, but it does indicate that the rate of cattle production on farms has not yet halted. The prospective small increase is especially significant since the number of cows in herds last January was unchanged while the number of breeding heifers was down.

The supply of calves and young cattle available for slaughter in 1956 has been enhanced not only by the small increase in calves born during the year but also by the $1-1 / 2$ million head increase in beef calves and steers on hand at the beginning of the year. From this supply, slaughter of calves has been no larger than last "year, but steer slaughter under inspection from January to June was up 865,000 head or 19 percent. As previously noted, slaughter of steers and calves off grass is expected to be high this fall. Thus cattle marketings and slaughter are being speeded up this year to remove part of the big backlog and to get nearer a current basis. This adjustment is a major reason for expecting beef output next winter and spring to be a bit smaller than in the past season and for the prospect that fed cattle prices and feeding profits may be partly restored.

## Interest Centers on Very

Short or Very Iong Feeding
There are signs that interest in cattle feeding this year will center in two programs opposite in nature and implications. On the one hand, the daraging experience the past year in holding cattle too long and to too heavy weight will stimulate a fast-rotating feeding in which cattle will be fed a minimum time to only moderate finish. But on the other hand, feeding of calves may be preferred by many feeders because calves were the most profitable class to feed the past year and because they take fullest advantage of ample feed supply and minimize the short-term speculative risk. Although price relationships differ by markets, quotations in table 3 show that prices of feeder steer calves (Good and Choice) at Kansas City in early August were closer to a year ago than were prices of feeder stears. They were about as high as Choice steers this August, whereas usually they are a little lower. Relatively stronger prices for calves than steers may contimue this fall, if prospects stay bright for a corn harvest nearly equal to last year's. Any decrease in the prospective harvest would weaken the relationship of calf to steer prices.

Table 3.- Comparison between prices per 100 pounds for fed steors and feeder steers and ateer calves, by grade, August 1953-56


1/ Standard grade. Market prices compiled from Market News, Livestock Division.

Another feature of the feeder market to date this year is the relatively stronger price position of lower grade steers and of feeder heifers. As a rule, low quality is discounted more in price in the bigsupply phase of the cattle cyele than in the phase of cattle scarcity. Cecasionally, though, low grade foeder steers and feeder heifers are discounted so much that they prove "best buys." This is especially true in a feeding year such as $1955-56$ that is marked by a supply of top grade fed steers so great that price spreads between slaughter grades, and between slaughter steers and heifers, become umsually narrow. Spreads were narrow throughout this past spring. As a result, heifers and lower grade steere often returned greater profits than did higher grade steers sold at the same time. As price spreads are not likely to be so narrow again next year, it is doubtful that heifers or lower grade feeders will offer 2 much relative advantage as they did this past season.

Seasonal Trends in Cattle Prices
May Return Near to Normal
Seasonal trends in prices of fed cattle have differed sharply from normal the last year or so. The usual seasonal swings in slaughter and prices were first delayed, then forced back to normal by expended slaughter. The price advance this July conformed more closely to the usual pattern. Unless new disturbances occur, more nearly normal trends would seem likely for some time. Prices of high grade fed steers and heifers customarily decline from an early fall high to a spring low, and quite possibly could do so again this coming year.

Cattle Numbers Steady at High Level
Cattle numbers appear to be at a standstill. They are so close to stability that they could swing either way next January. Any change would be small.

The inventory of slaughter steers and heifers at most will increase only a little and it may be reduced. The inventory of cows, which held steady last January, will depend on slaughter this fall. Unless the reduced cow slaughter to date is followed by a rate this fall equal to last year, the cow inventory will likely remain steady or increase.

On the whole, the cattle picture is one of near stability, with no foreseeable substantial decrease in slaughter rates but with the added feature that lighter weights at slaughter may hold beef output a bit below its exceptional volume of the last 12 months.

Hog Slaughter on Seasonal
Rise; Prices Op
Slaughter of hogs will rise seasonally throughout fall months. In early August the slaughter rate was still above last year's. Marketings are shifting rapidly from hogs from the fall pig crop to those from the spring crop. As the 8 percent reduction in the spring crop came in middle and late months of the season, the slaughter rate will likely hold close to last year in early weeks of the fall, then drop farther below.

Prices of hogs advanced to a late-May high, receded, then strengthened again in early August. Prices in early August this year were about equal to those of the same period last year.

Prices this fall will decline seasonally but not as much as last fall. They are expected to be higher than last year, and definitely to stay well above the low of last December.

Lamb Prices Above 1955

Slaughter of lambs has varied up and down from last year's level. For Jamuary-June the slaughter was only 2 percent less than a year before. The 1956 lamb crop is estimated as 1 percent greater than the 1955 crop, as slightly more ewes were on farms and the lambing percentage stayed at last year's record 95 percent. With the lamb crop differing so little, any change from 1955 in the supply of lambs for slaughter this fall will be directly related to changes in the number of lambs held for addition to flocks. Inasmuch as total returns from lambs and wool have increased recently, and an expansion is already underway in the East, prospects appear to favor some addition to herds and a small reduction in slaughter. However, no marked changes are likely.

Prices of lambs probably will decline seasonally and may hold at or a little above last year's prices. Inprovement expected in meat animal prices generally, compared with depressed prices of last fall, is a chief reason for this prospect.
"Standard" Proposed as
Grade Name for Veal
The Department of Agriculture has proposed that the present grade name of "Commercial" as used for veal calves and veal and calf carcasses be changed to "Standard." The change would match a similar change in name for young slaughter cattle and their carcasses.

## Shom Wool Production

Down SlightIy
The amount of wool shorn and to be shorn this year is estimated at 232 million pounds, 1 percent less than the 1955 clip. Wool production in the 13 Western sheep States (11 Western States, Texas and South Dakota) was down 2 percent, and in the remaining or "Native" States up 4 percent. Changes in output from 1955 were largely due to differences in the number of sheep shorn, both for the U. S. total and State by State, since average fleece weights were generally close to those of a year earlier.

Conditions For Emergency
Soil Bank Grazing Announced

As of August 3 stockmen in 357 counties or parts of counties in 11 States had been granted permission to graze their Soil Bank acreage reserve without losing eligibility to participate in the Soil Bank program. These include: Colorado, 15; Iowa, 33; Kansas, 25; Missouri, 4; Montana, 10; Nebraska, 45; New Mexico, 31; North Dakota, 4; South Dakota, 35; Texas, 152; and Utah, 3.

The conditions for granting such special permission are as follows: (1) The area must have been designated as a major disaster area. (2) The Governor of the State in which such designated counties are situated certifies that there is a need to permit grazing of the Acreage Reserve land because of national disaster. (3) The Secretary of Agriculture then determines the necessity for and consents to such grazing in order to alleviate damage and hardship.

The emergency Soil Bank grazing program is not to be confused with the Drought Emergency Feed Grain program under which eligible stockmen may receive special assistance to maintain their foundation herds of livestock. Currently 246 such counties in 9 States are so designated. A large number of these are included in the 375 counties which permit grazing of Acreage Reserve land.

## INNG-RUN INCREASES IN PRO DUCTIVITY OF HOOS AND SHEEP RELATIVE TO BREEDING FERDS

In the last three years the number of sows farrowing on United States farms has been less than 30 years ago. yet 27 percent more pork has been produced.1/The number of ewes has been 18 percent below the number 3 decades earlier, but lamb and mutton output has been 21 percent greater.

These comparisons highlight the remarkable past increase in productivity per sow and ewe. Together with similar gains in productivity of cattle, reported in this Situation for August 15, 1955, they account for substantial increases in production of meat. Meat production is at an all time high, and the supply for consumption per person in 1956 is estimated at only 1 pound less than the record set in 1908.

## Uptrend in Pigs Saved per Sow

Live weight production of cattle and calves per cow has increased 48 percent the last 30 years. Live weight production of hogs per sow has climbed 30 percent during the same time, and production of sheep and lambs per ewe has advanced about 28 percent.

In some respects, it has been harder to increase production of pork per sow than to increase beef per cow. Fewer means have been available. Some of the gain in output of beef has been achieved by shifting from dairy to beef types of cattle, and by feeding to substantially heavier weights. In hogs, previous trends toward larger, fatter types, and every attempt to market at heavier weights, have run into the roadblock of consumer resistance to fat pork.

Most of the uptrend in production of pork per sow has developed from saving larger litters. Litters in 1924-26 averaged 5.48 spring pigs and 5.64 fall pigs. The last three years they have averaged 6.91 spring pigs and about 6.80 fall pigs (table 4). The increases are 26 and 21 percent respectively.

Average slaughter weights of hogs have increased since the 1920's, though they have receded lately from their wartime highs. Also, more pork and less lard (in percent) is cut out of the hog carcass now than then. Production of pork per head slaughtered averaged 123 pounds in 1924-26, and 135 pounds in 1954-56. Increased weights and higher cut-out of pork have added to total pork output, even though it is questionable whether consumers applaud this particular trend.

1/The 30 -year period refers to changes from 1924-26 to 1954-56.

Table 4 - -Live weight of hog production per sow and average size of litter, 1924 to date


1/ Preliminary。

Table 5.-Live weight of sheep and lamb production per ere, and percentage lamb crop, 1924 to date


1/ Preliminary.

Table 6.- Number of hogs and sheep and lambs slaughtered, and quantity of meat produced, 1920 to date


1/ Computed 1920-39, as reported 1940 to date.
2/ Includes slaughter and production for Government emergency programs.

Lambing Percentage Up

The percentage lamb crop also has increased, though not as fast as litter size for hogs. Most of the gain has appeared during the last few years. From the 1920's through the 1940's the lambing percentage ranged between 79 and 90 (table 5). In 1949 an uptrend began, and for each of the last three years the percentage has been 95. The lambing percentage has risen in each region, and in addition a redistribution of sheep production to the eastern, high-percentage, regions has aided the uptrend in United States percentage.

Slaughter weights for sheep and lambs have increased from 38 pounds in the mid-twenties to $45-46$ pounds recently. Heavier weights reflect an improvement in type of lambs produced, and contribute substantially to a larger output of lamb and mutton now than three decades ago.

Other Kinds of Productivity

The live weight or dressed weight of animals produced per breeding animal is only one measure of productivity. Production may also be expressed per unit of labor, or per ton of feed fed. Nevertheless, production per breeding animal is of much significance to the capacity of the nation's livestock industry to provide abundantly for its consumers.

## Geography of Livestock Production and Slaughter by Earl E. Miller


#### Abstract

"Production in the West, consumption in the East" is the basic rule of the geography of livestock. In 1955, 55 percent of the live weight of hog production was west of the Mississippi, as was 69 percent of the cattle and calves and nearly 80 percent of the sheep and lambs. Iowa, Illinois, Nebraska, Texas and Minnesota were the leading States in total output. Iowa produced 23.5 percent of the live weight of hogs, 8.2 percent of cattle and calves, and 5.6 percent of sheep and lambs. Texas accounted for 8.7 percent of cattle and calves and 8.3 percent of sheep and lambs, but was far below leading States in hog production.


The relative position of various States in production of meat from slaughter was described in this Situation of March 2, 1956. Data that follow report livestock production by States last year. They also show the relationship between production and slaughter, indicating which States are surplus suppliers of their own slaughterers, and which are deficit. They do not relate, however, to the balance with consumption of meat by States, for which little infomation is available.

## North Central States Lead in Production

The relative importance of each State in live weight of farm production of meat animals in 1955 is shown in the chart, page 21 , and the three charts, page 22. The West North Central States lead in total meat animals and in cattle and hogs, and are second in sheep and lambs. The Western States lead in live weight of sheep production. For hogs the East North Central region is second, and the East and West North Central States combined produce 80 percent of the United States total. For cattle the South Central is second.

Of the 20.0 billion pounds of hogs produced last year, Iowa and neighboring States were far in the lead. Georgia was the only State in the top 10 that was not in the Corn Belt.

Half of the Nation's total live weight of cattle and calves is produced in the North Central States. Texas is the leading State but after it come Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas and Illinois, all in the Midwest. Each of 11 States produced more than a billion pounds of cattle and calves during 1955.

Nevertheless, cattle and calf production is dispersed throughout the United States. Even from herds kept for milk production, marketing of surplus young stock and of cull cows and bulls provides a significant part of total production. Cattle production in the New England States of over 4 percent of the total output attests this fact. Also, production in the Southeast (east of Texas) is 15 percent of the national total.
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Iive weight production of sheep and lambs was 1.6 billion pounds in 1955. The West produced a larger part of total sheep than of other meat animals. The 11 Western States produced 45.3 percent of the total live weight, and those States plus Texas and South Dakota (making up the "Western Sheep States") produced 57.9 percent. Texas, California, Wyoming, Colorado and Iowa are the top 5 States.

West Is Livestock Nursery
All the data just given relate to the live weight of production of meat animals on farms. This includes the weight of livestock born and raised during the year, plus the weight gain put on those on hand at the beginning of the year.

The weight gained in feeding makes up a sizable part of the live weight of cattle production and a considerable proportion of lamb production. The large volume of cattle and lamb feeding in the North Central States boosts the position of that region in production of those species.


Range States of the West rank higher as producers of feeder than of slaughter stock. There a great many calves and lambs are born that subsequently move farther east. Texas, for instance, produced 8.7 percent of the live weight of cattle and calves last year but contributed 10 percent of all calves born. It produced 8.3 percent of all sheep and lambs, live weight, but 13.9 percent of all the lambs saved (table 7).

## Midwest and West Surplus Producers

When livestock are shipped out of a farming or ranching State, whether for feeding or for slaughter, they generally moved toward the densely populated areas of consumption. For a considerable proporticn of the cattle and lambs produced in the Mountain and Plains States, feeding, slaughter and ultimate consumption take place in parts of the United States farther east or on the West Coast.

Data in the charts on pages 25-27 and table 8. show which States are surplus and which deficit producers of livestock. The status of each State is calculated by a comparison of its net marketings and slaughter. A State in which net marketings are larger than the tonnage of meat animals slaughtered in commercial establishnents is a surplus State; that in which net marketings are less than slaughter is a deficit State. Clearly, these comparisons outline surpluses and deficits for slaughter only. They do not relate to surplus or deficit for consumption of meat.

Although net marketings data are used in the charts and table, these are essentially the same as live weight of farm production as adjusted for any increase or decrease taking place in farm inventories. They are calculated as a State's marketings for all purposes less its inshipments for breeding or feeding. They thus do not compare a State's total market supplies of livestock (which may include tonnages originally produced elsewhere) with its slaughter, They pertain instead to how nearly farm production balances with slaughter. They show the extent to which slaughterers in a State -- as in those of large urban population -- must draw on livestock production in other States.

For all meat animals combined, the North Atlantic and the East North Central States, except Indiana, were deficit States in 1955. California, Colorado, Minnesota, Tennessee, Washington and Maryland and Delaware showed sizable deficits in slaughter supplies. By far the leading surplus State was Iowa, which not only had the largest volume of slaughter for any State but produced on its own farms enough extra to supply all the needs of the 15 smallest slaughtering States of the nation. Other leading surplus States were South Dakota, Montana, Indiana, Oklahoma, Texas, Wyoming and North Dakota.

Iowa, Illinois, and Indiana are leading surplus producers of hogs, though most North Central States except Kansas and Michigan are either surplus or about in balance. Both the Northeast and the West are notably deficit in hogs. Many hogs are shipped to those regions for slaughter.

Table 7 - Calves born and lanbs saved by Stater, and as percentage of the Untted States, 1955

| State and region | 8 | Calves born |  | Lambs saved 1/ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : | Number | ${ }^{2}$ Percentage <br> of total | $\begin{aligned} & : \text { Number } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Porcentage of total |
|  |  | 1,000 hend | Porcent | 1,000 head | Porosnt |
|  | \% |  |  |  |  |
| New England |  | 686 | 1.6 | 54 | 0.3 |
| New York |  | 1,344 | 3.1 | 126 | . 6 |
| New Jersey | : | 129 | . 3 | 11 | . 1 |
| Pennsylvania |  | 936 | 2.2 | 152 | . 7 |
| North Atlantic | : | 3,095 | 7.2 | 343 | 1.7 |
| Ohio . | : | 1,021 | 2.4 | 847 | 4.2 |
| Indiana |  | 890 | 2.0 | 395 | 1.9 |
| Inlinois | \% | 1,380 | 3.2 | 486 | 2.4 |
| Kichigen |  | 848 | 2.0 | 281 | 1.4 |
| Wisconsin |  | 2,452 | 5.7 | 199 | 1.0 |
| East North Contral |  | 6,591 | 15.3 | 2,208 | 10.9 |
| Minnesota .......... |  | 1,720 | 4.0 | 706 | 3.5 |
| Iowa ... |  | 2,033 | 4.7 | 825 | 4.1 |
| Missouri |  | 1,810 | 4.2 | 611 | 3.0 |
| North Dakota |  | 915 | 2.1 | 437 | 2.2 |
| South Dakota |  | 1,508 | 3.5 | 837 | 4.1 |
| Nebraska . |  | 1,813 | 4.2 | 226 | 1.1 |
| Kansas ... |  | 1.743 | 4.1 | 353 | 1.8 |
| West North Central | 2 | 21,542 | 26.8 | 3,995 | 19.8 |
| Delavare ............ |  | 36 | $\cdot 1$ | 3 | $2 /$ |
| Maryland |  | 264 | . 6 | 39 | . 2 |
| Virginia ..... |  | 658 | 1.5 | 297 | 1.5 |
| West Wrginia |  | 293 | . 7 | 272 | 1.3 |
| North Carolina |  | 444 | 2.0 | 42 | .$^{2}$ |
| South Carolina |  | 266 | . 6 | 4 | 2/ |
| Georgia ... |  | 683 | 1.6 | 11 | .1 |
| Florida . |  | 661 | 1.6 | 3 | 2/ |
| South Atlantic |  | 3.305 | 7.7 | 671 | 3.3 |
| Kentucky ... |  | 886 | 2.0 | 550 | 2.7 |
| Temnesses . |  | 900 | 2.1 | 239 | 1.2 |
| Alabaras .... |  | 820 | 1.9 | 34 | . 2 |
| Misaimeippi |  | 1,056 | 2.5 | 54 | - 3 |
| Arkansas |  | 703 | 1.6 | 39 | . 2 |
| Louisiana. |  | 966 | 2.3 | 52 | . 3 |
|  |  | 1,574 | 3.7 | 130 | . 6 |
| Teras ......... |  | 4,297 | 10.0 | 2,815 | 13.9 |
| South Central |  | 11,202 | 26.1 | 3,913 | 19.4 |
| Nontana ......... |  | 1, 111 | 2.7 | 1,146 | 5.7 |
| Idaho ....... |  | 554 | 1.3 | 969 | 4.8 |
| Wyoming . . ... |  | 483 | 1.1 | 1,298 | 6.4 |
| Colorado ...... |  | 846 | 2.0 | 1,031 | 5.1 |
| New Moxico .. |  | 572 | 1.3 | 759 | 3.8 |
| Arizona |  | 377 | . 9 | 256 | 1.3 |
| Utah ..... |  | 342 | . 8 | 1,021 | 5.1 |
| Nevada ................. |  | 260 | . 6 | 310 | 1.5 |
| Washington ............... |  | 515 | 1.2 | 263 | 1.3 |
| Oregon ....... |  | 619 | 1.4 | 693 | 3.4 |
| California .. |  | 1255 | 3.6 | 1,311 | 6.5 |
| Western .......... |  | 7,266 | 16.9 | 9,057 | 44.9 |
| United States ....... | 8 | 43,001 | 100.0 | 20,187 | 100.0 |

1/ Lambe docked or branded in 11 Western States, Texas and South Dakotas lambe living Jwne 1 all other States. 2/ Less than 0.05 percent.


All the North Atlantic and East North Central States are deficit in cattle and calves. California is also a deficit State, by a sizable 1. 4 Billion pounds. Most other States of the West and many Southern States are surplus producers. Southern States frequently are surplus in feeder cattle but deficit in high grade slaughter cattle.

With the exception of California the 13 Western sheep States each produce more sheep and lambs than are slaughtered within State boundaries. Other surplus States include Ohio, Virginia, West Virginia and Kentucky. California and New York show the largest deficiencies.




Table 8.- Live weight of commercial elaughter of meat anirals, surplus of net marketings above slaughter, and live weight of production on farme, by States, 1955


1/ Difforence between net marketings and conmercial slaughter. Not marketing are total marketings less inghiprants for feeding or breeding. Excluden interfara salea. State and regional totals for all meat animals may not be the sum of three classes due to rovading. 2 / Live weight produced during the year as determinad from balance sheet estimates for each Stato. Adjustments are made for inshipments and changes in inventory. 3/ Loes than 500,000 pounds. $4 /$ May not add to zero because of sone double counting in shipments or because of U. $S$. imports or exports of live animals.

## NEW OR REVISED SERTES

Consumption of Conmercially-Produced Meat by Months by Charlotte A. Kause

Meat is a perishable product and only relatively small quantities are stored. Consequently, month-to-month changes in production of meat cause similar fluctuations in the quantities moving into consumption. Prices often are unstable during these changes in supply and consumption.

Since 1946 data have been published on the number of livestock slaughtered and quantity of meat produced in all commercial plants, which includes all slaughter except that by farmers. From these data, together with data on stocks and foreign trade, the quantity of meat moving into consumption each month can be estimated fairly accurately. These estimates, presented in table 9, show how consumption has changed in months of the past. For instance, while consumption of pork from comercial sources averaged 60 pounds per person for all of 1955, in December it was 6.1 pounds or an annual rate of 73 pounds.

Recently, scattered new data have been obtained on the seasonal distribution of farm slaughter of livestock. Studies of the use of food in cold storage lockers and home freezers have given added information on seasonality in consumption of meat on farms. From these data estimates have been made of production and consumption of meat from farm slaughter. They, in turn, make it possible to estimate production and consumption of meat from total slaughter by quarters. Quarterly data in table 9 are revised from previous publications.

While all data on consumption per person are in actual pounds for each month or quarter, they can be converted to anmual rates by multiplying by 12 or 4 .

The Livestock and Meat Situation is published six times a year. Release date for the final 1956 isaue is November 1.5.
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Table 9.- Supply and diatribution of meat, by months, 1948 to date - Contimed
Veal


Table 9.- Supply and distribution of meat, by months, 2948 to date - Contimed
Lamb and mation


Table 9.- Supply and distribution of meat, by months, 1948 to date - Contimued


Table 9.- Supply and dietribution of meat, by months, 1948 to date - Contimued
Lamb and mutton


Table 9.- Supply and distribution of maat, by months, 1948 to date - Contimaed Pork (excluding lard)


Table 9.- Supply and distribution of maat, by months, 1948 to date - Continued Pork (excluding lard)


Table 9.- Supply and distribution of meat, by months, 1948 to date - Contimued Pork (excluding lard)


Table 9.- Suppiy and dietribution of meat, by months, 1948 to date $=$ Continued All meat


Table 9.- Suppiy and distribution of meat, by months, 1948 to date - Continued All meat


Table 9.- Supply and diatribution of meat, by months, 1948 to date - Continued
All mert


1/ Derived fron eatimates by months of population eating out of oivilian food oupplies, as interpolated from quarteriy data. 2/ Includes production and consumption from farm slaughter. 3/ Adjusted for meat purchamed by the ndilitary in one period and transforred to the Interior Department at a later period. 4/ Lear than 500,000 pounds. 5/ Includes meat procured by USDA and sh1pped abroad for CARE. 6/May not be sum of the 4 meats due to rounding.


Weiginted average of present Standard and Commercial grades.
2) Average all welghts and grades.
$5 /$ Chicago, St. Louis N, S, Yos Kansas City, Onaha, Siowx City, S. St. Jo
$1 /$ Number bushels of com equivalent in value to 100 pounds of 11 ve hoge.
$5 /$ Hom.
6/ 45-55 1b.
I/ Includes beef and veal, porik, leg of lamb and other meats.

Selected marketing, slaughter and stocke statiatics for maat animals and mata

| Item | 1955 |  |  | 1956 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Unit | : June | : Julv | Mav | : | June | : | July |
|  |  | : | : | : | : |  | : |  |
| : |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meat animal marketinga |  | : 104 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Index number (1947-L9-100) ............... |  | 104 | 97 | 120 |  | 109 |  |  |
| : |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stocker and feeder shipments to |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 Com Belt States | 1,000 | : 119 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cattle and calves ...................... | bead | 149 | 169 | 196 |  | 201 |  |  |
| Sheep and lambs ........................: | do. | 96 | 147 | 121 |  | 113 |  |  |
| : |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Slaughter under Federal inspection |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iumber slaughtered : |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cattle ................................. | do. | 1,641 | 1,524 | 1,646 |  | 1,679 |  |  |
| Steers ............................... | do. | 861 | 749 | 969 |  | 923 |  |  |
| Heifers ............................... : | do. | 215 | 201 | 202 |  | - 211 |  |  |
| Covs ..................................: | do. | 518 | 538 | 439 |  | 502 |  |  |
| Calves ................................. | do. | 610 | 550 | 606 |  | 596 |  |  |
| Sheep and laxbs .......................: | do. | : 1,205 | 1,076 | 1,063 |  | 1,084 |  |  |
| Hogs . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | do. | : 3,713 | 3,428 | 4,875 |  | 4,326 |  |  |
| Percentage sovs ...................... | Perceat | 28 | 30 | 14 |  | 22 |  |  |
| Average live veight per head : |  | : 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cattle ................................. | Pounds | : 960 | 958 | 998 |  | 984 |  |  |
| Calves .................................. | do. | 233 | 238 | 229 |  | 239 |  |  |
| Sheep and lambs ........................ | do. | : 91 | 92 | 93 |  | 89 |  |  |
| Hogs . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : | do. | : 264 | 256 | 240 |  | 250 |  |  |
| Average production : |  | : 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beef, per head ........................... | do. | 534 | 530 | 567 |  | 552 |  |  |
| Veal, per head .........................: | do. | 130 | 133 | 128 |  | 133 |  |  |
| Lamb and matton, per heed ............. | do. | 44 | 44 | 45 |  | 43 |  |  |
| Pork, per head ...... | do. | 148 | 145 | 134 |  | 139 |  |  |
| Pork, per 100 puume live veight...... | do. | 56 | 56 | 56 |  | 56 |  |  |
| Lard, per head .........................: | do. | 39 | 38 | 36 |  | 37 |  |  |
| Lard, per 100 pounde live weight .....: | do. | 15 | 15 | 15 |  | 15 |  |  |
| Total production : | killion | : 87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beet | pounde | $: 874$ | 806 | 929 |  | 923 |  |  |
| Veal | do. | 79 | 73 | 77 |  | 79 |  |  |
| Lemb and untton ........................ | do. | 53 | 47 | 47 |  | 46 |  |  |
| Porik ..................... . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | do. | 550 | 495 | 651 |  | 600 |  |  |
| Lard ..................................... | do. | 144 | 129 | 174 |  | 159 |  |  |
| : |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totel comerciel elaughter 1/ |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| number slaughtered : | 1,000 | - 2.237 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cattle .................................. | head | : 2,237 | 2,056 | 2,271 |  | 2,219 |  |  |
| Calves ..................................... | do. | 1,009 | 933 | 951 |  | 943 |  |  |
| Sbeep and lamb ........................... | do. | : 1,366 | 1,220 | 1,219 |  | 1,231 |  |  |
| Hogs ..................................... | do. | : 4,608 | 4,197 | 5,876 |  | 5,180 |  |  |
| Total production : | Mrulion | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beer ... | pounds | : 1,144 | 1,045 | 2,195 |  | 1,173 |  |  |
| Veal .................................... | do. | : 130 | 123 | 121 |  | 123 |  |  |
| Leab and matton . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | do. | 60 | 53 | 54 |  | 52 |  |  |
| Pork . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | do. | 667 | 594 | 778 |  | 71 |  |  |
| Lard ..................................... | do. | 167 | 147 | 199 |  | 180 |  |  |
| : |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cold storage stocks first of month |  | : 179 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beet ......................................as | do. | 119 | 106 | 172 |  | 155 |  | 135 |
| Veal . ...................................... | do. | 11 | 11 | 16 |  | 14 |  | 14 |
| Lamb and matton . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : | do. | 10 | 9 | 9 |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| Pork . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | do. | 477 | 376 | 510 |  | 457 |  | 394 |
| Total meat and meat products $2 / \ldots \ldots \ldots$ : | do. | $\vdots \quad 740$ | 614 | 861 |  | 781 |  | 692 |

1 Federally inspected, and other wholesale and retail.
$\frac{1}{2}$ Includes stocks of sausage and sausage roon producte, canned meats and camed meat products, and odible offals, in addition to the four meats listed.
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