than in live stock breeding and that we have trained specialists who devote lifetimes to this end that our crop productions would be greatly increased. In fact, it has increased wonderfully since 25 years ago, when the work was first begun. But there still are many farmers in this great state of ours who, as I pointed out in the beginning of my talk, devote so much attention to the matter of producing live stock that can be fed economically that they fail to realize that the ration itself must be produced at a profit if the farming system is to be well balanced and carried on at a profit. The greatest possibilities in the direction of reducing the cost of the ration lie in the use of better-bred, higher-yielding varieties of farm crops.

WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH SOY BEANS IN 1922?

P. W. JONES

My father was a smarter and better man than any of his sons and he trained us all as boys to work. Later I had the privilege of working with him for ten years before starting out for myself. One of his sayings was that any fool could work, but that the smart man was the chap who could get the other fellow to work. On this basis I feel that I have made a very smart president of our soy bean association, as I have had no trouble in getting Professor Briggs, our secretary, to do all the work. A little later he will be given an opportunity to tell you what he has been able to do for the cause in this most unfavorable year.

According to crop-report statistics of December, 1921, Wisconsin planted 8,000 acres of soy beans, not including those planted with corn. Of this acreage 3,500 acres were cut for seed and produced 29,000 bushels, with a total farm value of $77,000.00 or about $2.65 per bushel, the yield being slightly less than 9 bushels per acre. The seed acreage was slightly lower than in 1920, but was double that of 1919. The farm value of the seed in 1919 and 1920 was around $4.00 per bushel.

Of the 8,000 acres 4,400 acres, or 55%, was grown in 8 counties of the central district. Portage county had 1,500 acres, Waushara had 1,100 acres, and Juneau 700 acres. Burnett county, in the northwestern district, had over 500 acres, making a total for the four counties named of 3,800 acres, or nearly half of the entire acreage of the state. Marinette, in the northeastern district, with 350 acres, was the only other county in the North with any considerable acreage, although Washburn, Chippewa and Polk each had over 100 acres.

The seven counties in the western district planted 780 acres, my county, Jackson, being well in the lead with over 300 acres. The balance of the state had a very limited acreage, although every county planted a few beans.

An analysis of these figures shows several interesting things. Those counties where alfalfa is an important crop do not take much interest in soys planted alone and I can't say that I blame them. If I had a

forty-acre field of alfalfa in front of the house and Briggs tramped clear across it up to his knees just to suggest that I try out two acres of some chop suey variety of soy beans I would set the dog on him sure. Again, those counties that have been obnoxious in complaining of red and alsike clover as noxious weeds do not get in very many soys, but again I don't blame them except for the noxious weed part, and most likely I would be using the same dodge myself if I had happened to live in one of those favored counties. Going farther, we find that the largest acreage of soys is in those counties having areas of lighter soils and where the past few seasons have been hard on clover stands. My own county, Jackson, is perhaps typical of this lot of counties. Its acreage of 307 acres was less than a tenth of what should have been planted for hay alone to partially replace the loss of clover. Many farmers are now having to buy hay and the weediest trash that was put up will cost around $20.00 on the farm. If this weedy stuff is worth $20.00, what price would you put on the forty tons of almost perfect soy bean hay that went into my barns last summer? Do you think that I would bite if my neighbor offered me two tons of the weedy stuff for one ton of mine?

From my understanding of the situation, I believe that fully half of the area of the state could increase its acreage of soy beans fully tenfold with profitable results. Do not understand me as advocating any such increase for seed purposes, but rather for hay, silage and pasture use. As a matter of fact, it will be more profitable to confine the production of seed beans to those portions which have proved best adapted to it and to there increase the acreage in certain localities where suitable threshing outfits are already located or will be obtained. The machine and labor cost of threshing soys with the smaller size bean hullers is several times what it is when suitable rigs are available, and to produce seed in competition with Illinois, Ohio and Indiana the cost of production must be brought down from what it now is.

In looking over the situation as shown by the figures, it looks to me best to push soy beans hardest in the counties already growing them profitably in sizable acreages and also in those counties having similar soils and conditions, but with smaller acreages of beans. My own experience with soys on peat marsh soil has been so satisfactory the past two seasons that I should also want to include counties having these marshes as being desirable prospects.