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In August 1948, more than half of all eggs marketed by producers in the Northeast were sold to cooperative associations, city receivers, and direct to consumers. Among producers selling eggs, almost half sold some eggs direct to consumers, while less than 10 percent sold to each of the other two outlets. Cooperative associations and city receivers, however, provided the major outlets for producers with large flocks, while producers with
small flocks sold almost half of their eggs direct to consumers.

Independent truckers and hucksters and retail stores each accounted for about 13 percent of total egg sales. Almost 30 percent of the producers in the Northeast sold eggs to retail stores, but these sales were concentrated among producers with smaller flocks.

Table 1.- THE MARKET BASKET: Retail cost of 1935-39 average annual purchases of farm food products by a family of three average consuners, farm value of equivalent quantities sold by producers, marketing charges, and farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar, 1913-51


1/ Calculated from retail prices collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of Agriculturel Economics.
2. Payments to farmers for equivalent quantities of farm produce minus imputed value of byproducts obtained in processing.

3/ Marketing charges equal margin (difference between retail cost and farm value) minus processor taxes plus Government payments to marketing agencies.

4/ Revised.

Approved by the Outlook end Situation Board September 24, 1951


The consumer's dollur spent for farm food jroducts was evenly divided between farm producers and marketing agencies in August. I/ There have been only small fluctuations in the farmer's share of the consuner's food dollar since November 1950 -- between 49 cents and 51 cents. The figure in July was 49 cents. At the peak in rpril 1945 , it was 55 cents. Although the total index of prices received by farmers for their products (including fibers and other nonfoods) went down from aid-July to mid-August, there wes a slight rise in the average farm price of foodstuffs. Fruit, some meat animals, milk, and eggs were anong the items that increased; but truck crops, chickens, butter and butterfat, rice, sheep and lambs were among those thet declined. Altogether, the farm price of foodstuffs in August was 4 percent below the record reached in February this year. Charges for marketing fam food products decreased slightly in August, following a 3 -month rise.

Consumers in the United States spent about 26 percent of their disposable income for foodstuffs, including ronfarm foods, during the second quarter of 1951. This is the same percentage as they spent in the second cuarter of last year -- just before the outbreak of war in Korea. In 1935-39, just before World War II, civilians spent an average oí 23 percent of their disposable income for foods. However, the same kinds and cuantities of foods as were consumed belore World War II would heve taken only 19 percent of disposable income during the second quarter of this year. Civilians are eating 13 percent more food per perion and, in general, a better quality of food than they did in 1935-39. Although food consumption per person is belov the 1946 peak, total cjvilian food consumption will set a new record this year, because of the greater population.

1/ The figure for August 1951 is a preliminary estimate based on latest available retail price data. Estimates of the division of the retail price between farmers and marketing agencies are based on comparisons of concurrent prices at the farm and retail levels, except for seasonel canning crops, dried fruits, sugar, and vegetable oil products. During a period of rising prices, the farmer's share calculated on this basis is somewhet ligher than the share which would be obtained by comparing prices roceived by farmers for purticular lots of products with prices raid by consumers for the same lots after they have moved through the marketing system. The reverse is true in periods of declining prices.

## Preliminary Estimates for August

The farm value of foods in the "narket basket" increased from an annual rate of $\$ 352$ in July to an estimated $\$ 357$ in August. 2/ Higher prices for citrus fruits, eges, milk, and meat products more than offset declines in food grains and oilseed crops.

The.retail cost of the farm foods. in the market basket declined from an annual rate of $\$ 723$ in mid-July to an estimated $\$ 714$ in mid-August. 3/ Retail prices of margarine and vegetable shorteming in August were about 5 percent below. July levels. Seasonal price declines in apples, potatoes, and several of the truck crops resulted in a large decrease in prices puid by consumers.for fresh fruits, and. vegetabjes.

At an annual rate of $\$ 357$, charges for narketing these farm food products in August were about 4 percent below the record high reached in July.

## Farm Value of Food Products <br> Lower in July than June

Farm value of the market-basket foods decreased about l percent from June to an annual rate of $\$ 352$ in July. This marked the fiffth successive monthly decline from the high of $\$ 371$ recorded in lebruary. Practically al. of this 5 percent decline in farm value has been absorbed by increased marketing charges. The farm value of food products in July 1951, however, was 12 percent above a year ago, with higher valuer in all commodity groups except fruits and vegetables.

Lower farm orices for livestock accounted for most of the decrease in farm value between mid-June and mid-July. A 10 -percent drop in the price of fresh oranges caused a small decrease in the fruits and vegetables group A 2 -percent gain in the farm value of the poultry and eggs group resulted from a seasonal rise in egg prices.

[^0]New High Recorded for
Charges for marieting the form foods in the market basket equaled an annual rate of ${ }^{W} 37 \mathrm{i}$ in July, a alight increase over the record established in the preceding montin. Marketing churges have increesed each month since April, with a totgl increcse of 5 percent from mid-April to mid-July.

Increased charges for marketing meat products in July accounted for the rise in marketing charges over the preceding month. Meat products, however, were the only commodity group for which marketing charges were lower in July 1951 than a year earljer.

## Retail Cost Unchanged

from June to July
At an annual rate of 423 , the retail cost of the market basket of farm foods in July was practically urchanged from June. The retail cost of these foods increased over 10 percent from Noverber 1950 to a record high of $\$ 726$ in February this year, but has remeined relatively steady since February.

The retail cost of the poultry and eges group increased 2 percent from June to July. Lower retail prices for margarine and vegetable shortening resulted in a 2 -percent decline in the retail cost of the miscellaneous products Eroup. Fruits and vegetables went down 1 percent, but the retail costs of othor commodity groups were unchanged.

Compared with a yat ago, the retail cost of maxket-besket foods totaled 8 percent higher in July 1951, with increases in all commodity groups except fruits and vegetables. Cunned fmits and vegetables were substantially higher but retail prices for fresh fruit: and vegotables averaged 7 percent below July 1950. Increases in the other commodity groups ranged from 7 percent for meat product: to 19 porcent. for poultry and eggs.

F'armer's Share of Consumer's Food Dollar
Unchanged at 42 Cents Sn July
Famners received 49 cents of the dollar that consumers snent for farm foods in July. This was the same as in June, but was below the 51 cents received in earlier months this year. In July 1950, farmers received 47 cents of the consumer': food dollar.

## CONSTMBRS' EXPENDITURES FDK FOOD

## Consumers Bet Better <br> than in 1935-39

The totcil volume of all food consumed by United Stcites civilians is rurining at a record high in 1951. Per capita consumption of food is about 13 percent above $1935-39$, although about 5 percent below the record reeched in 1946. Consumers spent 26 percent of their disposable income for food during the second quarter of this year, compared with 23 percent in 1935-39. However, the same kinds and quantities of food as consumed before the war would have talem only 19 percent of their disposable income in the second

Table 2.- Per capita food cost and expenditure related to disposable personal income, Unt ted States average, 1935-51.


1/ Computed from aggregate income and expendjture data of the Bureau of Foreign and Donestic Cominerce. For methods of computation and data for 1929-43 see teble 4, page 9 , of the September 1950 issue of this publication. Estimates of disposable income and expenditures have recently been revised for 1944 and later years.
a/ Quarterly data have been estimated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics from expenditures for food and alcoholic beverages reported by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.
querter of this yeur. 4/ This rise in the proportion of income spent for food resulted from the purchase of lerger quentities and better qualities of food at ret jil and the purchise of more merketing services arising from eating more meals ut rosturunte mather chonges in eating habits.

Food Expendi tures hbout stocdy
in the Second Quarter in 195]
Concuners' expenditures for all food were at an innul per capite rate of $\$ 374$ in the second cuexter of 1951 , which was dow slightly from the first quarter. 万er copiti disposuble incone increused 2 percent. The proportion of disposible personsl insome spent for food declined from 27 percent in the first quarter to 26 percent in the second quarter.
luring the April-June period, consumers spent the same proportion of their disposable incoms for food ais in the same cunrter lest year, imuediately preceding the Korean outbreal. Food oxpenditures for the quarter vere 10 percent higher then a yeur ago, but disposcble income also was up about 10 percent.
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EGG MARKETING CHANNELS AND METHODS USED BY NORTHEASTERN PRODUCERS 1/

By 0. C. Hester, Agricultural Economist

The marketing practices and policies followed by producers of eggs in the northeast region were more closely associated with size of flock than with any other factor studied in this investigation. The size of flocks maintained by producers in an area has a definite influence on the type and number of buyers through which eggs are marketed. Specialized egg handlers are located where large flocks are numerous, but where small flocks are predominant, the eggs are handled as a sideline by many of the marketing agercies. The cost of assembly, grading, and transportation is likely to be higher for eggs produced by small, widely scattered flocks than for eggs from flocks that are large and concentrated.

## Market Outlets Used by Producers

Egg producers in the northeast region marketed their eggs through several types of outlets in August 1948 (cover chart). The largest volume, about 19 percent of all eggs reported marketed, was sold direct to consumers, 18 percent went to cooperative associations, and 16 percent to city receivers. Truckers and hucksters and retail stores each bought about 13 percent. Sales to country dealers accounted for 11 percent of the eggs sold, while hatcheries took 7 percent, and hotels, restaurants, and bakeries about 3 percent (table 3).

More than one-third of the producers reported sales to more than one outlet during August 1948. The number of outlets used was related to the size of flock. About 70 percent of the producers with more than 400 hens used two or more types of outlet, while less than one-fourth of the producers with less than 100 hens used more than one outlet.

Producers having flocks of less than 100 laying hens generally sold direct to consumers or to retail stores, and about three-fourths of their eggs were sold through these two outlets. Although more than 40 percent of the producers with flocks of 200 or more hens sold direct to consumers, direct sales accounted for only about 15 percent of their eggs. Cooperative ascociations and city receivers were the principal outlets for these producers.

1 This article summarizes the results of a regional research project designed to aid in improving the efficiency of marketing eggs in the 12 Northeastern States. This study was financed with funds authorized by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. The following state am Federal agencies participated in the project: Agr. Expt. Stas. of Maine, N. H., Vt., Mass., R. I., Conn., N. Y., N. J., Pa., Del., Md., W. Va.; PMA, FCA, and BAE. Data were collected by means of a mail questionnaire sent to a sample group of farmers in the region during August 1948. Replies were received from about 13,000 farmers. Of the se almost 8,000 reported having hens of laying age at the time of the survey.

Table 3.- Distribition of producers, eggs sold, and prices received by type of market outlet, 12 Northeastern States, fugust 1948


I] Totals more than 100 becauce some producers sold to more than one type of' outlet.

2/ Cooperative associations may heve made udditional payments in the form of patronage refunds.

Since produceis with certain size flocks tended to patronize different types of buyers, the outlets ranked differently when classified according to number of producers selling to each outlet. A larger number of producers sold direct to consumers than to any other type of outlet. About 47 percent of the producers marketed sme or all of their eggs in this manner (table 3). The second lurgest number, 30 percent, used retail stores as a market outlet. About 10 to 12 percent of the producers sold to ex.ch of the following: Truckers and hucksters, cooperative associutions, and country dealers. Only 6 percent sold to city reeeivers, although this outlet ranked third in volume of egge.

## Transportation of Eggs from Ferm to Buyer

More than 55 percent of the producers reported that they delivered eggs to the buyer. These producers accounted for about 43 percent of the eggs sold. Since this surviy was made during the season when egg production is relatively low, the practice of buyers may have been different during other seasons.

Country doalers, truckers and hucksters, and city receivers picked up more than 80 porcent and hatcheries more than 68 percent of the eggs sold to them. Producers dclivered clightly more than half the eggs sold through cooperatives and more than three-fourths of the eggs sold to retail stores. More than two-thirds of the eegs sold direct to consumexs and hotels, restaurants, and bakeries were delivered by produceri.

## Sizing and Grading Practices

More than $6 \hat{\alpha}$ percent of the northeastern egg producers reported that they sold eggs on the basis of size. Ihe extent of this practice varied from one area to another. In the Now England States, New York, and New Jersey three-fourths or more of the producers sold on the basis of size. In Pennsylvania and Delaware more than half, in Maryland one-third, and in West Virginia one-fourth of the producers sold on the basis of size.

The proportion of producers selling on the basis of size was lowest for producers with less than 50 , hens. About 40 percent of those producers sold on the basis of size compared with more than 93 percent of the producers with more than 400 hens.

## Prices Received by Producers for Eggs

Hatcheries paid the highest prices for all eggs except those of small size. Prices received from hotels, restaurants, and bakeries, and direct to consumers generally ranked next (table 3). Producers', however, did not necessarily realize higher net returns from eggs sold to these outlets. The production of hutching eggs requires special breeding and flock management, and the eggs must receive special care. Producers selling direct to consumers and to hotels, resticurants, and bakeries may be required to provide grading, packaging, transportation, and handling not required of producers selling to other outlets.

The lowest prices were paid by outlets that bought eggs mainly for resale in the shell. Country dealers paid the lowest prices for large, medium, and small eggs. Independent truckers and hucksters paid next to the lowest prices for both' unsized and sized eggs. Retail stores paid the lowest prices for unsized eggs, and their prices for sized eggs were umong the lowest.

## Prices Received on Basis of Size'of' Flock

Producers with flocks of $400^{\text {: }}$ or more hens reported considerably higher prices for large eggs than producers with smaller flocks. Differences were comparatively small between large- and small-flock producers in pricés received for unsized, medium, and small eggs (table 4).

Practically all eggs sold to hatcheries, which yielded higher prices then any other outlet, came from large flocks. The prices received by producers in each flock-size group reflect largely the differences in prices paid by the outlets used but they also reflect the location of small and large flócks in low- and high-price areas. In general, a larger proportion of producers with large flocks was located in the area in which higher prices were received while small flocks were predominant in ureas in which low prices were received.

Table 4.- Distribution of producern, ages sold, and prices received, by size of flock, 12 Northeastern States, August 1948

| Size of flock | Percentage : Averuge price per dozendistribution : received by producers |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | roducer | ges sold | Insized | Large | Medium | Small |
|  | Percent | Percent | Conts | Cents | Cents | Cents |
| 1-49 | 32.6 | 3.9 | 60.8 | 72.6 | 65.6 | 52.6 |
| 50-99 | 21.5 | 6.4 | 63.8 | 70.9 | 64.4 | 52.4 |
| 100-199 | 17.9 | 10.1 | 61.2 | 72.6 | 63.5 | 48.9 |
| 200-399 | 12.8 | 14.8 | 60.6 | 74.2 | 64.8 | 48.2 |
| 400 and over ..... | 13.2 | 63.5 | 61.0 | 78.8 | 65.0 | 49.5 |
| Not reported . | 2.0 | 1.3 | 59.2 | 72.3 | 63.1 | 50.0 |
| Average ..... | - | - | 61.8 | 74.4 | 64.9 | 49.8 |

Effect of Tronsportation Provided on Pricos Received
Producers that delirored the eggs they solo received a higher average price than producers that sold to hayers at the farm. The difference between the price for delivered eggs and those picked up at the farm was larger for eggs sold on the basis of size than for ungraded eggs. Some outlets, however, paid more for the eggs they picked up than for those delivered to them. For example, large eggs picked ur at the furm by country dealers, city reccivers, hatcheries, and restaurents brought higher prices than eggs delivered to these outlets.

Eggs delivered to the buyer misht ordinarily be expected to bring more than eggs of equal size and quility picked up at the farm. As August is a month of relatively short supply, the differentials reported in this study are probably not typical for the entire year.

## Prices Beceived by Size Basis of Sale

Producers received an average of 61.8 cents a dozen for unsized eggs compared with 74.4 cents for large, 64.9 for medium, and 49.8 cents a dozen for small eggs.

The differences in prices received for eggs sold on each basis were fairly consistent between outlets with the exception of hatcheries. Prices received from hatcheries were higher and the djfferences between prices received for the various sizes were larger than in any other outlet.

## Effect of Location on Prices Received

In genural, farmers in Stater farthest removed from large cities or consuming centers received lower average prices for the eggs than producers nearer large markets. Prices vero highest in the New England States and New Jersey and lowest in West Virginia and Maryland. Highest prices were received by producers in New Hampshire where a large proportjon of the eggs went to hatcheries and direct to consumers. Higher prices in Delaware than in Maryland were lergely the result of sales to hatcheries. Some of the
reasons for geographical variations in prices are: Local supply and demand conditions, distance and cost of transporting eggs to consuming centere, nunber and size of agencies in the merketing process, and the guntity and quality of eggs marketed by individual producers.

## Trading of Eggs by Farmers

About one-fifth of the producers reported trading eggs for merchandise. This practice varied from less than 4 percent of the producers selling eges in New Jersey to more than 43 percent in West Virginia. Very few producers reported a different price for eggs traded than for those sold for cash. Those States in which a large proportion of the producers reported seling to retail stores were also high in the proportion of producers taking paymert in trade. Of producers who traded eggs, the largest proportion was those with less than. 100 hens.

## Comprison of Marketing Practices in Northeasterm End North Central Stiates

A similar survey of egg-marketing practices was conducted in the North Central States in April and August 1948. 2/ The survey showed that more egg producers in that region sold their eggs to retail stores than to any other type of outlet. In August. 1948 , about 36 percent of the producers sold to that outlet compared with 30 percent in the Northeast. Retail stores bought 24 percent of the eggs in the North Central States and 13 percent of those produced in the Northeast. Direct sajes to consumers were made by 19 percent of the producers in the North Central States and accounted for 10 percent of the eggs produced. In the Northeast, direct sales were made by 47 percent of the producers and accounted for 19 percert of the egga produced. Sales to country dealers were less important in the Northeast then in the North Central States.

Density of population and nearness to market accounted in part for the larger proportion of direct sales to consumers, city receivers, hotels, restarants, and bekeries in the Northeast than in the North Central States.

Hatcheries, direct seles to consumers, and hotels, restaurants, and bakeries were the outlets paying the highest prices in both regions. Lowest prices in both regjons were received from retail stores, country buyers, and truckers.

The proportion of producers who sold their eggs on the basis of size was larger in the Northeast than in the North Central states.

The proportion of the producers who delivered their eggs was smaller in the Northeast than in the North Central States and a smailer proportion of the eggs produced was delivered.

2 The results of this survey were published in "Sales of Eggs by Farmers in the North Central Region," BAE, Agr. Inform. Bul. Ho. 46, June 1951.

For a summary of this report see "Egg Sales by Furmers in the North Central Region," Apr. 1950 issue of The Marketine ...? ?.

Table 5.- Price spreada between farmers and conswers - tood producte: Retail price, fara value of equivalent quantities eold by producere, byproduct adjustment, miceting charges, and farmer's shere of rotail price, Juiy 1951 I/

| Comodity | Parm equivaleat | $\begin{array}{cc} : & \\ i & \text { Retail } \\ : & \text { uollt } \end{array}$ |  | Grose fart valne | ::: yproduct:iallowances:: | Hot faxt value$\qquad$ | Margin <br> adjusted for tbyproduct. | Covernment marketing taxes (-) and paymento ( + ) | Marketiag chargee 2/ | Parmer's share |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : |  | 3 | Doliare | Dollaris |  |  |  |  | Dollars |  |
| : |  | : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mart |  | : | : 723.32 |  |  | 352.41 | 370.91 | -0.34 | 370.57 |  |
| Mret bat |  | : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kent products .................... |  | : | 225.42 | 159.31 | 9.69 | 149.62 | 75.90 | -- | 75.30 | 66 |
| Dairy products ..................: |  | : | : 134.14 | 72.50 |  | 72.50 | 61.64 |  |  |  |
|  |  | : 2 |  |  |  |  |  | -- | 61.62 | 54 |
| Poultry and eggs ...............? |  | : 1935-39 | 55.37 | 35.92 | -- | 35.92 | 19.45 | -- | 19.45 | 65 |
| Bakery and other cersal |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { annual } \\ & : \quad \text { average } \end{aligned}$ | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| producte: | Farm produce equivalent of annual family purchaees | quantities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All ingredients .............. |  | purchased, | 104.11 | -- |  | 27.50 | 76.51 | - . 04 | 76.47 | 27 |
| Grain .......................... |  | por family | : -- | 26.74 | 5.20 | 21.54 |  | --- |  | 2 |
|  |  | 2 of three |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other cereal producta ......... |  | - average | : 38.14 | 27.94 | 3.60 | 14.34 | 23.30 | -- | 23.30 | 38 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All frults and vegetablea ....... |  | : | 157.52 | 48.59 |  | 43.59 | 108.93 | - | 108.93 | 31 |
| Fresh fruits and vegetables ..tFresh vegetables .......... |  | : | 119.78 | 40.06 | --- | 40.06 | 79.72 | --- | 79.72 | 33 |
|  |  | : | - 72.77 | 74.7 | -- | 22.77 | 50.00 |  | 50.00 | 31 |
| Canned fruits and vegetables .: |  | : | - 22.91 | 4.12 | - | 4.12 | 20.79 | - | 20.79 | 17 |
| : |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hibcellemeous producte ..........s |  | : | 46.76 | -- | -- | 18.18 | 22.58 | -. 30 | 28.28 | 39 |
| : |  | : : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : |  | : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : |  | : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : |  | ; : | Cents | Cente | Cents | Cents | Coats | Ceats | Cents | Percent |
| : |  | : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beef (Choice grade) $3 /$............:2.16 1b. Choice grade cattioz |  | : Pound | 84.8 | 4/68.5 | 7.7 | 60.3 | 21.0 | -- | 24.9 | 72 |
|  | $.16 \mathrm{lb}$. lambs | - Pound | $=77.8$ | 65.2 | 10.2 | 55.0 | 22.3 |  | 22.8 | 7 |
| Pork (Including lard) .............il.4. l lb. boge |  | : Pound | 45.4 | 29.3 | . 4 | 28.9 | 16.5 | - | 25.5 | 64 |
| + |  | ! | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buttor ........................... Butterfat and farm buttor |  | : Pomad | : 78.6 | 56.2 | - | 56 |  |  |  |  |
| Cheese, American ..................i10.08 1b. milk |  | : Pound | - 62.6 | 34.8 | - | 34.8 | 27.3 | -- | 27.3 | 56 |
| Evaporated milk ...................:1.95 1b. milk |  | : 14 l -oz. can | 15.0 | 7.07 | -- | 7.97 | 7.7 | -- | 7.3 | 47 |
| Ruid milk ..................................... | arn retail and vboleaale | : Quart | : 23.9 | 12.42 | --- | 12.62 | 9.5 | -- | 9.5 | 57 |
| ise cream ............................ | . 8 1b. mix | - Pint | : 32.3 | 7.47 | --- | 7.47 | 23.3 | --- | 23.8 | 24 |
|  |  | : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1 : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ggge ...................................... | . 03 do2. | : Dozen | 67.3 | 48.0 | -- | 48.0 | 19.3 | --- | 19.3 | 71 |
| Cnisken . .............................. | $.1361 b$. | Pound | 55.5 | 30.7 | -- | 30.7 | 24.9 | --- | 24.3 | 55 |
|  |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nbite bread ......................... | . 912 lb . wheat | Pound | 16.2 | 3.12 | . 59 | 2.53 | 13.7 | -- | 13.7 | 16 |
|  |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Com flakes ........................si |  | : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | . 05 1b. corn | 8-oz. pkg. | : 13.3 | 3.39 | 1.19 | 2.20 | 11.1 | --- | 11.1 | 17 |
|  | . 343 1b. corn | Pound | : 7.8 | 3.91 | . 60 | 3.31 | 4.5 | -- | 4.5 | 42 |
| Plour, white .............................. <br> Rlce ........................................ | . 68 1b. wheat | : Pound | : $\quad 9.0$ | 4.82 8.99 | .91 1.21 | 3.91 7.78 | 5.1 |  | 5.1 | 43 |
| RoLed oats ......................... 2 | . 05 lb . oats | : Pound | : 14.3 | 5.02 | 1.02 | 4.78 | 9.2 10.3 | - | 9.2 10.3 | 46 28 |
|  |  | : : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apples |  | : P | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0ranges $\cdot$..............................: | . 0224 bu. | Pound | : 12.2 | 4.32 | -- | 4.32 | 7.9 | --- | 7.3 | 35 |
|  | . 0613 box - freah use | Dozen | : 40.3 | 15.1 | --- | 15.1 | 30.9 | -- - | 30.9 | 33 |
|  |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Веаля, впар ........................: |  | : Poun : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cabbege ................................. | . 0375 bu. | : Pound | 1 <br> $:$ | 6.94 1.92 | - | 6.94 1.92 | 8.9 3.3 | $\cdots$ | 8.9 | 4.4 |
| Lettuce , ............................... | . 0222 bu. | : Pound | : $\begin{array}{r}5.2 \\ : \quad 12.5\end{array}$ | 1.92 5.55 |  | 1.92 5.55 | 3.3 6.7 | -- | 3.3 6.3 | 37 |
|  | . 0185 crt. | : Head | : 12.5 | 5.55 5.93 | - | 5.55 5.33 | 6.7 10.0 | --- | 6.3 10.3 | 4 |
|  | . 061 lb . | : Pound | : 9.1 | 2.77 | - | 2.77 | 6.3 | --- | 10.3 6.3 | 37 |
| Potatoes ..................................... | . 0174 bu. | : Poumd | : 5.6 | 2.05 | --- | 2.05 | 3.5 |  | 3.5 | 37 |
| Skeetpotators ............................. <br> fesatoes <br> *................................ | . 0204 bu. | : Pound | : 11.4 | 4.47 | --- | 4.47 | 6.9 | -- | 6.9 | 37 |
|  | . 0251 ba. | : Pound | : 25.9 | 7.78 | - | 7.78 | 18.1 | -- | 18.1 | 30 |
| : |  | : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peacher, canned ....................il |  | : | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | .89 1b. Calif. cling | : No. 2t can | : 33.6 | 5.74 | --- | 5.74 | 27.9 | -- | 27.9 | 17 |
|  | .03 lb . eweet | $:$ Ho. 2 ean | : 22.2 | 2.75 | - | 2.75 | 19.4 | -- | 19.4 | 12 |
|  |  | Ho. 2 can | 15.5 .$\quad 20.6$ | 3.84 | --- | 3.34 | 11.8 | -- | 11.8 | 25 |
|  |  | : \%o. 2 can | : 20.6 | 3.01 | - | 3.01 | 17.6 | --- | 17.6 | 15 |
| Pronge |  | ! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prange ......... |  | : Poud : | : 28.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mary beans $\qquad$ | Ib. dried, Callfornia Ib. Mich. and I. I. | Pound | : 28.1 | 12.25 | -- | 12.25 | 15.9 | --- | 15.9 | 4 |
|  | pea beans | Pound | 15.5 | 5.26 | --- | 5.26 | 10.2 | --- | 10.2 | 34 |
| (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| feat sugar ............. |  | Poun | : 10.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Margaring |  | Pound | 10.7 | 4.08 | . 217 | 3.37 | 6.9 | . 54 | 6.3 | 36 |
|  | 12.29 lb . sugar cane | Pound | 10.2 | 4.79 | . 77 | 4.02 | 6.2 | . 54 | 5.7 | 39 |
| Protable shorteoling <br> ................... | Cottonsaed, scybean $B$, and aidm rill | Pound |  | -- | --- |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \| |  | Pound | . 36.9 | -- | -- | 16.73 | 20.2 | - | 21.3 20.2 | 40 |
|  |  |  | : ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| , |  | $: 3$ | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Thull dotatis conceralng : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br> Eeph, 1945 (out of print). Commodity-group estimates are derived from data more incluaive than the individual items ilsted in this table. For example, <br> the mart-products group includea veal and mutton, farm ablea of lower grade cattle, allowance for retail value of byproducts and processed meate, in <br> deditics to lamb, port (Including land), and carcase beef of Choice grade. <br> $2 /$ Marketing charges equal margin adjusted for byproduct allowances minus Govermment marketing taxes plus Government payments to marketing agencies. <br> 3/ Hame of grade was changed from Good to Choice on Dec. 29, 1950. <br> 4 Grose farm vulue beforo adjusting for Choice grade promín was 62.6. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Table 6.- Price aproads between farners and consumers - rood products: Retail price and farm valuo, July 1951 compared with the 1935-39 average, July 1950 and Jume 1951 i/


Tabl. 7.- Price apreade between fariers and consumers - food products: Mariceting charges and farmer's ahare of retail price, July 195l compared with the 2935-39 average, July 2950 and Jtue 1951 1/

| Commodity | Rotail unit | $\text { : } 1935-39$ | Karcoting chargen $2 /$ |  |  |  |  | 2 | Fargor's dhar |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { July } \\ & 1950 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -J_{\text {Unte }} \\ 1951 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ju2y } \\ & 1951 \end{aligned}$ | Porcentage change July 1951 from - |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1935-39 } \\ & \text { avergge } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Joly } \\ & 1950 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { June } \\ & 1951 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JuI7 } \\ & 1951 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | July : | $\operatorname{Jin} 0$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mentat backpt ......................s) |  | 1204.47 | 3/356.99 | 3/368.86 | 370.57 | $+4$ | 4 | 40 | 47 | 49 | 49 |
| Het producta ...................i) |  | : 45.88 | 3/77.67 | 72.90 | 75.80 | 2 | + 4 | 47 | 3/63 | 68 | 66 |
| Dairy produota ...................si) |  | : 33.89 | 3/ 55.40 | 61.37 | 61.64 | + 11 | 4 | 50 | 53 | 54 | 54 |
| Poultry and egge ..................... | 1935-39 | $\begin{array}{ll}7 & 8.90\end{array}$ | 3/ 28.41 | 18.98 | 19.45 |  | + 2 | 66 | 60 | 65 | 65 |
|  | annual |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mhery and otbor caral <br> 3) products: | ararage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | quarchased, ( | 42.80 | 3/69.98 | 76.21 | 76.47 | + 9 | 6 | $\mathfrak{7}$ | 27 | 27 | 27 |
| Graln ........................................ <br> other cereal products ..........z) | por fantily |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 | 22 | 21 | 21 |
|  | of three (2 | 1212.20 | 3/21.67 | 23.54 | 23.80 | $+10$ | + 1 | 32 | 39 | 38 | 38 |
| Alicrutte and regetables .....as) $C$ | consumers | 153.81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{ll}1 & 53.81 \\ : 37.48\end{array}$ | $3 / 107.63$ 3/ 85.08 | $3 / 110.53$ 81.09 | 108.93 79.72 | $\pm 1$ -7 | - 1 | 31 35 | 32 34 | 31 33 | 34 33 |
| Prosh vagetables ...........n) |  | : 21.68 | 3/ 49.60 | 52.60 | 50.00 | $+1$ | - 5 | 35 | 3/31 | 29 | 31 |
|  |  | : 12.21 | 3/ 25.06 | 3/ 20.99 | 20.79 | +38 | - 1 | 14 | $3 / 21$ | 16 | 17 |
| nespulaneous producta .........s) |  | : 19.19 | 3/ 27.90 | 3/ 28.97 | 28.28 | + 1 | 2 | 25 | 3/ 30 | 39 | 39 |
| : |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  | Gepts | Center | Conts | cents | Parcsad | Porcons | Pepcent | Parcent | Receat | Eaxat |
|  |  | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | : 12. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Pound | 12.9 | 3/25.7 | 3/ 22.7 | 24.0 | - 7 |  | 56 | ${ }^{67}$ | 73 | 72 |
|  | Pound | 13.6 | 2326.4 | 21.3 | 22.8 | $-14$ | +7 $+\quad 2$ | 49 | 3) 64 | 73 | 7 |
| Port (incluting lard) ..............s: | Pound | 20.3 | 3/ 14.6 | 16.1 | 16.5 | $+13$ | + 2 | 52 | $3 / 37$ | 65 | 6 |
|  |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( | Pound | 11.1 | 20.8 | 22.3 | 22,4 | + 8 | 4 | 68 | 70 | 72 | 72 |
| Cberst, Axarioun .................... | Pourd | 12.3 | 3/ 26.6 | 28.0 | 27.8 | + 5 | $-1$ | 53 | 3/ 5 | 56 | 56 |
| Traporited ailk ...................... : 4 | 4toz. can | 4.6 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 7.9 | $+10$ |  | 38 | 44 | 47 | 47 |
| nuti milk ........................... | Qumart | 5.1 | 3/ 8.3 | 9.3 | 9.5 | +14 | $+2$ | 55 | 57 | 57 | 57 |
| lee orcen . .t. ....................... | Pint | 6 | $6 /$ | 23.9 | 23.8 |  | 4 | $6 /$ |  | 24 | 24 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tsge ................................. | Dozen | 6.7 | 2/14.7 | 19.5 | 19.3 | + 31 |  | 77 | $3 / 72$ | 70 | n |
| cieoken ............................. | Found | 13.1 | 27.4 | 23.6 | 24.8 | - 9 | + 5 | 56 | 49 | 57 | 55 |
|  |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whte bread | Pound | 7.9 | 3/ 12.3 | 13.6 | 13.7 | + 11 | 41 | 12 | 17 | 16 | 16 |
|  |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 7.1 | 9.9 | 10.9 | 11.1 | + 12 | + 2 | 11 | 19 | 17 |  |
| comm meel | Pound | 1.6 | 3/ 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.5 | + 7 | + 2 | 47 | $3 / 4$ | 42 | 42 |
| nour, white | Pound | 2.1 | ( 4.6 | 5.0 | 5.1 | + 11 | + 2 | 43 | $3 / 45$ | 4 | 43 |
| knot ................................. | Pound | 4.7 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.2 | + 2 | + 2 | 33 | 3/42 | 47 | 46 |
| lolled onto ......................... | Pound | 5.6 | 3/ 9.2 | 10.1 | 10.3 | $+12$ | + 2 | 24 | 30 | 29 | 28 |
|  |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| dpplen ........................................ <br> Orange: ...................................... |  | ; 2.9 | 3/ 10.5 | 7.6 | 7.9 | -25 | $+4$ | 41 | 3/ 36 | 36 | 35 |
|  | Dozen | 19.3 | 3/ 31.6 | 30.7 | 30.9 | - 2 | +1 | 36 | 37 | 35 | 33 |
| : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bャrns, map ....................... |  | 6.8 |  | 12.2 | 8.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cabbage C...........................t | Pround | 1 8 | $3 / 3.7$ | 4.4 | 3.3 | - 11 | - 25 | 24 | 32 | 25 | 37 |
|  | Brach | 3.7 | 4. 6.8 | 6.0 | 6.9 | + 1 | + 15 | 31 | 35 | 45 | 4 |
| Lettue Daions ................................. | Hoad | 5.8 | $3 / 8.0$ | 6.2 | 10.0 | + 25 | + 61 | 33 | 31 | 54 | 37 |
|  | Pound | 3.2 | $3 / 6.0$ | 7.4 | 6.3 | + 5 | - 15 | 29 | 3/31 | 32 | 30 |
| Potatoen <br> thetpotatoes . . .............................. <br> pratoes | Pound | : 1.3 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 3.5 | + 21 | - ${ }^{3}$ | 50 | 43 | 34 | 37 |
|  | Pound | $: 3.4$ |  | 6.2 20.9 | 6.9 18.1 | +47 -24 | +11 +13 | 6 | 3/ $\begin{array}{r}48 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 4 | 39 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $3 / 28$ | 23 | 30 |
|  |  | 16.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Puobey, canned <br> Corn, canned <br> Pury, canned ................................. <br> loantoes, caniod | Mo. 23 can | 16.2 10.6 | 3/ 14.4 | 27.9 19.4 | 19.4 | +18 +35 | 0 0 | 14 | 14 | 17 | 17 |
|  | No. 2 can | : 13.3 | $3 / 11.0$ | 12.0 | 11.8 | + + + | - 2 | 15 | $3 / 25$ | 23 | 25 |
|  | Ho. 2 can | \% 7.9 | $3 / 12.7$ | 17.8 | 17.6 | + 50 | - 1 | 16 | 3/20 | 14 | 25 |
| 旡 |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mmas ...................................s: livy bana. $\qquad$ | Pound | 7.0 | 3/16.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Pownd | 3.5 | 71.1 | 2/10.3 | 10.2 | +44 | $\underline{1}$ | 46 | 24 | 3/35 | 36 |
| t |  | $\pm$ \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br> Che sugar ................................ <br> Hherthe ................................... 8 <br> furchble ahortming .................... | Pound | 23.6 | 5.8 | 6.1 | 6.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Pound | : 3.4 | $3 / \quad 5.4$ | 3/ 5.7 | 6.3 5.7 | +6 | + 0 | 32 | 3/39 | 2/39 | 36 |
|  | Pound | $\pm 13.2$ | 3/23.1 | 22.8 | 21.3 | - 8 | - 7 | 24 | 3/22 |  | 40 |
|  | pornd | : 14.2 | 3/ 22.6 | 21.5 | 20.2 |  |  | 27 | 2/26 | 4 | 45 |
| ? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br>  <br> opt. 1945 (out of print). Comodity-group estimates aro derived fron date more inclusive than the individual items listed in this table. for arimpe. <br> the ment-producta group inaludes real min mutton, farm sales of lower grade cuttle, allowance for retail value of byproducts and procescad meate, in <br> Ndition to jamb, port (inaluding Lard), and carcass beef of Chotce grade. <br>  Mrtoting agenetes. <br> 3/ Revised. <br> 4/ Less than 0.5 percent. <br> / Mame of grade parownt. changed from Good to Choice on Dec. 29, 1950. <br> 6 Price data not aveilable. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 8. - Farm products: Indexes of prices at several levels of marketing,

| : Prices : Foods - Fibers - Whole-: Prices : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | paid | - zotat | 5 Whole- |  |  | Whole | Prices | sale | ceive |  |
|  | by | : detaj | : sale | Pri | Retai | sale | receiv | rices | by | Pric |
| Year : and : | city | : price | :prices | Price | prices | price | by | of | arme | paid |
|  | families | : 0 for | of all | receiv | of | of | farmer | 211 | for | : by |
| month: | for all | : food | : food | : by | :cloth-:textile |  | for | farm | 2.11 | :farm- |
| month. | commodi- | : prod- | : prod | farmers | ing | prod | cotto | prod | prod- | : ers |
|  | ties | : ucts | - ucts | - 4/ | $1 /$ | ucts | and | ucts | ucts | 6 |
| : | I/ | : 2 | $: 3 i$ |  |  | $3 /$ | wool | $3 /$ | 6/ |  |
| 1913 : | 71 | 77 | 81 | 91 | 69 | 81 | 110 | 94 | 95 | 81 |
| 1920: | 78 | 94 | 96 | 106 | 78 | 99 | 1.31 | 111 | 111 | 93 |
| 1918 : | 108 | 134 | 151 | 172 | 128 | 1.93 | 279 | 195 | 192 | 141 |
| 1920 : | 143 | 166 | 174 | 181 | 201 | 230 | 284 | 198 | 197 | 171 |
| 1929 : | 122 | 128 | 126 | 136 | 115 | 127 | 167 | 138 | 138 | 121 |
| 1932 : | 98 | 83 | 77 | 67 | 91 | 77 | 54 | 63 | 61 | 82 |
| 1935 : | 98 | 102 | 106 | 99 | 97 | 100 | 109 | 104 | 101 | 99 |
| 1936 | 99 | 103 | 104 | 104. | 98 | 101 | 114 | 106 | 106 | 99 |
| 1937 | 103 | 106 | 108 | 112 | 103 | 107 | 111 | 114 | 11/4 | 105 |
| 1938 : | 101 | 96 | 93 | 94 | 102 | 94 | 80 | 90 | 90 | 98 |
| 1939 | 99 | 93 | 89 | 90 | 100 | 98 | 87 | 86 | 88 | 98 |
| 1940 : | 100 | 93 | 90 | 94 | 102 | 1.04 | 98 | 89 | 93 | 98 |
| 1941 | 105 | 102 | 105 | 114. | 100 | 119 | 131. | 108 | 125 | 105 |
| 1942 | 117 | 120 | 126 | 14.5 | 124 | 136 | 1.78 | 1.39 | 147 | 120 |
| 1943 | 124 | 135 | 135 | 175 | 130 | 137 | 190 | 161 | 179 | 133 |
| 1944 : | 126 | 132 | 133 | 173 | 139 | 139 | 194. | 162 | 182 | 140 |
| 1945 : | 129 | 135 | 134 | 183 | 1.46 | 141 | 2.01 | 169 | 152 | 1.45 |
| 1946 | 140 | 155 | 165 | 207 | 160 | 164 | 260 | 1.96 | 218 | 159 |
| 1947 : | 160 | 189 | 213 | 249 | J.86 | 200 | 296 | 238 | 256 | 186 |
| 1948 : | 172 | 20.2 | 22.6 | 260 | 198 | 209 | 296 | 248 | 265 | 202 |
| 1949: | 170 | 189 | 204 | 229 | J.90 | 198 | 272 | 218 | 232 | 194 |
| 1950 : | 172 | 189 | 210 | 228 | 180 | 208 | 313 | 224 | 238 | 198 |
| 1950: 230 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| July | 172 | 197 | 2.7 | 7/233 | 18/4 | 201 | 310 | 232 | 245 | 199 |
| Aug. : | 173 | 194 | 221 | 235 | 186 | 211 | 343 | 234 | 249 | 200 |
| Sept.: | 175 | 193 | 224 | 238 | 190 | 2.23 | 371 | 237 | 253 | 203 |
| Oct. | 1776 | 192 | 218 | 235 | 193 | 230 | 363 | 234 | 2.50 | 204 |
| Nov. : | 176 | 193 | 221 | 239 | 194 | 235 | 386 | 242 | 257 | 206 |
| Dec, : | 179 | 200 | 226 | 250 | 1.96 | 247 | 383 | 247 | 266 | 207 |
| 1351: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jan. : | 182 | 208 | 230 | 265 | 198 | 251 | 401 | 2.56 | 279 | 211 |
| Feb. | 184 | 213 | 237 | 276 | 202 | 255 | 41.1 | 2.67 | 291 | 215 |
| Mar. | 184 | 212 | 236 | 272 | 203 | 258 | 425 | 268 | 290 | 21.9 |
| Apr. | 185 | 210 | 235 | 269 | 204 | 257 | 42.5 | 266 | 288 | 220 |
| May | 185 | 2.2 | 237 | 266 | 204 | 256 | 425 | 263 | 284 | 219 |
| June | 185 | 212 | 236 | 264 | 204 | 250 | 409 | 26. | 280 | 219 |
| July : | 186 | 212 | 235 | 262 | 203 | 244 | 377 | 255 | 274 | 219 |

1 Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Consumer Price Index for Moderate-Income Fomilies in Large Cities." $\quad 2 /$ Calculated from "Retail cost" of market basket (p. 2), 3/ Bureau of Labor Statistics, converted from $1926=100$ base.
4/ Calculated from "Farm value" of market backet (p. 2 ).
5/ Cotton and wool prices weighted by production in 1935-39.
6/ Based on figures published by the Crop Feporting Board.
7/ Revised.

Table 9.- Indexes of consumer income and of hourly carnings in inarketing, $1935-39=100$


1/ United States Department of Commerce estimates. Adjusted for seasonal variation.
2/ Prepared in the Bureall of Agricultural Economics from data of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, not adjucted for seasonal variation. Revised series.
3/ Compiled from data published by the Interstate Comaerce Comission.
$4 /$ Bureau of Labor Statisties.
5/ Weighted composite of earnines in steam railways, food processing, wholesaling, and retailing.
6 Revised.
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[^0]:    2 The "market basket" contains quantities of farm food products equal to the 1935-39 average amual purchases per family of three average consuners. Full details are presented in Agriculturel Information Bulletin No. 4 , "Price Epreads Between Formers and Consumers.".

    3/ Total retail cost of all foods currently consumed per family of three average consumers is roughly 50 percent higher than the retail cost of the "market basket." The market basket of farm food products does not include imported foods, fishery products, or other foods of nonfarm origin; it does not include food consuned in households on farms where produced; it measure the cost at current prices or 1935-39 average prewar purchases and does not allow for the curcently higher level of per capita food consumption, which is 10 to 15 percent above the level for 1935-39; and does not include additionil mark-ups for preparation and service of meals purchased in cating places.

[^1]:    4 This is shown by cherges in the cost to consumers of quentities and qualities of foods repxesenting average annuil consumption per person during 1935-39 (table 2). This cost is calculated by tiking as ai 1935-39 base the actual food expenditure for that period (\$1.18.60) and multiplying this base cost by a United States civerage consumer's food cost index. The index is a weighted average of indexes representing, (1) retail food prices in 56 cities (0. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics), (2) retill food prices in other cities and towns, and (3) prices received by producers applied to foods consumed on farms where produced.

