Land Use Policy Issues

Today, there are 70,565 square miles of land in North Dakota. There are many potential uses for this land. Farmers would like to expand their acreages. Many communities would like to add new industry. Many people want to preserve or expand scenic areas, recreational sites and historic locations. The impending development of North Dakota’s energy resources will undoubtedly cause both temporary and permanent changes in land use.

By the year 2000, there will still be just 70,665 square miles of land in North Dakota. If there were enough land for all perceived uses so that the conflicting uses of land could be widely separated, there would be little need for land use policies that are being proposed at all levels of government at the present time.

The land use policy issue is broad, since virtually all that humans do involves the use of land. Some of this suggests conflicts strongly with traditional attitudes and beliefs regarding ownership and the right to speculate in land. If illustrates clearly why land use policy is such a controversial issue.

How can private property rights be balanced with public rights?

But what if you take only some of the land owner’s rights to the property? Is zoning taking some of the rights? And at what point is the land owner entitled to compensation — or how much regulation can be allowed before the land owner is damaged?

These questions are related to the windfall discussed under the economic issue. Should the windfall be granted to someone who is injured because of zoning, land use or an interstate highway go to the owner or society? And on the other side, what if someone’s property value is reduced or nearly voided because of land use or zoning? This is the opposite of a windfall — it could be a wipeout.

An example of reduced value occurred in Fargo. The owner of a large home planned to convert it into apartments. However, residents of the area were successful in getting it rezoned to single family residential, so the home owner will not realize his expected value. Should he be compensated?

In Colorado, a Denver suburb with limited water supplies is attempting to obtain water now being used to irrigate 37,000 acres of farmland in a nearby county. This illustrates the problem of land use as related to a fixed supply of water. Today, there’s no frontier with ample land and water. The farmers can’t move and they must compete with their city neighbors for existing resources.

This is the central question in developing a land use policy. Our land and water resources are fixed. How do we allocate our resources to care for competing needs of today and tomorrow? The solution isn’t likely to please all the parties involved.

North Dakota citizens should take every opportunity to become knowledgeable regarding land use policy issues and participate in the process of policy development.
# PUBLIC POLICY MEETINGS – 1950

**Harry Anderson, Extension Economist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>No. Attendance (Who)</th>
<th>Comments (Subject Requested)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 13</td>
<td>Kindred</td>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>35 Farmers</td>
<td>1949 Farm Act – Brannan Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 14</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>LaMoure</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>23 Mostly businessmen (few farmers)</td>
<td>General Farm Situation and Brannan Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 15</td>
<td>Oakes</td>
<td>Dickey</td>
<td>12:00 noon</td>
<td>25 Young farmers – mostly vets</td>
<td>General Farm Situation and Farm Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 27</td>
<td>Litchville</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>28 Mostly farmers</td>
<td>General Farm Situation and Farm Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 20</td>
<td>Steele</td>
<td>Kidder</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>46 33 Businessmen – 13 farmers, Sponsored by Lion's Club</td>
<td>Farm Outlook – 1949 Farm Act – Brannan Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 21</td>
<td>Bismarck</td>
<td>Burleigh</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>60 52 farmers – 8 businessmen, Sponsored by Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Farm Outlook – 1949 Farm Act – Brannan Act – Devaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 22</td>
<td>Jamestown</td>
<td>Stutsman</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>76 One-half farmers, Sponsored by Lion’s Club</td>
<td>Farm Outlook – 1949 Farm Act – Brannan Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 27</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Sargent</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>50 Mostly farmers</td>
<td>Farm Outlook – 1949 Farm Act – Brannan Act – Devaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minnor</td>
<td>Sargent</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>60 24 Farmers – 36 businessmen, Sponsored by Lion's Club</td>
<td>Farm Progress – Brannan Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 28</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>McIntosh</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>30 Mostly businesssponsored by Lion's Club</td>
<td>Devaluation – 1949 Farm Act – Brannan Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 3</td>
<td>Nortonville</td>
<td>LaMoure</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>45 Nearly all farmers</td>
<td>Devaluation – 1949 Farm Act – Brannan Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 13</td>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>Golden Valley</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>78 30 farmers – 48 businessmen, Sponsored by Lion’s Club</td>
<td>1949 Farm Act – Brannan Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 14</td>
<td>Dickinson</td>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>38 All businessmen</td>
<td>Brannan Plan – Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 15</td>
<td>New England</td>
<td>Hettinger</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>40 Mostly farmers, Sponsored by local editor</td>
<td>1949 Farm Act – Brannan Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 16</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>29 26 farmers – 3 others Creamery sponsored meeting</td>
<td>1949 Farm Act – Brannan Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 27</td>
<td>Cogswell</td>
<td>Sargent</td>
<td>8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>150 Cogswell Coop Elevator Association Farm Coop Members</td>
<td>Farm Programs – Brannan Plan – 1949 Farm Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50% women – fair discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IN THE JOB OF MARKETING, FARMERS HAVE BEEN FAR OUTCLASSED, THEY'VE TAKEN THE PRICE THAT'S OFFERED AND PAID THE PRICE THAT'S ASKED

The American farmer has generally been a surplus producer. The individual farmer and even groups of commodity producers have had little or no impact on market supply and thus little control over prices they receive. Public policy and price supports have basically set farm product prices. However, within any marketing year there are many marketing trends and price fluctuations. Extension marketing programs have been aimed at providing farmers with outlook information that can be used as guidelines for deciding which products to produce and how to best market those products. Farmers must know what they have to sell and what it costs to produce it if they are to receive a fair price for it. Grading of both grains and farm animals must be understood and these have been taught to both youth and adults through 4-H programs and adult grading classes. Grain grading standards have been revised several times and major revisions were made in the 1950's. Extension grain marketing specialist H.W. Herbst prepared numerous articles for newspapers and presented numerous radio and TV programs regarding those revisions. He also conducted 21 grain grading schools throughout the state in 1952 demonstrating grain grades and stressing the use of pure seed.

Market price protection through the use of futures contracts has been an Extension marketing discussion topic since the 1950's and many of the larger producers have learned to use that technique.

INFLATION-DEFLATION GAVE ROUGH RIDES, BUT FINANCIAL ANALYSIS HELPED SAVE RIDES

Farmers must be eternal optimists but their optimism sometimes leads to financial distress. Under-capitalization, restricted cash flow, unbudgeted operations, low production and uncertain prices have led to many mortgage foreclosures that may have been prevented.

Lending agencies, machinery dealers and others have shared the farmers' optimism and many have over-extended loans and credit that backfired when production and prices failed to meet optimistic levels.

Inflation-deflation effects on land values have been especially disastrous to farmers and creditors alike. North Dakota farmers have suffered through at least five such periods -1890's, 1920's, 1930's, 1950's and 1980's. Each of those periods forced many under-capitalized farmers out of farming and at the same time helped better financed farmers to expand.

Extension has been ever aware of inflation-deflation land value effects and its limited farm management staff has emphasized enterprise and whole farm budgeting to combat it. During inflationary periods, farmers' optimism was strong competition to budgeting and "easy" loan money ballooned farm indebtedness far beyond sound budgeting.

Deflationary land value periods have been very sobering to indebted farmers and Extension has had greater success in teaching farm financial management during those periods.

Statewide economic conferences conducted during the 1920's were Extension's first major effort towards farm financial management. They were largely based on horses as the source of farm power and farm tractors soon made horses and the quarter section and even half-section farms obsolete. Land prices increased as tractor powered farmers reached for more land. Many used the inflated prices to increase their land mortgage for a down payment on other land.

Those who expanded early bought land at less inflated prices and had longer to pay for it than those who expanded later and just before land price deflation. They survived the 1930's as farmers much better than did the late expanders.

Land use planning of the late 1930's and early 1940's was a form of financial planning as well as a conservation program. It was somewhat set back by WWII and inflated land prices.

Farm and home development of the 1950's emphasized family living goals along with financial management goals. Both family living budgets and farm operating budgets were stressed. Cash flow and debt management were emphasized for survival in emergency and depressed periods.

As many as one-third of North Dakota's farm families were experiencing serious financial problems by the 1980's, Extension developed a program for increased emphasis in farm financial management using individual farm financial analysis service. Prelude to that service was the development and scheduling of one day financial management workshops entitled "Farm Management Under Economic Stress." Over 1,300 farmers attended such workshops held at 28 places during 1982. Agriculture's financial history 1960-1982 along with commodity price outlook, enterprise budgeting, cash flow analysis and a detailed discussion of financial and production oriented survival tactics were included in the workshops.

Extension expanded that program in 1983. Besides conducting 18 of the one day workshops, a pilot program of 15 two day in-depth financial
management workshops was concentrated on western North Dakota counties. Workshop emphasis was the instruction, step by step, of farm families in how to prepare financial statements and how to use them in making decisions. Approximately 1,500 farmers attended those 1983 workshops.

Extension's emphasis in farm financial management was further strengthened in 1984-85 by the addition of a one-on-one farm financial analyst service. Extension recruited and trained 56 people for that work and make them available for individual farmer consultation. Approximately 3,000 farmers attended the two day in-depth workshops that year and 585 of them followed up by using the services of a farm financial analyst.

Funding for the farm financial analyst service has been a joint investment by the Federal and State Extension Services, the North Dakota Rural Rehabilitation Corporation and the North Dakota Farmer's Home Administration. There appears to be a growing demand for that service and future emphasis of it will depend largely on funding.

FARM AND HOME INSTITUTES—WHOLE COMMUNITY AFFAIRS WHERE EVERYBODY PARTICIPATES AND EVERYBODY SHARES

Farm and home institute type meetings were major winter activities for most county staff for many years. Most institutes were two days affairs with programs for both men and women. Local merchants, service clubs and other groups were invited to participate and generally provided morning and afternoon "coffee." Some even provided free noon meals.

Institute programs were based on local requests and no two were exactly the same. Local people were used as discussion group leaders and many of them became excellent commodity group leaders.

County agents and home economists coordinated institute programs and scheduled specialists and resource people. They generally did not make program presentations so that maximum use could be made of the "out of town" resource people.

Diversity of institute programs is well illustrated by four institute programs.

Attendance at institutes was excellent and nothing short of a blizzard kept people from attending. Institutes were door openers for giving assistance to many families. Topic discussions fostered many follow-up requests for more detailed information and on the farm and in the home assistance.
IN NORTH DAKOTA MOST EVERYONE GOES TO COUNTY AND STATE FAIRS AND SHOWS

Agricultural fairs and shows have been major social-agricultural and promotion events in North Dakota since shortly after the state was settled. Local merchants and business associations were the first promoters and they did quite well.

When county agents arrived they were immediately recruited as co-promoters and they have served in that capacity ever since. Local fairs and shows have done much to promote and inspire better 4-H and Homemaker club work and are used in many counties as their project achievement awards show.

Statewide fairs and shows have been a natural outgrowth from county fairs and they too have leaned heavily on Extension agents and specialists for promotion and conduct of exhibits. General fairs at Fargo, Grand Forks and Minot and the State Dairy Show at Jamestown filled the summer months but North Dakota’s long winter months also demanded more social-agricultural activity.

Farm commodity groups sought to fill that need by organizing commodity shows and poultry breeders were some of the first to become active. Nearly every farm family had some poultry and it was not difficult to organize local shows where proud breeders of chickens, turkeys, ducks, geese, guineas, bantams and other fowl could compete for ribbons and small prizes.
WELLS COUNTY
FARM AND HOME IMPROVEMENT
INSTITUTE
FESTIVAL HALL - FESSENDEHN
NOVEMBER 9-10

SPEAKERS

ARTHUR SCHULE
Agricultural Engineer
Speaking on "Electricity, Your Friend Man" "Better Ways of Using Electricity on Your Farm"; and "Rebuilding the Home for Greater Comfort and Convenience."

IRENE CROUCH
Home Improvement Spec.
Speaking on "Proper Wiring and Adequate Lighting in the Farm Home"; and "Selection of Electrical Equipment for the Home."

HARRY GRAVES
Horticulturist
Speaking on "Landscaping, Farm Reconsiliaiton, Arrangement of Buildings and your Plantings"; "Variety, Size, Location and Value of Farm Fruit Orchards and Vegetable Gardens."

E. M. ARMSTRONG, of TIL-COUNTY REA, CARRINGTON, WILL SPEAK ON "WHEN AND WHO WILL GUY REA POWER THIS FALL."

PROGRAM

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 9—
1:00 P. M. — Afternoon Speaker: Drawing for Door Prizes.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 10—
1:00 P. M. — Afternoon Speaker: Drawing for Door Prizes.

EVERYDAY—ELECTRICAL AND HOME IMPROVEMENT EQUIPMENT ON DISPLAY BY THE MERCHANTS OF FESSENDEN.

Register for DOOR PRIZES Both Afternoons

Free Coffee And Doughnuts Will Be Served
Sponsored by Fessenden Civic Club and NDAC Extension Service
Soon a statewide poultry show was organized and there was also a national poultry show. Clarence Mairs of Lisbon raised White Holland turkeys and went from the Ransom County Poultry Show to the State Poultry Show and on to the National Turkey Show where one of his entries received grand champion award in its class. There was much demand for his breeding stock and millions of Thanksgiving turkeys descended from his White Holland bloodlines.

Corn growers were not far behind the poultry breeders and local corn shows sprang up in several communities. They usually included other exhibits but most of the promotion was for corn with the view of advertising seed corn. That was before hybrid corn varieties were available for North Dakota's climate and Minnesota 13, Falconer, Northwestern Dent, Rainbow Flint, White Dent and other varieties were favorites.

Durum wheat, barley, potato and hard spring wheat growers were not bushy and before long each had its own state show accompanied by some kind of local entertainment.

Livestock producers were not to be left out and they, along with the Valley City promoters, organized the North Dakota Winter Show at Valley City in 1937. Facilities were limited and several widely separated buildings were used for livestock, crops and home economics exhibits.

Purebred livestock sales have been included with the North Dakota Winter Show and Barnes County Agent Larry Iverson managed the livestock show and sales catalog during most of his tenure as Barnes County Agent.

Home economics exhibits were initiated by Barnes County Extension Home Economist Mary Laycock. They were all local exhibits at first but later expanded to include the whole state.

4-H and Future Farmers of America crops and livestock exhibits and judging contests have been a substantial part of the North Dakota Winter Show. They have continually inspired participating 4-H and FFA members to improve their work.

Construction of the large Winter Show building at Valley City in the 1950s involved a major fund raising project. Extension agents did not directly solicit funds for that building but were actively involved in publicizing that project.

Several thousand North Dakota 4-H members have entered exhibits and participated in the crops and livestock judging contest at the Winter Show.

County agents and specialists have cooperated and worked well with all local, county and statewide shows and fairs.

TO LEARN IS A NEVER ENDING DESIRE SATISFIED ONLY IF ONE WILL INQUIRE

Dr. Seth Russell, Dean of NDSU College of Arts and Science during the late 1960's, expressed an interest in presenting discussion topics to off campus groups. He suggested several topics and challenged Cooperative Extension to seek out other topics and recruit audiences for them. County Extension staffs enthusiastically accepted his challenge and soon meetings were scheduled at Bismarck-Mandan, Jamestown, Lisbon and other places.

Dr. Russell recruited several of his staff members to participate and their presentations were well accepted. Many requests for similar meetings soon exceeded their ability to staff them. That led Cooperative Extension into hiring in 1968 a full time person to plan, coordinate, staff and schedule such meetings. Virgil Gehring, a school teacher-administrator who knew no obstacle great enough to deter him was that person. He was offered with the Extension District Supervisors and worked with them in setting up and scheduling such meetings.

Repeated requests for college level courses resulted in scheduling them at either a credit or non-credit level. One of Mr. Gehring's early projects was the setting up of courses for the Fargo Police Department to upgrade the scholastic background of its officers. That resulted in several officers continuing their interrupted college education and fulfilling requirements for a college degree.

Mr. Gehring's department grew steadily and was named the Department for Continuing Studies. In 1973 it was transferred from Cooperative Extension to the State University and established in the College of University Studies.

Many thousands of North Dakota people have participated and benefited from these meetings and college level courses. Cooperative Extension again demonstrated its ability to initiate, organize and conduct a program until it was able to stand alone.
EXTENSION'S FUTURE TO FULFILL, DEPENDS ON WHO WILL PAY THE BILL

What is the future for Extension funding? Cooperative funding between federal, state and county governments poses some problems. All three are undergoing budget problems and much budget shifting is underway. Each is looking to the others to assume a larger share.

Today's farmers are much more sophisticated and knowledgeable than ever before. Agricultural science and technology continues to advance at an increasingly rapid rate. Anticipating changes and training staff members for those changes will require more effort than in the past. Whether or not one likes it, farming is a business and business management will be more and more important for surviving in making technology changes. Some have criticized Extension for promoting programs that increase production and partially blame Extension for our large farm products surplus. Surely the use of commercial fertilizer, chemical weed control, new crop varieties, plant disease and insect control, production testing, artificial insemination, balanced rations and many other practices have helped to increase production.

A farm worker in 1985 could produce enough food for about 85 people. That same worker in 1965 could have produced enough food for only about 37 people. If today's, 1985, production had been at that same level as that of the 1965 farm worker, the United States would not have produced enough food to feed its own people. Production efficiency along with sound business management are essential in all business and Extension's efforts have been focused towards those ends. Dealing with surplus production is complex and difficult. It involves political and governmental policies and often those policies are not favorable to farmers.

Extension's table of organization and staffing pattern have not been static. Continuous efforts have been made to adjust staff members, staff skills and staff locations to meet the needs and provide the best services for the people of North Dakota.

Newspapers and magazines have headlined stories concerning Extension's future and several of them are included. It should be interesting to participate in whatever does develop.

OH, THE FUTURE'S NOT OURS TO SEE, BUT WITH PLANNING WE CAN HELP IT TO BE

Agriculture in 1985 is undergoing a period of great financial stress and a tragic shake-out of many underfinanced farm families. How will that affect future Extension programming and financing? Since the mid 1950's Extension has been emphasizing the business side of farming and that will demand even greater emphasis.

Farm numbers and rural population have been greatly reduced in recent years but even more reductions are ahead. What is the future for Extension's rural youth programs? 4-H has been one of Extension's strong "bread and butter" programs through both good times and bad times. Will it continue to be a basic Extension program?

Homemakers clubs have been the prime support groups for Extension's home economics programs. Their numbers have decreased with the farm population decrease. What will be their role in Extension's future?

Similar questions could be asked for all phases of Extension work. What will Extension have to offer the specialized livestock or crops producer?

What emergency situations will arise and how will government respond to them? Administrations of emergency programs have been some of Extension's finest work efforts. Will Extension be involved in emergency work in the future as it has been in the past?

How will Extension be funded? About 30% of the North Dakota Extension 1985-86 budget came from federal sources. Will Congress continue that support or will it delegate that responsibility to state and local governments? State funds made up 42%, county funds 21% and private contracts 7% of that budget. Private funds included work with youth, sugar beets, potatoes and other special programs.

During extended difficult state and local financial times who will be Extension's paymaster?

Will the present individual county agent system along with some area specialists survive or will county agents give way and only area specialists be the new Extension pattern?

Surely some staffing changes will occur on a trial basis. Public reaction and funding will be major considerations and much planning will be needed.
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ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
STATE SUPERVISOR,
EMERGENCY FARM LABOR
NORTH DAKOTA EXTENSION SERVICE

JANUARY 31, 1944
HERBERT W. HERBISON,
STATE SUPERVISOR, FARM LABOR.

FEBRUARY 23, 1944
E.J. HASLERUD, DIRECTOR,
N. DAK. EXTENSION SERVICE.
"There is no one member of the college staff who has received more attention and more favorable support from the people than the County Agent. He is the representative in the local farm community of all that the college of agriculture stands for. His primary function and first duty is putting knowledge to work—all knowledge relating to agriculture. Broadly interpreted, this must include an intellectual program far beyond mere physical and material problems concerned with production. It must include economics, sociology, rural health, rural education, recreation, and community organization."

—Dean F.B. Mumford, University of Missouri

FARM LABOR PROGRAM SIDELIGHTS
OPERATING DAYS AND NIGHTS

Extension's assignment to the WWII Farm Labor Program has been briefly discussed. That was both an extensive and intensive program operation, 1943-45, and Mr. Herbison did a superb job in supervising it. Herbison was a colorful reporter and his reports tell it best.

LABOR SIDELIGHTS OF 1943

"Bells! Bells! Bells! Hell's Bells! Two telephones are-rin' at the office from 7 a.m. till ten at night and one at the house far into the morning as some night-owl calls to get a line on his cornbine routing into the state from a night club where he just remembered he wanted to call the N.D. Labor Guy.

"This time it's good news. Mauder of Nebraska has just informed Herbison that good old Nebraska has labor on its way to arrive sometime Friday.

"The N.D. Extension Labor Office has literally a dispatcher's office day and night throughout the peak harvest weeks. It was fun while it lasted but more fun when it let up.

Oscar Nesser, Assistant State Supervisor, and H.W. Herbison, State Supervisor, Emergency Farm Labor, for the North Dakota Extension Service had a right busy and interesting year in administrative supervision of a service program that a lot of folks once thought was a hot potato for whoever messed around with it. Both came out of the experience with grayer hair but richer for many kind things said by county extension agents, farmers and others of the 1943 Farm Labor Program's contribution to the state's war effort.

EVERYONE GAVE A HELPING HAND TO GET THE CROP OFF OF THE LAND

Preface to Report

"This report is meant to give the reader a quick look at some of the more significant results obtained in the 1943 Farm Labor Program in North Dakota as administered by the North Dakota Agricultural Extension Service. As so often happens, activity in carrying forward the program has not permitted us with time to do a complete job of telling all of the things that were done or to describe in much detail how they were done and who helped get them done.

"This report summarizes results of activity in which many took part. The writer, as supervisor of the program, had only one part to play in the overall program that was only made possible through the cooperation of the entire Extension Service staff at both state and county levels. While not much mention is made of them in this report, supervision was shared with the county agent leader and our three district Extension supervisors. This emergency program assigned by the 76th Congress, when accepted by Director Haslerud for the North Dakota Extension Service, became the responsibility of all of us in that service. That spirit has prevailed throughout the year and all who could contribute to its successful operation did.

"Looking ahead we have confidence that our Extension people, cooperating agencies and local leadership can do a better job in 1944 than in 1943 if all are mindful of the seriousness of the situation still with us. Some danger exists in people feeling that because things turned out all right in 1943 there is no need to be greatly concerned in 1944. We think 1944 may be, in some respects, a more difficult year to operate in. Our population in the state is still shrinking rapidly and the loss is largely in ablebodied workers. Many of our present farm operators are old men. They and their wives are wearing out rapidly and can't keep up the pace that they have set for themselves in 1942 and 1943. Most of the older Victory Farm Volunteer (VFW) boys enrolled and used last year will be in the armed service in 1944. Our 18 year old farm boys are going also. Of greatest challenge is the farm machinery situation in maintaining a high level of production. More and more time must be spent in patching up and keeping rattletrap equipment working — 1943's production output was hard on machinery. Our trucks and cars are in bad shape and will not be replaced.

"In retrospect, we wonder many times if what we went through in the few short months we have been associated with this program really did happen. On pinching ourselves and finding that it did, we look forward with a lot of confidence in being able to lick
the job ahead in 1944. In addition to aiding our farm people in solving their labor supply problems, the 1943 Farm Labor Program went far toward welding our service together into an integrated organization with strength to meet any task despite real obstacles. We still lack experience we wish we had, but we do not lack in courage."

H. W. Herbison, Supervisor

1,919,869 ACRES
CUSTOM COMBINED

A total of 5,240 placements of local and interstate custom combines is reported by County Extension Agents for the harvesting of small grains and flax in North Dakota in 1943. 1,919,869 acres were reported harvested by these custom combines.

1,301 placements of out-of-state machines are reported. Most of these machines originated in Nebraska and Kansas. 707,600 acres of combine harvesting is credited out-of-state machines placed. 3,999 placements of local and interstate combine harvesters is reported; 1,212,069 acres of harvesting is credited them.

Neighborhood War Service Leaders did most of the footwork in surveying job offers for custom harvesting, in recruiting local combine machines for work on other farms and in assisting local and county farm placement offices in routing and movement of local and interstate machines. This was a very valuable service, particularly fitted to the eastern half of the state where swathing of grain must be done and combine harvesting completed with machines equipped with pickup attachments.

501 out-of-state combine harvesters were routed to North Dakota thru the efforts of the "Alliance Office" set up and operated cooperatively by the Extension Service and War Food Administration. Most of these machines were "straight combine outfits" suitable for placement in western North Dakota counties. Transportation subsidies were arranged for those who were not in the regular custom combining game.

On the whole, North Dakota’s custom combine phase of its total Farm Labor Program progressed without much ballyhoo for two reasons: — We wished to emphasize local recruitment and complete utilization of machines within the state and refrain from much newspaper publicity touching on "outside machines" until almost the last local machine had been stretched around to help others. — Secondly, we were concerned over how the interstate machines would follow our directional routing requests; we didn’t wish to have too many farmers depending on machines that might fail to show up. In retrospect, we think this was sound policy.

Some of the "bugs" in the 1943 placement of out-of-state combines were occasioned by:

(1) The fact that North Dakota is at the end of the line for custom machines making the harvest from the South, South Dakota was into the custom market with both feet and their farmers were "on the grab" for any machine enroute to North Dakota during its passage thru our sister state to the South. As a result, farmers down there did just what ours would do under similar circumstances — machines were siphoned off for a week or ten days enroute and then finally showed up on the late side.

(2) Combine operators, at least many of them, are independent cusses who like to shop around and work where they "jolly well please". The small amount of transportation money involved was no real deterrent in causing them to change their ways.

(3) Few transient combine outfits seemed to know much about the Alliance deal and figured that about all they had to do was to keep going in the right direction and take any job along the way that looked good to them.

(4) The Canadian combine arrangement we depended on and had lined up and all set to go fell thru due to mess up of health inspection requirements insisted upon by the Immigration people.
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II. RECRUITMENT AND REGISTRATION OF WORKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Total Registrations Reported By Counties (1943):</th>
<th>73,592</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total local registrations</td>
<td>49,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Families registered</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Men registered</td>
<td>23,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Women registered</td>
<td>4,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Youth registered</td>
<td>202,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interstate domestic and foreign registrations</td>
<td>17,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Regular domestic migrant labor</td>
<td>13,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Domestic migrant, War Food Administration (WFA)</td>
<td>3,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Foreign</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) WFA transported</td>
<td>368 reported (probably more)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Special groups registered for farm work</td>
<td>6,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Troop workers, U. S. Army</td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Internees</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conscientious Objectors</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Cadets in training, on 3-day pass</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. FARM LABOR PLACEMENT AND ORDER PROCESSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seasonal/1-Year-around</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Individual Farm Orders for Labor</td>
<td>32,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Different Workers Ordered</td>
<td>70,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Worked Placed</td>
<td>70,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Men</td>
<td>45,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Women</td>
<td>4,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Youth</td>
<td>15,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Youth in groups</td>
<td>9,675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
BY
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA
FARGO, N. D.

July 26, 1944

TO:  COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS AND OTHERS CONCERNED

FROM:  E. J. Messner, Director of Extension

SUBJECT: Prevailing Wage and Employment Practices in North Dakota

1. In conformity with Public Law 228, 78th Congress, and the administration thereof, we report our findings out of public hearings concluded July 26, 1944, for the express purpose of obtaining information and agreement at county and employment area levels bearing on prevailing wage and employment practices in the harvesting of small grain, potato, sugar beet crops in North Dakota to be:

A. PREVAILING WAGE AND EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE FOR HARVEST LABOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Area</th>
<th>General Farm Work</th>
<th>Haying*</th>
<th>Stacking*</th>
<th>Threshing*</th>
<th>Bagging</th>
<th>Fertilizer</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>60¢ an hr.</td>
<td>60¢ an hr.</td>
<td>60¢ an hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocassee</td>
<td>60¢ an hr.</td>
<td>60¢ an hr.</td>
<td>65¢ an hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mankato</td>
<td>40¢ an hr. or $4 per day</td>
<td>60¢ an hr.</td>
<td>60¢ an hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson</td>
<td>50¢ an hr.</td>
<td>30¢ an hr.</td>
<td>36-37 per day</td>
<td>36-37 per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>40¢ an hr.</td>
<td>60¢ an hr.</td>
<td>65¢-70¢ per hr.</td>
<td>8¢ per bushel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1¢ an lb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowia Lake</td>
<td>40¢ an hr.</td>
<td>65¢ an hr.</td>
<td>70¢-75¢ per hr.</td>
<td>8¢ per bushel</td>
<td>$1 an lb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottineau</td>
<td>40¢ an hr.</td>
<td>65¢-70¢ per hr.</td>
<td>75¢ an hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minot</td>
<td>40¢ an hr.</td>
<td>65¢ an hr.</td>
<td>75¢ an hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>50¢ an hr. or $90 max.</td>
<td>60¢ an hr.</td>
<td>65¢-70¢ an hr.</td>
<td>65¢-70¢ an hr.</td>
<td>$1 per an.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATE AVERAGE PREVAILING: 60¢ an hr. | 50¢ an hr. or $5 per day | 60¢-65¢ an hr. | 60¢-75¢ an hr. | 8¢ per bushel | $1 per an.

Sugar beet operational rates held to be prevailing at contract rates offered this spring in all counties, and harvesting rates to be agreed upon tentatively last spring for certification and contract purposes for all beet labor used.

*All rates for general farm work, haying, stacking, and threshing include board.
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN  
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS  
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota Agricultural College  
U. S. Department of Agriculture  
Cooperating  

Extension Service  
State College Station, Fargo, North Dakota  
September 8, 1944

TO:  COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS AND FARM LABOR ASSISTANTS.  


SUBJECT:  Mexican Nationals Independence Day, September 16

1. For your information, the Mexican Nationals consider September 16 as their "4th of July". It is very likely that a lot of these workers will not want to work on September 16, and will proposition their employers for the day off and offer to make the day up on Sunday. You should tip all employers in your county who have Mexican off to the fact that this is a big day in the thinking of the Mexican Nationals and to make the best of it in the event their workers insist on having the day off. We had better be good sports and humor them in this.

2. Towards the middle of next week, you should receive a supply of Greeting circulars to the Mexican Nationals on their Independence Day from the State Farm Labor Advisory Committee. Please use what means you have at your disposal to place these in the hands of workers the 16th. These circulars will come from the Governor's office.

3. As long as their Independence Day comes on Saturday, it might be a pretty good idea to talk over this day with some of the folks in your county and maybe arrange to have a little celebration of Mexican Nationals on Saturday evening. Here is a chance for the church, Mayor, or some of your farm people to give the boys the glad hand and express an interest in their Independence Day, and maybe provide an opportunity to have a little harmless fun without tearing the town apart. Anything you can do along this line will be greatly appreciated by the Mexican government, I am sure, and will go far in cementing our relationships another year in securing farm labor.

Yours very truly,

H. W. Herbison  
State Supervisor  
Emergency Farm Labor
During the year of 1944, everyone worked harder than before doing their part to help win the war. Mr. Herbstman prefaced his 1944 Emergency Farm Labor Program statistical report as follows:

"The largest aggregate field crop in the history of North Dakota was harvested in 1944 without material loss occasioned by lack of labor. This fact reflects how well Emergency Farm Labor Program activity was planned and carried out to fit the needs of the state, its counties, its several communities and many farms.

"Administration of the 1944 Emergency Farm Labor Program was provided by the North Dakota Extension Service under Public Law 229, 78th Congress. In discharging that administrative responsibility in North Dakota, the cooperation and assistance of other agencies, organizations and leaders was sought and obtained. Teamwork at state and county levels to obtain agreement in matters of policy, program planning and work assignments keynoted a cooperative farm labor program. Without that cooperation the total job would have been most difficult to accomplish.

"Four major lines of attack were used against the total farm labor supply program in North Dakota. These were: (1) construction and use of labor-saving equipment whereby we might reduce our dependence on outside seasonal labor for haying and harvesting as well as better utilization of youth, women and older men of the state in carrying on field operations; previously requiring the employment of husky male workers; (2) custom harvesting of field crops thru intensive procurement and supervised utilization of local and out-State equipment as a direct replacement of harvest workers; (3) total mobilization and maximum use of all local labor within the state available for work on farms, including youth, women and townsmen; (4) organized recruitment, movement and supervised use of foreign and interstate domestic labor needed to supplement local labor in seasonal field operations on farms.

"This report of the State Farm Labor Supervisor is in reality a report of results made possible thru the efforts of the whole Extension Service and of others working closely with that service. Providing for farm labor supplies essentially necessary to the production and harvesting of war crops and livestock products is but one part of the total war food responsibility to which North Dakota Extension Service has geared its efforts. What has been done was done largely thru the same administrative and supervisory channels that other program efforts follow. Guidance and counsel of others has been sought and used thru the medium of the State Farm Labor Advisory Committee and County Farm Labor Advisory Committees.

"Grateful acknowledgement is given the cooperation of the Office of Labor, War Food Administration, in

"..."
TO PARENTS OF YOUTH interested in farm work during the 1944 school year vacation:

I know that you’re proud that your son or daughter desires to work on a farm during 1944. You have a right to be, for this is a very practical way for any young person to show his patriotism.

Any parent, however, is likely to have some questions about the Victory Farm Volunteer Program—who sponsors it, how is it supervised, where do volunteers work, etc. I shall try to give you the answers to these and other questions in this letter.

If there are other matters about which you wish information, I urge that you talk with your County Extension Agent or with your High School Superintendent. We want you to understand the program fully and to know the conditions under which your children will work and live.

Yours sincerely,
E. J. Haslerud
Director
NDAE Extension Service

April 3, 1944

WHAT KIND OF WORK WILL THE VFV BE DOING? .... Some will be doing general farm work, others will be doing seasonal work such as haying, harvesting, potato picking, etc. Some will live with the farmers, others will live at home, going to the farm daily for their work.

IS FARM WORK TOO HARD? .... Farm work is hard work. It will not be too hard, however, for young people in good health, as age, weight and physical condition are considered in job assignments.

There is usually a break-in period for a few days for a youngster to become accustomed to the more difficult jobs.

WHAT ARE THE ADVANTAGES OF FARM WORK? .... The outdoor work with good wholesome food will develop young people physically. It gives them a chance to get acquainted with animals and growing things. It broadens their understanding of farm people. It enables them to earn and save some money. It gives them an opportunity to express their patriotism by participating in a real war job.

WHAT WAGES WILL BE PAID? .... Workers will receive the wage common in the area for the work expected of them. A high school youth with no farm experience cannot expect to receive the same wages paid to a trained adult worker. However, if skill and ability in farm work are developed, the youth’s earning ability will increase and very few farmers will object to paying the younger what he is worth.

HOW CAN I HELP MY SON AND DAUGHTER MAKE GOOD? .... Show them that you are proud of their desire to contribute to the war effort by working on a farm. Explain that there will be fun as well as hard work in the new job. When he goes on the job, let him stand on his own feet.
(Senator Watt Hired Women Shockers)

Senator Watt, pioneer Scot farmer in Cass County widely known for his love of a nickel and his cutting criticism of new-fangled things in general, got up and "gave testimony" recently to the value of women in harvest work in Fargo, reporting in substance, "Last year, if anyone had told me that a woman would ever set up a shock of grain on my farm while I lived, I should have branded him crazy and been willing to bet my farm that I'd never live to have a woman hired man on my place. I've got to admit that I've got them -- four women from Fargo -- because I couldn't get men for love or money and I had to get my grain shocked. Those women have shocked just as much grain per day and done it as well or better than any man I ever had on the place. I hate to admit that I'm ever wrong, but I sure was wrong about these town women -- they're all right and God bless them for the job they are doing."

(Women Handled Onions and Dandelions)

Up at Grand Forks when the rains came and the onios and Russian dandelions had to be weeded quickly and regular labor was not available, one little radio appeal to the women of Grand Forks resulted in 153 weeder reporting for placement next morning. The job was done in a hurry and with more care exercised in doing the job than men usually went to.

(Twenty Dollars a Day)

The Grafton placement office tells of Mrs. A,... who picked her 200 bushels of potatoes every day throughout the picking season and then went home to get supper for five kids after she had made her twenty dollars for that day; and of another couple where a one-armed man and his good wife averaged 300 bushels of potatoes per day thru the picking season at 10 cents a bushel.

(Men Do The Cooking)

The Pembina office reports that "every female who could walk, creep or crawl" was out picking spuds with the result that cafes and restaurants couldn't coax anyone for love or money to come in and help feed workers except a few men who were not physically able to pick spuds themselves.

(Staff Workers Like Farm)

Around the Extension Service offices, stenos and clerks took their annual leaves and week-ends to do farm work. Most of them welcomed the opportunity to help the Labor Program along and earn some new clothes on the side.

---------------

LOCAL LEADERS DID THE FOOT WORK

Local leaders, may their tribe increase! When credit is given, and a lot of it is due for the 1943 Farm Labor Program's contribution to the total war food production effort of North Dakota, local volunteer leaders stand in line for most of it. Thru them, for the most part, was the actual functional phases of the program carried on. Thru them came a lot of the guidance and counsel that helped make organization and procedure fit the needs of farm people. And thru them was the lion's share of the need determination and actual placement of Farm workers made.
The young, old, girls, boys, women, men and "city slickers" too — all did their part to see the war through.
Office girls around the North Dakota Extension Service offices were the first to get a look at the new Women's Land Army uniform on a worker.

Mrs. Rosalie Huizinga, stenographer in the "Farm Labor Office" wears it out where it can get soiled a little with the by-products of honest toil.

June grass seed harvest would have suffered greatly without the help of the women near McLeod, N.D.

"City Slickers" — Ransom County town people volunteered for farm work after their regular days work was done.
There was a County Agent once
Whose name you may have guessed,
Who tried to work quite faithfully,
And hailed from way out West;
He did some things successfully
By aid of staunch cohorts,
But doomed to failure after all;
He couldn’t make reports.

They called him on the carpet too
And told him this and that;
Upbraided him of Nature’s fault,
For naught beneath his hat.
They fed him up on discipline,
They drenched him with retorts,
And labeled him a “nut” because
He couldn’t make reports.

If you a County Agent be
And if you would not fail
You better keep your records up
In grandeur and detail,
For when the trumph of Gabriel’s horn
Hails you before His Courts,
Be think the place that mortals go
Who cannot make reports.

— Ralph Newcomer, 1927
Morton County, ND
EXTENSION WORKERS' GROANS AND SNORTS WERE LOUDEST WHEN MAKING REPORTS.

Extension being partly funded each by county, state and federal governments is required to report to each of those branches of government. Pocket size daily diary booklets have been provided and county staffs make both a statistical and a narrative report each month to their county auditor and the state Extension office. Specialists and administrative staff report only to the state office.

At year's end both county and state staffs make narrative and statistical reports for their whole year of work. Detailed annual narrative reports were discontinued in the 1980's. Copies of annual narrative reports prior to that are on file at the NDSU library. They are the chief source of information concerning the Cooperative Extension Service in North Dakota.

Reporting never was popular and some staff members' reports were so brief it was difficult to tell whether or not they were working. There was also the other extreme and it appears that some were better reporters than they were performers.

About 1922 County Agent Leader John Haw sought to stimulate better county agent work and better reporting by making a contest with prizes. His theory was that such a contest would stimulate better work as agents would need more to report. A first prize of $50, which was much money at that time, was offered for the best annual narrative report. Competition for that prize was not whole-hearted but some agents over-acted and prepared narratives thicker than two Sears-Roebuck catalogs. They were not popular with their fellow county agents and after two years the contest died, ungrrieved.

Dislike for reports along with the great amount of time required for making and evaluating them meant that changes were both desirable and necessary. However, no major change was made for reporting Extension work until 1968.

THEN ALONG CAME "SEMIS," THE NEW STANDARD GAUGE TO Usher Extension INTO THE COMPUTER AGE

North Dakota Extension workers became captives of the computer age in 1969 when the Federal Extension Service de creed a computer program format for planning and reporting. Extension Management Information System was its name and it was dubbed "EMIS." Each state was given the option of prefacing "EMIS" with its own state name or with the word State and North Dakota chose the latter and entered the "SEMIS" age.

R. B. Widdifield was given responsibility for organization and training for "SEMIS" and regardless of the usual resistance to change did a creditable job. "SEMIS," at first, provided a unified planning and reporting format including clients or audiences in seven program areas for each month by each Extension planning unit. Major programs and educational campaigns to carry out those programs were all computer coded and could be readily retrieved for evaluation.

Major programs and educational campaigns starting in FY 1983-84 were projected for four years — FY 1983-84 through FY 1986-87 — with reporting and evaluation on a quarterly basis. Approximately 85% of total available time was assigned to major programs and the remaining 15% was reserved for administrative responsibilities, adjustments in major programs and participation in unforeseen situations. The following format of Planning Units, Program Areas, Major Programs and Educational Campaigns together with their computer codes show the diversity of Major Programs being conducted by Extension in 1985.

SEMIS and computers greatly simplified Extension's record keeping but their use without accompanying narratives has resulted in dull impersonal statistics which do not reflect Extension's true accomplishments. Such reports provide very little information as to the philosophy and methods that have been responsible for Extension's acceptance.

WHAT HAS IT COST? HOW HAS IT PAID? HOW ARE ITS PROGRAMS TO BE WEIGHED?

Extension is a government agency and people have paid taxes to support its programs. What has Extension done to justify its existence? Some of Extension's work can be given a dollar value such as in terms of increased crop and livestock productivity. Other Extension work is difficult to value in dollars because it deals with peoples lives and their quality of home living. Looking at the measurable dollar impact of Extension work, crops and livestock production offer the most obvious answers. In crops production Extension started with the use of pure seed as a means for improving farm grain prices. Prior to that campaign grain admixtures — mixtures of hard spring wheat, durum wheat, rye and barley — were common and North Dakota farmers were losing $ to $ per bushel for their wheat. On a statewide basis that was much money lost due to use of impure seed and improper handling of harvested grain. Extension
made farmers aware of that great loss and arranged for securing an adequate supply of pure seed at reasonable prices.

Crop varieties are continually being improved in terms of disease resistance and yield capacity. When a new improved variety is available it represents a distinct dollar value over older varieties and the sooner it is used the greater its impact will be. Extension has constantly supervised distribution of improved grain varieties developed through the NDSU Experiment Station towards keeping them pure and yet available to all farmers as soon as possible. Over the past 40 years new wheat and barley varieties have increased yield potentials as much as 400%.

Use of commercial fertilizer provided a great opportunity for increasing crop profits but if improperly used could mean a loss instead of a profit. Extension provided the know how for taking soil samples and selection of the correct kind and amount of fertilizer to use and how to apply it. Hundreds of soil sampling demonstrations and fertilizer demonstration test plots were conducted throughout the state with large farmer attendance at each. Fertilizer use bulletins were prepared and used at meetings in every county.

Chemical weed control provided a potential for greatly improved crop yields and Extension conducted many demonstrations and meetings in every county to show how to calibrate field sprayers and apply the proper chemical at the correct time and rate. Early demonstrations were confined mostly to mustard and french weed. During June most farm fields were yellow tinged or in solid yellow with mustard blooms. Mustard shaded out the grain and robbed it of both moisture and nutrients. Today very little mustard or french weed is seen throughout North Dakota. Newer chemicals have continuously been developed for control of other weeds such as wild oats and noxious perennials and Extension has prepared bulletins and conducted meetings and demonstrations relative to their use. Chemical weed control is not cheap but it has provided a strong margin of returns over costs.

Insects and diseases have been continuous crop hazards and Extension has constantly monitored their situations and alerted farmers to potential outbreaks. When large scale infestations occurred Extension organized assistance and methods for their control. This has been especially true for grasshopper, cricket and army worm control.

Extension’s role in improved livestock productivity started in its earliest programs. Early herds and flocks were of poor or mediocre quality. Also, they were badly inbred because of difficulties of obtaining good sires locally. Dairy cow butterfat and chicken egg production were especially low. Quality of meat animals was low. Starting as early as 1911 Better Farming Agents and continuing on throughout Extension’s existence livestock judging and selection of high quality breeding stock have been stressed. Bulletins and 4-H lessons concerning livestock testing, judging, selecting, feeding, managing and marketing have been prepared and presented at meetings and demonstrations in every community.

North Dakota Extension workers have been pioneers in beef cattle production testing.

The old saying “you can lead a horse to water but you can’t make it drink” might be compared to the farmer who said he didn’t need a county agent because he already wasn’t farming half as good as he knew how to farm. Undoubtedly many things contribute to the financial failure of a farm business but no financial failure is justified until after all available resources have been used and that includes Extension. Surely Extension has not had a cure all or save all remedy for every financially distressed farm family but a few examples will signify Extension’s potential impact. Extension by itself does not claim to be other than the teacher, the motivator or the catalyst to people’s actions. It is the individual farmer’s actions that determine Extension’s impact.

$100,000 SAVED STUTSMAN CO. WHEAT GROWERS BY COUNTY EXTENSION PROJECT TO IMPROVE GRAIN GRADES, SURVEY SHOWS 1931

“During the past three years the county Extension project to improve the quality of wheat shipped from Stutsman County has resulted in a remarkably valuable change, according to facts shown in a survey recently completed by Harper Brush, county agent, and the Northwest Crop Improvement Association. The survey shows improvements in several respects that have brought over $100,000 extra dollars to Stutsman county farmers, it is estimated.

“Support to the project for better grades of wheat was given by elevator managers in the county, the Jamestown Chamber of Commerce, the local Kiwanis Club, and the newspapers of the county.

“Our mixed durum shipments,” said Mr. Brush, “have decreased about seven percent since 1928. This change is worth around fifteen cents a bushel on over 200,000 bushels, or $30,000. Shipments of smutty wheat decreased seven percent also; this is worth over $10,000. The amount of red durum decreased from 12 percent in 1928 to 3 percent in 1930. Present market values will give the county a profit of about $50,000 on this transaction. The amount of dockage has
decreased 2 percent. But, most important of all, our shipments of hard red spring wheat increased 23 percent in the three years, or an increase of about 700,000 bushels.

In a letter to Mr. Brush from the association which assisted in the survey, the following comment was made: "We certainly want to congratulate your county on its success in fighting mixed and smutty wheat. We also wish to compliment you on the way you have worked at this job. It has been worth over $100,000 to Stutsman County and this additional revenue will continue year after year if you raise good grain. To our way of thinking the decrease in mixed durum, smut and red durum is both a highly profitable and a spectacular achievement. We hope you will continue this splendid work."

WHETHER D.H.I.A. OR
WEIGH A DAY
DAIRY HERD TESTING
WILL GIVE GOOD PAY

Extension's dairy herd improvement (DHI) programs have consistently shown the value of production testing and good management practices. Using official DHI figures for two different production periods to show income from DHI herds as compared to non-DHI herds will illustrate potential benefits from that program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non DHI</td>
<td>DHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milk per cow</td>
<td>12,143</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return above feed costs</td>
<td>$916</td>
<td>$392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHI costs per cow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return above feed and DHI costs</td>
<td>$894</td>
<td>$380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>+ $174</td>
<td># $05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures show a marked increase in production by non-DHI herds. That can be credited largely to the use of artificial insemination sires and the elimination of many of the less productive herds in the state. With that great improvement in non-DHI herds, DHI herds still show an advantage of $95 per cow. During 1980 there were 13,000 cows under the North Dakota DHI program and at that benefit rate, DHI dairy producers had about $1¼ million extra annual income for their efforts.

MORE THAN 900,000 CATTLE
AT $5 PER HEAD!
EXTENSION PAID WELL
IN THAT DEAL IT IS SAID

Drought conditions starting in 1933 continued in earnest throughout 1934 and dust storms heralded in seeding of the 1934 crop. Dust storms were so severe many farmers quit seeding and fence rows and road ditches soon drifted full with the vagrant soil. Twenty-four mid continent states felt the drought sting and North Dakota was also visited by swarms of nomad grasshoppers volunteering as harvest hands for any grass or crop brave enough to rebuke the drought. Testament to that drought and typical of the situation was the seeding of 108,000 acres of wheat in Adams County and the harvest of only about 9,000 acres of that wheat and a yield of only 1½ bushels of shriveled wheat per acre.

Nature seems to have ways of protecting itself and that spring weary grass roots were signaled to lay low and not become exhausted by sending forth their tender young blades. Western ranges were bare as a dance hall floor on Sunday morning and about two million cattle, a million sheep and one-half million horses were waiting for a muffled dinner bell to ring.

Cattle and sheep market prices were in the cellar and wouldn't even pay transportation costs to market. Only "Uncle Sam" was strong enough to come to the rescue and even "He" was heavily "taxed" to get the job done. He called on Extension to "saddle up" for the biggest livestock roundup in history and county agent leader N.D. Gorman's annual report for 1934 tells it like it was.

"Early in May the drought situation was laid before the President and he sent a special message to Congress asking for the necessary appropriations to carry on a Federal drought relief program. Congress voted $525,000,000 to be allocated to the several agencies contemplating relief work and Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, Chester Davis, Administrator of A.A.A., Harry Hopkins, Administrator, Federal Emergency Relief Administration and Wm. Meyers, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration were appointed as a National Drought Relief Committee.

"The drought cut the nation's wheat crop in half and the total wheat production in North Dakota was about twenty-one million bushels. Livestock in much of the state began to show signs of starvation in May. Feed supplies were low in the spring after carrying an abnormally large amount of livestock on farms, and, where grass did not start, cattle had to be kept on dry feed during even the months of May and June.

"Because of low prices for livestock during the previous years, farmers had held back their young stock and in the spring of 1934 had the largest number of livestock on farms in the history of the state. With drought delaying pasture in a large section of the state and in many counties grass did not start at all, this unusually large number of livestock on farms added to the farmer's burdens.

"There was no relief in putting the livestock on the market because in their poor condition prices received would not pay transportation to market. Some
farmers were beginning to shoot their livestock rather than seeing them starve; others were hanging on hoping that rain would come.

"The situation relative to livestock feed was so acute that in May 1934, appeals were made to the government for help. The Federal government quickly moved into action with a proposal to purchase livestock for slaughter and distribution to unemployed through relief agencies. Condensed animals, those unfit for shipment to market, were killed on the farm. The following table of prices were adopted: For cattle two years old and over $12 to $20; from one to two years old $10 to $15 and under one year $4 to $8. The lowest price was paid for diseased cattle and those too emaciated to ship for slaughter.

"Dr. John H. Sheppard, President of the Agricultural College, was appointed State Drought Relief Director and Al Dexter, Assistant Drought Relief Director in active charge of the organization of the livestock purchase campaign. County agents were appointed as drought relief directors in their respective counties. A committee of three livestock men was appointed in each of the counties to advise and assist the drought relief director and appraisers were appointed for each township, selected from the farm personnel of the county."

"Livestock purchase prices recorded above were not adopted without controversy and much protest by farmers and North Dakota relief officials alike. Prices initially announced by the government started at $15 for the top grade of cattle and correspondingly lower prices for lower grades. A representative of the Secretary of Agriculture, the head of the Bureau of Animal Industry, was sent out to investigate the situation and a conference of relief directors for the four states — Minnesota, Montana, South Dakota and North Dakota — with him was called in Minneapolis. Assistant Directors Gorman and Dexter represented North Dakota and South Dakota was represented by its Governor. Minnesota and Montana were not yet anticipating much of a cattle purchase program and their representatives were somewhat passive.

"South Dakota's Governor was satisfied with the original prices announced by the government but North Dakota representatives thought those prices were much too low and it remained for them to carry the fight for higher prices. Gorman and Dexter held out for a price of $25 for the top grade of cattle as against the $15 price announced by the government and correspondingly higher prices for the lower grades. Arguments lasted for several hours before a compromise was reached and the adopted prices stated above were approved.

"It can be recorded here that the North Dakota Extension Service was almost solely responsible for the addition of $5 per head in the price paid to the distressed and discouraged North Dakota farmers for more than 900,000 head of cattle purchased by the government. This amounted to many times over the amount of the Extension budget that the Governor of the state vetoed during the legislative session of a year before and would have paid for more than the Governor saved the taxpayers by reducing the salaries of the Extension workers.

"Approximately 85 percent of the farmers of the state sold 978,069 head of cattle to the government. The government paid $13,405,453 for cattle purchased of which $4,890,345 ($5 x 978,069) was Extension's benefit payment to cattle growers. In addition, 83,000 head of sheep were sold to the government for a total payment of $124,166."

Before leaving the Livestock Purchase Program one incident that caused some commotion deserves space.

One of the major problems encountered in that program was a shortage of railroad stock cars for shipping out the cattle. The assistant state relief director set rigid guidelines and lines of authority for allotment of cars to each county but of course, every county relief director tried every possible means to get his quote increased.

Dexter knew all their tricks and adhered to quotas as fairly as possible but he could not anticipate a mix up of two persons names which caused him a bit of trouble. Here is how it was reported by county agent leader Gorman who was also assistant state relief director.

"Right in the midst of the car shortage and when A. J. Dexter, assistant relief director, had given strict orders that car quotas be observed the incident of a similarity of names resulted in Karl Swanson, county agent in Williams County, getting enough stock cars to ship 10,000 head of cattle out of his country in one day.

"Matt Tindall, located at Bismarck, represented the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation whose regional offices were in Minneapolis. Norman Findall was assisting Al Dexter in general field duties. When Norman Findall arrived in Williston, Karl Swanson convinced him of the seriousness of the livestock situation and prevailed on him to telephone the Minneapolis office of the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation, the organization that directed the supply of cars on the order of the Assistant State Drought Relief Director and received the cattle bought for the government, to request that enough cars be ordered out to Williston to ship 10,000 head of cattle out of the county. The head of the Surplus Relief Corporation mistook the name Findall for the Tindall who represented him in the state and whose duty it was to request allocation of stock cars on order of the Assistant Relief Director. Thinking his own field representative had made the request the Director of the Surplus Relief Corporation then
directed the Great Northern Railroad to make available sufficient cars for immediate shipment of 10,000 head of cattle from Williston.

"Karl Swanson quickly assembled and loaded Williams County cattle on the cars and Dexter received his first knowledge of the situation when he read the startling news in state papers that three trains loaded with a total of 10,000 cattle left Williston in one day. Oh, it was a great day for Karl Swanson and Williams County farmers but a real headache for Dexter. Every other county relief director felt betrayed and wasted no time in letting Dexter know it. Of course Swanson was strongly reprimanded but he was so happy about getting rid of 10,000 cattle that he thought it was worth the reprimand. He said he could stand Al Dexter's wrath much easier than the complaints and pleadings of the hundreds of farmers whose cattle were starving in their barnyards."

Statewide county agents' reports for 1934 list that year as the most hectic in their experience and it could probably be listed as such for the entire history of Extension in North Dakota. Besides the cattle buying program, grasshopper control and securing hay for the remaining foundation stock became major programs that year. More than 10,000 tons of hay were shipped in from Canada to meet those needs.

MALTING BARLEY WILL TURN TO JUST FEED IF PROPER THRESHING ONE DOES NOT HEED

One Extension farm machinery project that had great potential for increasing farm income from grain dealt with the downgrading of malting type barley because of skinned or broken kernels. North Dakota had been the number one barley producing state but was doing a poor job of supplying malting grade to the market. Improper threshing and handling caused from 50% to 90% of all malting type barley to be downgraded to feed barley and a loss of from 15 to 75 per bushel depending on market supply.

Extension Agricultural Engineer, S. L. Vogel, was also a barley producer and experimented with ways to reduce threshing and handling damage. He found that by reducing cylinder speed and having proper concave clearance kernel damage could be reduced to meet malting grade requirements. He also found that blower type elevators could cause much kernel damage if operated at too high a speed.

Mr. Vogel worked with the Midwest Barley Improvement Association in preparation and publication of his findings. His bulletin was in great demand in both the United States and in Canada. He also worked with the NDSU Experiment Station staff, machinery dealers and the malting barley industry in conducting meetings and field demonstrations for proper threshing and handling of barley and other grains.

It would require much research to place an accurate dollar benefit from Mr. Vogel's project but surely it has been a substantial amount. More than 50,000 copies of his bulletin "Thresh Barley for Malting Carefully" were requested by barley producers.

FARM CROPS FIELD DAY AND BARLEY THRESHING DEMONSTRATION

North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, ND July 21, 1950

9:00 a.m. Assemble at Experiment Station Seed House

Tour of Experiment Station Field Plots
Professor T. E. Stoel and Associates

12:15 p.m. Lunch, Ceres Hall, NDAC

1:15 p.m. Barley Threshing Demonstration
(Area north of Field House)
Opening of Meeting and Introductions
Chairman, Hal Steffanson, Cass County Agent

Welcome to NDAC
Dr. Glenn Smith
Associate Dean of Agriculture, NDAC

Cooperation in Barley Improvement
Dr. John H. Parker, Director
Midwest Barley Improvement Assn.,
Milwaukee, WI

Shipments of Malting Barley from
Country Elevators
Henry O. Putnam, Executive Secretary
Northwest Crop Improvement Assn.,
Minneapolis, MN

Skinned and Broken Kernels in Malting Barley
L. E. Voell
Kurth Malting Co., Minneapolis, MN

Thresh Barley for Malting Carefully to
Get Market Premiums
S. L. Vogel, Agricultural Engineer
NDAC Extension Service

Interest of the Farm Equipment Industry in
Careful Threshing of Malting Barley
Louis Adams, Harvester Line, Sales Manager
Allis-Chalmers Mfg. Co., Milwaukee, WI
Farmers will assemble around the combine according to the make they own. Combine experts will discuss adjustments and answer questions.

From: Midwest Barley Improvement Association
828 North Broadway
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

SPRING IS NEAR AND IT IS GETTING LATE WHERE CAN I GET MONEY TO OPERATE?

Farmers have always been major users of credit and unwise use of that business tool undoubtedly caused some to lose their farms. Land has generally been the farmer's major resource for raising money and insurance companies, banks and individual lenders readily loaned money at premium interest rates in exchange for a mortgage on the land.

During periods of inflation land prices often doubled, tripled or more and many farm land loans were refinanced with a larger mortgage. When deflation returned, mortgages on much land were greater than the price for which comparable land could be purchased. Farmers then quit paying on their land mortgages and lenders became major land owners.

That situation led to laws establishing the Federal Land Bank System in 1916-17. Under those laws farmers could organize local cooperatives which could obtain money through the farm credit system at a low interest rate and lend it to farmers against land mortgages. Those cooperatives were called farm loan associations. Each association elected its own board of directors and officers. They also hired an executive secretary whose appointment was subject to approval of the Regional Federal Land Bank officials.

During 1917 North Dakota county agents were faced with an all out effort for WWI and there was a greatly expanded need for farm credit. They became familiar with provisions of the Federal Farm Loan Act and organization of the farm loan associations. That year they assisted in the organization of 69 local farm loan associations in North Dakota.
Subsequently, many associations were joined together to reduce administrative costs and minimize the affect of local crop disasters. Purpose for organizing farm loan associations was to make farm land loans at realistic appraised land values on a cooperative basis.

Mr. E. G. Quamme, President of the Farm Land Bank of St. Paul during that period, said that in his opinion the value of assistance given to farmers by county agents in helping to organize their farm loan associations was worth their total annual costs to the counties where they worked.

Success of North Dakota farm loan associations is a history all by itself and more will not be said about it here. However, it should be remembered that the North Dakota Cooperative Extension Service greatly contributed to the establishment of credit for farmers. Besides assistance with organizing farm loan associations, the initial authorship of a Congressional bill which authorized and established the Agricultural Credit Corporation was by county agent leader John Haw. Although that original bill did not pass Congress, a revised version of it did pass.

Agricultural Engineer S.L. Vogel teaching welding class.

Agricultural Engineer S.L. Vogel demonstrating tractor hitching safety.
MACHINERY BREAKDOWNS
NO LONGER BREAK HIS COOL
MY ELECTRIC ARC WELDER
WILL SOON FIX THAT TOOL

Farm machinery has the nasty habit of breaking down when it is most needed and many colorful expletives may have been originated at such times. Before R.E.A. and electric arc welders came along, a breakdown usually meant a day or more of lost machine time for a new part to be obtained and replaced or a broken part to be welded at a repair shop.

Electric arc welding greatly changed farm machinery repair but before a farmer could do the job intensive training was needed. Training in safety and prevention of arc burn were especially important and even after such training some had to learn of the danger of arc burn by experience.

Extension Engineer, S. L. Vogel, worked with county agents and rural electric cooperatives' managers to set up schools for beginning arc welders and refresher schools as newer machines and electrodes came along. Demand for those schools was much greater than expected and their biggest obstacle was places where they could be held. Sometimes it was necessary for a rural electric cooperative to install higher capacity transformers and special wiring.

Arc welding schools started in the early 1950's and have continued through the time this is being written. Vogel retired in 1974 but has come back each year to conduct welding schools requested by county agents. Mr. Vogel states that more than 12,000 farmers have received training at his arc welding schools. What has been its cost? How has it paid? Ask the farmer who benefited from that training.

COST OF AGENT SERVICE
REASONABLE
1931-32

"Seed in the whole community has been changed, home conveniences installed, shelterbelts planted, breeding and feeding stock sold and exchanged, and other activities carried out, with the assistance of the county agent in the home township," states Roy Johnson of Cartwright.

"When we start to save money by cutting taxes, let's not cut noses to spite faces," says Mr. Johnson, "it won't pay. Cutting our bill sixty cents on each one hundred dollars of taxes we pay in McKenzie County to dispose of the county agent's service will not save us from going broke, nor has it been a factor in contributing to our present condition."

"For my own part, agent service pays its way but I would not begrudge the service as I see benefits in the community even if I could not put my finger on dollar and cent returns to myself."

"As an example of actual financial returns, take the case of my alfalfa seed sale last winter. I was offered seventeen cents per pound but with the agent's help disposed of it for 25 cents. That item alone has paid my sixty cents per hundred dollars of taxes for agent work for more years than I care to bother figuring out."

As a contribution towards dollar wheat in past years and again in the future, Mr. Johnson points to the fact that protein premiums were first brought to the front by Dr. Ladd of the Agricultural College. Work of establishing the value in each county was turned over to the county agents who collected samples for analysis for six years. Scores of samples were collected in McKenzie County and, doubtless, many farmers can point to the fact that they sold their entire wheat crop of thousands of bushels at premiums ranging from five to twenty-five cents per bushel. Mr. Johnson conscientiously raises a question before McKenzie County voters this fall.

"Can they afford to dispose of county agent help in the present crisis?"

IT'S IN THE BOOKS!
IT'S IN THE BANK!

That could well be the slogan for good farm management. Yes, good farm management starts with the "books" — farm account books. Without adequate records and accounts farmers are operating more or less by guess and some may not be good guessers.

Commercial interests — banks, elevators, creameries, machine dealers and others — knew the importance of good records and tried to stimulate farmers into keeping records by giving them free record books. Most of those books were too simple and inadequate for farm management purposes but they did spark some interest in record keeping.

Extension's efforts in many projects are fostered by adequate records and efforts were made to design a book that would provide the necessary information but still not be too difficult to keep up. Farmers were invited to participate in a record keeping project and offered free record books and an annual summary and record analysis to all cooperators. Record books could also be purchased without entering into Extension's record keeping project.

O. M. Fuller, Assistant Farm Management Demonstrator, appears from the records to be the first specialist to offer record keeping and analysis.
assistance and that was in 1928. Fuller's project under several different formats continued as an on-going Extension project until 1981 when it surrendered to commercial record keeping.

Extension farm account books are still available from county agents and the Extension Bulletin department and about 2,500 are requested each year.

Mr. Fuller sent a letter each month to everyone who had obtained an account book. A letter example follows:

March 1929

Dear Sir:

The farmer is a business man
To that you will agree
Without the aid of farm accounts
Where would the farmer be?

He has a big investment
Most of the coin is spent
Lots of farmers do not know
Just where the money went.

Keeping records on the farm
Will solve this problem fine
Efficient farmers are convinced
It pays them for their time.

Mr. Efficient Farmer
Keeps Farm Records

I'm the guy who completed my farm account book last year and intend to finish again this year. Turn me over and you will see a picture of my brother who made a good start but failed to complete his record last year. He does not know whether he is making or losing money from his farming operations. I know whether I am making or losing money because I am keeping farm records. I know just where the leaks are in my last year's business and plan to patch them up this year.

You have received a farm account book this year from the Department of Farm Management at the Agricultural College. Are you keeping a daily record of your farm business so that your book will be complete at the end of the year?

If you are having any difficulty in keeping this record, kindly let me know and I will be glad to help you.

Yours very truly,
O. M. Fuller
Assistant Farm Management Demonstrator

ACCIDENTS HAPPEN EVERY DAY TO THOSE WHOSE THOUGHTS ARE FAR AWAY

Farming is an industry but its operations are mostly a family affair and many minor accidents or injuries go unrecorded. However, even without counting those unreported accidents agriculture is a hazardous occupation. Farmers work with many kinds of machines, tools and animals and as they rush to get work done often overlook some safety precautions.

North Dakota Extension from its beginning has been aware of farm accidents and has tried many methods to stimulate and promote family and farm safety. Both 4-H club and Homemakers' Club programs have included safety lessons and 4-H members have presented public safety demonstrations for more than fifty years.

Fire prevention and fire control are included in safety and prevention of dust explosions and spontaneous combustion have been extensively demonstrated by Extension specialists. Fire extinguishers and five gallon backpack pumps for farm and home use were demonstrated statewide during the 1940's and 1950's.
State legislation during the 1950's provided for organization of rural fire departments and Extension gave extensive assistance to their organization. John Zaviske's 1957 annual report states that 82 rural fire departments were in operation.

Hazard reduction to reduce accidents and fires was also promoted by Zaviske through 4-H and Homemakers Clubs. Identification and removal of hazards and trash was reported to him for more than 20,000 farms and homes in 1957 and that became an ongoing activity.

Tractor tipping because of improper hitching has been a popular demonstration at hundreds of meetings and events around North Dakota. Extension engineer S. L. Vogel conducted those demonstrations for about 25 years and undoubtedly helped to prevent many such accidents.

Tractor and farm machinery maintenance, care and safety project were part of the 4-H program starting in 1945. WWII greatly reduced the farm labor supply and many young farm boys and girls were called upon to operate their home farm machines. There was much concern for safety of such youth and Extension agricultural engineers set up a tractor safety and maintenance program to help prepare youth for such work.

Local club leaders and older 4-H members were invited to attend three day training meetings conducted by the engineers. Training started with classroom discussions and showing of films of tractor and machinery care, maintenance operation and safety.

That was followed by demonstrations on tractor servicing, lubrication, air cleaner and oil filter service, front wheel bearing lubrication and carburetor adjustment. Leaders and older youth were then assigned tractors to demonstrate work that had been taught.

Safety was a major part of the three days training. Proper hitching to prevent tractor tipping and reduce draft was a popular demonstration. Shutting off all machines before servicing or unplugging them was strongly stressed.

Club leaders and youth who received that training then taught it at their local clubs.

Labor shortages persisted and many farmers wanted to employ young boys to operate their tractors. That demand grew so greatly that the National Fair Labor Standards Act was amended in 1966 to provide for such employment. It placed restrictions on employment of youth under the age of sixteen and set a minimum age of fourteen for employment to operate farm machines and tractors. It required that the youth must receive at least 24 hours of safety instruction, pass a written examination and demonstrate the ability to drive a tractor with an implement before they could be certified for employment.

Extension agricultural engineers, county agents and vocational agriculture teachers have been the main instructors and certifiers for that program. During the twenty years, 1966-1985, that the program has been conducted North Dakota Extension workers have instructed and certified more than 7,500 youth for such work. Very few of those youth have been involved in a farm machinery accident even though statistics show that young people are involved in a higher percentage of farm accidents. Providing safety training has demonstrated that it does reduce the farm accident rate and such training has given many youth an opportunity to earn money and helped to relieve farm labor shortages.

**BEEF CALF PRECONDITIONING MORE MONEY TO THE BANK TO BRING**

An extra $7 per head for feeder calves sounds good but in reality most North Dakota farmers who preconditioned their calves more than doubled that figure. Preconditioning is the preparation of an unweaned calf to better withstand the stress of weaning and movement from its home range through market channels and into the feedlot.

Preconditioning has been a major Extension project since 1980 and by 1985 about 15% or 120,000 of North Dakota's beef calves were certified green tag preconditioned calves. Certified preconditioning requires specific health and management practices certified by the farmer and his veterinarian. It requires a 30 day semi feedlot environment with a water trough and feed bunks. Calves may be fed either home grown or commercial rations and will generally weigh 40 to 70 pounds more than non-preconditioned calves. That extra weight more than pays for feed costs and required immunization and parasite control. Preconditioned calves shrink less and adjust well to feedlot conditions.

Certified preconditioned calves are identified prior to sale by a green metal tag and thus the name "Green Tag." Extra income from "Green Tag" calves comes from increased prices of 2 to 4 cents per pound they usually bring above non-preconditioned calves.
During the 5 year period 1980-84 a total of 398,650 “Green Tag” calves were marketed in North Dakota. Using only the $7 figure mentioned above that has meant at least an additional $2,790,000 for North Dakota cattle producers. Preconditioning undoubtedly also reduced death losses and thus added to income.

Projected ahead the preconditioning program has by conservative estimates the potential for increasing annual income to North Dakota farmers from feeder calves by more than $8 million.

STUTSMAN COUNTY
FARMERS’ EXCHANGE LIST
Published by County Extension Agent
JAMESTOWN, NORTH DAKOTA, MARCH 25, 1932

Purpose of Exchange List

The Stutsman County Farmers Exchange List has been compiled to assist farmers in the sale and exchange of farm products. Keep this list where you may refer to it, read it over carefully. The articles listed have not been inspected and no responsibility is taken for the quality of the articles. You are urged to deal directly with the party having produce for sale or exchange.

This list is being mailed to every farmer and elevator manager in Stutsman county and to every county agent in the state. The Exchange List represents just one of many services rendered by the County Extension Office. Any one who does not receive a copy of this list may have one by writing or calling the County Extension Agent.

The Golden Rule is simple. Let’s use it more.

HARPER J. BRUSH, County Extension Agent.

Test All Seed Is Warning

Because numerous samples of seed submitted to the Pure Seed Laboratory at the North Dakota Agricultural college by the county agent have shown low germination tests this spring, every farmer is urged to submit samples of his seeds to the laboratory for germination and purity test before seeding.

Size of Sample Important

For grain, flax, and other large seeds, the sample should be 8 ounces in size, and for alfalfa, clover or grass seed, 4 ounces in size. Make up the sample from four or five different places in the bin.

Service Free

Puffy and germination tests are run free of charge to the individual farmer. Just mail sample to Pure Seed Laboratory, State College Station, Fargo, N. Dak. Be sure your name and address are plainly written or printed on package or on slips of paper in sample.

Annual Report Pictures County Extension Work

To give farmers in general a better idea of the work conducted through the County Extension office, is the purpose of the brief summary below, which is taken from the 1931 annual reports filed with the County Board of Commissioners by the County Agent and the Assistant County Agent.

Annual Report

During the past year 2422 calls were made at the Extension office by farm people. In addition to the office calls, 302 farm or home visits were made by the two agents. 2000 telephone calls were answered and 2946 individual letters written, relative to extension work. Sixty-six circular letters were mailed to 7,044 people while 112 newspaper articles appeared in the different newspapers published in the county. In addition to this, 288 demonstration meetings were held with an attendance of 4759 people. Four hundred seventeen women enrolled in twenty-three Home-makers clubs, were directed in their work by Miss Magdalene Heiber, Home Demonstration agent, while 175 Junior club members in twenty 4-H clubs were assisted in their projects by the two agents.

Live Stock Work Prominent

Livestock improvement work was emphasized in the meetings of the County Advisory Council at which the program carried out during the past year was planned. During the year 6600 head of breeding ewes were placed with fifty-eight farmers. A survey of lamb shipments from the county was made and four castrating and docking demonstrations and nine lamb grading demonstrations were held in an effort to improve the quality of lamb shipments from the county. A Sheep Breeders’ Field Day was held and assistance given in the sale of sixty-six purebred Rams. Two Junior Sheep clubs were continued with a membership of fourteen.

A survey of cattle shipments from the county showing losses through poor breeding and feeding of nearly $1000.00 per earload, was made. Five feed crop meetings and one beef cattle committee meeting were held to stress proper feeding. Six cattle grading demonstrations were held at which the various market grades of cattle were shown. A cow testing association was continued and eight herds qualified for National Dairy Council Honor Roll diplomas given to owners of herds producing over three hundred pounds of butterfat per cow during the year. One Dairyman’s Council was held with the State Extension Dairymen. One Junior Swine club was continued, the members making an average net profit of $50.45 each. Two poultry farm demonstration flocks kept record of production and costs during the year, and two culling demonstrations were conducted by the agent. One Junior Poultry club was organized in the spring.

Long Time Crops Program Wins

The past year is the second year of a long time crops program and the completion of a course from heat shipment from the county in comparison with a similar survey made two years
FARMER'S EXCHANGE LISTS DID QUITE WELL HELPING FARMERS TO TRADE, BUY OR SELL

Starting in the 1920's county agents worked with local newspaper editors in putting out a special edition of their paper called the Farmers Exchange List. Farmers were invited to list what they wanted to buy, sell or trade. Their lists were compiled in the county agent's office and published free in the Exchange List. Exchange Lists were continued for about 40 years and continued to provide a good means for farmers to buy, sell or trade tools and equipment, livestock and other farm products.

Most farmers' Exchange Lists were published in February or March, and many county agents included a summary of their last year's activities in it. It was mailed free to every farmer and grain elevator manager in each county.

---

FOR SALE
Livestock

SHEEP AND GOATS
- Agnes Woodworth, Oakdale, 3 and 4 years old. Bred on the farm. Born March 15, 1926. 10 months old. 124 pounds. 1 Parson Red Shorthorn. 1 red, 1 month old.
- Otto K. Finger, Woodworth, 3 year old. Bred on farm, 1 year old. 2 Parson Red Shorthorns. 2 red, 1 month old.
- C. W. Rawson, Woodworth, Grade Holstein milker. 1 cow, 2 years old.
- E. L. Hardin, Woodworth, 1 Red Shorthorn bull, 1 year old.
- Y. W. Engstrom, Laporte, Registered Hereford bull, 1 year old.
- H. L. Hardin, Laporte, Grade Shorthorn bull, 1 year old.
- Frank Yates, Laporte, Grade Shorthorn bull, 1 year old.
- H. A. Engstrom, Laporte, Registered Hereford bull, 1 year old.
- S. E. H. Carter, Laporte, 1 Hereford heifer.
- Van Erem Bros., Laporte, 1 beef cow.
- W. A. Hoge, Laporte, Registered Hereford bull, 1 year old.
- Joe F. Mobe, Laporte, Grade Shorthorn bull, 2 years old.
- Henry Zahn, Laporte, Registered Aberdeen Angus bull, 3 years old. Bred on farm. Born May 1, 1925. 2 years old. 225 pounds.
- Williams Co., Laporte, 3 years old. Registered Shorthorn bull, red.
- State Board, Laporte, 1 aged Holstein bull and several young bulls, all registered.
- O. M. Davies, Laporte, 1 aged Holstein bull, 2 years old.
- O. W. Thompson, Laporte, 1 Grade Holstein bull, 2 years old. 125 pounds.
- Arthur L. R., Laporte, 1 aged Holstein and Shorthorn heifer, red and white coming Fall.
- Arthur L. R., Laporte, 1 aged Holstein and Shorthorn heifer, red and white coming Fall.
- Arthur L. R., Laporte, 1 aged Holstein and Shorthorn heifer, red and white coming Fall.
- T. M. McKenzie, Laporte, Registered Shorthorn bull, 1 year old.
- Robert Bates, Laporte, Registered Hereford bull, 1 year old.
- T. M. McKenzie, Laporte, Registered Shorthorn bull, 3 years old.
- L. W. R. Hobbs, Laporte, Registered Shorthorn bull, 1 year old.
- Henry Zahn, Laporte, Grade Shorthorn bull, 1 year old.
Horses WANTED

A. O. Roberts, Eridge—Young horses.

Henry Touchman, Cleveland—A team of good young horses.

Charles McBeck, Edmonds—Young colt, Percheron stallion.

D. S. Winstead, Lovettsville—Two horses, not over 12 months old.

William Booth, Jr., Eridge—Horse, 1200 or 1200 lb.

Lorenzo Johns, Lovettsville—Horses.

S. E. Kerr, Cleveland—One horse.

N. F. Hittin, Medina—Horse.

Norton Lien, Ypsilanti—Team of good horses—no time payments.

August P. Lipps, Eridge—Team horses.

The Elder Horse Sale Co., Jamestown—We have contract for 349 well-bred horses and mares, from 1100 pounds up, for eastern markets.

Alf Schallander, Montpelier—One horse, 1300 to 1400 pounds. Not over 9 years old.

Edward Beineke, Streete—Two good work horses, brown, black or sorrel.

Leonard Millspaugh, Montpelier—Team of horses.

Orlando Dabney, Jamestown—Young broke horses.

Gatright C. Schleske, Medina—Horse.

Machinery WANTED

Vern Schrader, Buchanan—Good corn binder.

John Attleson, Star Route, Jamestown—One single row cultivator.

Fred Willows, Edmonds—Sheep shearing machine, double clipper, without engine.

J. E. Davidson, Pk 32, Spiritwood—Wagon box in good condition. Good second hand leader.

H. R. Gmelke, Medina—Second hand drill.

A. P. Cramble, Woodworth—Duck foot cultivator.

Charles D. Finney, Montpelier—15 or 11 foot corn drill. Double disc preferred.

George Jaff, Cleveland—Hay stacker.

John Lee, Montpelier—Quack grass digger.

Alfred Ziegler, Cleveland—John Deere or Dixon mower.

J. J. Martin, Route 2, Gackle—Stare disc.

W. N. Terry, Jamestown—Second hand hay leader or hay stacker.

John Reynolds, Courtway—Grain drill, 22 bushels, in fair shape.

W. A. Atwater, Route 1, Cleveland—One zone McCormick-Deering corn cultivator in good condition.

Henry Swann, Galloway—Truck wagon, plow type.

Cuda T. Monke, Jamestown—Two mowers; four-wheeled sweep rake; side delivery rake and narrow track hopper.

Wilbert C. Mather, Edmonds—One zone corn cultivator in good shape.

J. A. Anderson, Cleveland—Side delivery hay rake. Must be in repair and cheap.

Vern Boojhout, Montpelier—Spring tooth harrow or a two row side cultivation 8 or 8 foot. A tandum disc, 15 inch.

Arthur Spitzer, Eridge—Two new corn cultivators. John Deere or M. C. in first class shape.

John J. Johnson, Woodworth—Good corn binder.

Henry Monke, Jamestown—Used parts for a 15-30 Hart-Parr tractor.

Wheat WANTED

Henry Gross, Medina—Hard Durum wheat.

Thos. J. Arrowood, Pigeon—Seed wheat.

John Stickel, Gackle—50 bushels Amber Durum seed wheat; 150 bushels Ceres wheat.

L. E. Peterson, Edmonds—80 bushels Ceres wheat.

J. C. Leen, Buchanan—Ceres wheat.

N. M. Elen, Kemah—250 bushels Medium Durum, 99 per cent pure.

H. A. Engraver, Route 2, Jamestown—Ceres wheat.

R. J. Fendley, Jamestown—Ceres wheat.

Jacob Nitchl, Courtway—50 bushels seed wheat.

Harry C. Lowes, Buchanan—Ceres wheat.

Barley WANTED

R. M. Hunt, Ypsilanti—Seed barley.

Thos. J. Arrowood, Pigeon—Seed barley.

L. E. Peterson, Edmonds—100 bushels feed barley; 50 bushels seed barley.

Farmers' Exchange List

John Lee, Montpelier—Quack grass digger.

Alfred Ziegler, Cleveland—John Deere or Dixon mower.

J. J. Martin, Route 2, Gackle—Stare disc.

W. N. Terry, Jamestown—Second hand hay leader or hay stacker.

John Reynolds, Courtway—Grain drill, 22 bushels, in fair shape.

W. A. Atwater, Route 1, Cleveland—One zone McCormick-Deering corn cultivator in good condition.

Henry Swann, Galloway—Truck wagon, plow type.

Cuda T. Monke, Jamestown—Two mowers; four-wheeled sweep rake; side delivery rake and narrow track hopper.

Wilbert C. Mather, Edmonds—One zone corn cultivator in good shape.

J. A. Anderson, Cleveland—Side delivery hay rake. Must be in repair and cheap.

Vern Boojhout, Montpelier—Spring tooth harrow or a two row side cultivation 8 or 8 foot. A tandum disc, 15 inch.

Arthur Spitzer, Eridge—Two new corn cultivators. John Deere or M. C. in first class shape.

John J. Johnson, Woodworth—Good corn binder.

Henry Monke, Jamestown—Used parts for a 15-30 Hart-Parr tractor.

Henry Gross, Medina—Hard Durum wheat.

Thos. J. Arrowood, Pigeon—Seed wheat.

John Stickel, Gackle—50 bushels Amber Durum seed wheat; 150 bushels Ceres wheat.

L. E. Peterson, Edmonds—80 bushels Ceres wheat.

J. C. Leen, Buchanan—Ceres wheat.

N. M. Elen, Kemah—250 bushels Medium Durum, 99 per cent pure.

H. A. Engraver, Route 2, Jamestown—Ceres wheat.

R. J. Fendley, Jamestown—Ceres wheat.

Jacob Nitchl, Courtway—50 bushels seed wheat.

Harry C. Lowes, Buchanan—Ceres wheat.

R. M. Hunt, Ypsilanti—Seed barley.

Thos. J. Arrowood, Pigeon—Seed barley.

L. E. Peterson, Edmonds—100 bushels feed barley; 50 bushels seed barley.
**BUDGETS AND PROGRAMS GO HAND IN HAND WHETHER THEY DECREASE OR WHETHER THEY EXPAND**

The old saying "there is no such thing as a free lunch" applies to public work as well as to business so who pays Extension's bills?

All costs of the Better Farming Association were paid from funds contributed by individuals, service clubs, chambers of commerce and business interests. After Extension was established it was expected that the local share of its costs would be paid from county taxes but most counties were slow in appropriating money. Even into the early 1920's those early supporters of Better Farming Agents got "stuck with the bill" for county agents in some counties.

Until the mid 1930's county agent work was an on again, off again program in many counties. Unlike other federally sponsored programs that were funded entirely from federal funds it prospered or suffered with the "good times" and the "bad times" of the local people. Except for emergency federally financed programs during "bad times" Extension may not have survived its youthful days in North Dakota.

During much of the period 1914-1933 fewer than half of the counties had county agents whereas 1934-1985 reflects Extension staffs in all counties. Inflation has also greatly affected budget amounts.

Federal Extension funds represent several different actions by Congress but are treated here as the composite of all federal funds. Some federal funds are designated for a specific kind of work and reflect staffing necessary to carry out that work. Expanded Foods and Nutrition Extension Program funds are an example of such designated funds and reflect the addition of approximately thirty staff members to carry out that work. Some other programs for which designated funds have been provided are for work on Indian Reservations, rural health, farm and home development, wildlife and environment protection, drought and grasshopper emergencies and war time special programs.

A sampling of Extension's budgets shows budget trends and sources of funds. Much of the increase in budget amounts are due to inflation. Salaries that were $1,200 a year in 1914 grew to $2,800 by 1945, to $6,000 by 1955 and to $22,000 by 1985. Even at that rate of growth Extension has often found it difficult to maintain a full staff because of resignations to enter private work at better pay. Automobiles that cost $1,000 in 1940 cost more than $12,000 in 1985 and all other costs have increased in proportion.

Special or emergency federal funds that were appropriated were either integrated into on-going federal Extension funds or discontinued after the emergency period expired. Several of the major specially funded Extension programs are mentioned elsewhere in this report and they are mentioned again here only for their budget impact.

WWII emergency programs assigned to Extension carried with them about $100,000 and most of those funds were cut off and Extension's staff reduced when the emergency period was over.

Post war adjustments and poor crops brought additional emergency programs during the 1920's and again federal funds were increased and then cut back. During WWII county and state funds also increased but during the 1920's state funds were greatly reduced while county funds more than doubled.

Extension's federal funds were the lowest in 1932-33 that they had been since 1916 and county and state funds had also been cut back to about their 1916 level.

Enactment of the federal Agricultural Adjustment Act program in 1933 was the first program that provided funds for Extension in every county of North Dakota. Both federal and local allotment funds were used to get that program underway and at that same time introduce county Extension work into every county.

Governor Langer vetoed the state Extension appropriation in 1935 and again in 1935 except for about $5,000 for annual office space at NDAC.

Drought years, grasshopper invasions, WWII and other emergencies all affected Extension's budgets. Budget figures are given here at ten year intervals with a few additions to reflect the impact of some of those emergency programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>STATE*</th>
<th>FEDERAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1915-16</td>
<td>$ 14,000.00</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$ 16,500.00</td>
<td>$ 40,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-20</td>
<td>$ 15,500.00</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$ 16,500.00</td>
<td>$ 52,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-23</td>
<td>$ 16,500.00</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$ 16,500.00</td>
<td>$ 53,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924-25</td>
<td>$ 17,000.00</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$ 16,500.00</td>
<td>$ 53,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-29</td>
<td>$ 17,500.00</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$ 16,500.00</td>
<td>$ 54,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-33</td>
<td>$ 18,000.00</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$ 16,500.00</td>
<td>$ 54,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-37</td>
<td>$ 18,500.00</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$ 16,500.00</td>
<td>$ 55,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938-41</td>
<td>$ 19,000.00</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$ 16,500.00</td>
<td>$ 55,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942-45</td>
<td>$ 19,500.00</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$ 16,500.00</td>
<td>$ 56,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-49</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$ 16,500.00</td>
<td>$ 56,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-53</td>
<td>$ 20,500.00</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$ 16,500.00</td>
<td>$ 57,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-57</td>
<td>$ 21,000.00</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$ 16,500.00</td>
<td>$ 57,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-61</td>
<td>$ 21,500.00</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$ 16,500.00</td>
<td>$ 58,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-65</td>
<td>$ 22,000.00</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>$ 16,500.00</td>
<td>$ 58,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*State funds listed includes funds received from potato, sugar beet, livestock, crops and other federal grants for special work with them.
EXTENSION'S FUTURE TO FULFILL, DEPENDS ON WHO WILL PAY THE BILL

What is the future for Extension funding? Cooperative funding between federal, state and county governments poses some problems. All three are undergoing budget problems and much budget shifting is underway. Each is looking to the others to assume a larger share.

Today's farmers are much more sophisticated and knowledgeable than ever before. Agricultural science and technology continues to advance at an increasingly rapid rate. Anticipating changes and training staff members for those changes will require more effort than in the past.

Whether or not one likes it, farming is a business and business management will be more and more important for surviving in making technology changes. Some have criticized Extension for promoting programs that increase production and partially blame Extension for our large farm products surplus. Surely the use of commercial fertilizer, chemical weed control, new crop varieties, plant disease and insect control, production testing, artificial insemination, balanced rations and many other practices have helped to increase production.

A farm worker in 1985 could produce enough food for about 85 people. That same worker in 1965 could have produced enough food for only about 37 people. If today's, 1985, production had been at that same level as that of the 1965 farm worker, the United States would not have produced enough food to feed its own people. Production efficiency along with sound business management are essential in all business and Extension efforts have been focused towards those ends. Dealing with surplus production is complex and difficult. It involves political and governmental policies and often those policies are not favorable to farmers.

Extension's table of organization and staffing pattern have not been static. Continuous efforts have been made to adjust staff members, staff skills and staff locations to meet the needs and provide the best services for the people of North Dakota.

Newspapers and magazines have headlined stories concerning Extension's future and several of them are included. It should be interesting to participate in whatever does develop.

"There is no one member of the college staff who has received more attention and more favorable support from the people than the County Agent. He is the representative in the local farm community of all that the college of agriculture stands for. His primary function and duty is putting knowledge to work—all knowledge relating to agriculture. Broadly interpreted, this must include an intellectual program for beyond mere physical and material problems concerned with production. It must include economics, sociology, rural health, rural education, recreation, and community organization." —Dean P. B. Mumford, University of Missouri

OH, THE FUTURE'S NOT OURS TO SEE, BUT WITH PLANNING WE CAN HELP IT TO BE

Agriculture in 1985 is undergoing a period of great financial stress and a tragic shake-out of many under-financed farm families. How will that affect future Extension programming and financing? Since the mid 1950's Extension has been emphasizing the business side of farming and that will demand even greater emphasis.

Farm numbers and rural population have been greatly reduced in recent years but even more reductions are ahead. What is the future for Extension's rural youth programs? "Four-H has been one of Extension's strong "bread and butter" programs through both good times and bad times. Will it continue to be a basic Extension program?"

Homemakers clubs have been the prime support group for Extension's home economics programs. Their numbers have decreased with the farm population decrease. What will be their role in Extension's future?

Similar questions could be asked for all phases of Extension work. What will Extension have to offer the specialized livestock or crops producer?

What emergency situations will arise and how will government respond to them? Administrations of emergency programs have been some of Extension's finest work efforts. Will Extension be involved in emergency work in the future as it has been in the past?

How will Extension be funded? About 30% of the North Dakota Extension 1985-86 budget came from federal sources. Will Congress continue that support or will it delegate that responsibility to state and local governments? State funds made up 42%, county funds 21% and private contracts 7% of that budget. Private funds included work with youth, sugarbeets, potatoes and other special programs.

During extended difficult state and local financial times who will be Extension's paymaster?

Will the present individual county agent system along with some area specialists survive or will county agents give way and only area specialists be the new Extension pattern?

Surely some staffing changes will occur on a trial basis. Public reaction and funding will be major considerations and much planning will be needed.
Today's Editorial  
Fargo Forum, Aug 1964

Extension Service Marks Its Golden Anniversary

The Cooperative Extension Service—perhaps better known to most people of this area as the county agricultural and home agent system—marks its 50th anniversary today.

The Service, through its methods of showing farmers how to use information and practices developed at state agricultural experiment stations, has increased the economic well-being of farmers and farm families beyond measure.

In their work with farm families, county agents—both agricultural and home—have helped increase farm income through more efficient and practical farming methods, have helped farm organizations devoted to upgrading the nation's agriculture, and have started thousands upon thousands of farm youth—through 4-H—towards a better rural oriented life.

The Extension Service has kept pace with the times. Starting with basic improvements in farming methods, the agents are now assisting farmers and their families in improving farm management practices and participation in public affairs.

Through effective use of information and facilities provided by state experiment stations, today's county agent has become a person of prime importance in the growth and development of rural America.

The Smith-Lever Act, passed on May 8, 1914, created the Cooperative Extension Service. The Act states: "That the Cooperative Agricultural Extension work shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics not attending or resident in (land grant) colleges in the several communities and importing to such persons information on said subjects through field demonstrations and otherwise."

The nation's Extension workers can be proud of the contribution they have made and continue to make to America's rural education program and its participants.

Farmers rank Extension Service high for information

The Cooperative Extension Service is a valuable and frequently used information source on pest management and crop production, according to a survey sent in the fall of 1963 to 2,000 randomly selected North Dakota farmers.

"The pest management practices survey was conducted by the Cooperative Extension Service to gather information for extension personnel on the range of pest management practices used by state farmers and their information sources," says Marcia McMullen, extension plant pathologist.

Completed surveys by 12 percent of the mailing list showed that extension county agents and university specialists, along with private pesticide dealers, were ranked as the two most important sources for information used to make pest management decisions.

Seventy-seven percent of the respondents received information on crop production and pest management from the Extension Service. This extension information was received one to two times by 30 percent of the respondents, three to five times by 42 percent of the respondents and 2.2 percent of the farmers reported receiving information more than 20 times in 1964.

Information was received by the farmers in a variety of ways: 24 percent indicated by mail, 17 percent by newspaper, 16 percent by a visit to the Extension office, 14 percent by telephone, 14 percent by Extension educational meetings, 12 percent by radio or TV and 2 percent by farm visits.

These farmers estimated that information received from the extension service increased net farm income; 28 percent reported a $1 to $1,000 increase, 33 percent reported a $1,000 to $5,000 increase, 8.4 percent reported a $5,000 to $10,000 increase and 2.6 percent reported an increase of over $10,000.
County extension agent

He's a public servant who's often taken for granted

What person is an on-call consultant to hundreds of businesses operating in a highly complex and competitive industry? This person's advice is based on the latest technological and scientific information available and has great economic consequences for the consumer. This person is expected to be a specialist whose areas of expertise vary with the season. And yet the job description can only be filled by a generalist.

What person can expect to be approached about business-related questions whenever he goes out in public? The daily schedule of this professional is interrupted many times by "customers," but he receives no direct compensation from them.

This professional has three bosses (county, state, and federal), but he can only survive by establishing and maintaining personal credibility with the consumers of the service.

Give up?

This person is the county extension agent.

He is the most accountable of public servants, available on demand, a resource to agriculture that has been provided at public expense for the past 70 years.

This tradition of providing supportive services to agriculture has created a unique professional, a public servant who is truly a servant.

This is a very knowledgeable servant. The varied expectations of the public push and stretch the agent into new areas. He is under the gun to learn new things all the time.

There is no resting on laurels or tenure. His work is public and his results are public. The hours are long and the demands are many.

His knowledge has to fit the enterprises in the area he serves. A change of location may mean learning a new area of agriculture from scratch. Knowledge of horticulture is vital for serving town and city residents.

He has to have the wisdom to say, "I don't know but I'll find out and get back to you," or say, "I'll put you in touch with someone that can help you."

Part of his job is technical and scientific. Part of his job is projecting economic consequences. Part of his job is developing people.

Part of his job is being a public educator. Part of his job is knowing when to make a referral to others.

The agent has to have an incredible sense of self-esteem, and must function as a consultant to farmers and ranchers when he is not likely to be operating a farm of his own. His job comes under scrutiny for cost-effectiveness, yet he has no easy way of tracing the economic impact of his influence.

He is becoming increasingly liable for information he gives about pesticides, and yet his customers expect him to go beyond the book in advising about these products.

He has to resist his own inclinations to foster dependency or to be too active in making decisions for a minority of farmers who put him in his role.

He must walk a tightrope between pleasing everyone and holding to personal judgment and principles. Many times he has to make a quick judgment over the phone based on what he knows about the caller and the caller's background for implementing the ideas.

Why do these people place themselves in such a vulnerable position for their life's work? Is it their love for agriculture, people, learning new things, and the satisfaction of having helped others?

Do some people like living close to the eye of the storm and feel comfortable with the risks? Is there something saintly in this sacrifice of self for the public good?

These people are not apt to complain to their constituents about the difficulty of their role, nor are they likely to trumpet their virtues.

Neither one would be seemly. These people are taken for granted. They know that. They accept it. That is just the way it is. I'm not sure I would like their job. Before a farmer becomes too critical, he should ask himself, "Would I like to be in their shoes?"

Who would like his work be that accountable and open for review? Many farmers express appreciation. Not enough do.

The "thank-yous" keep me going. I have a hunch these agents need a boost once in a while, even if they aren't expecting it.

(Farmer is a clinical psychologist at Rapid City, S.D., who specializes in rural mental health and family relationships. His column is distributed by Extra Newspaper Features.)
Extension's Future Is Today

House official opposes cuts to Extension Service budget

New York Times News Service

WASHINGTON — The chairman of a House Appropriations subcommittee said last week that Congress would prevent the Reagan Administration from cutting the budget of the Agriculture Extension Service by 90 percent in the fiscal year 1987.

"It just doesn't make any sense to devastate the Extension Service," the chairman, Rep. Jamie L. Whitten, D-Miss., said after hearings by the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies. "This group has been doing a good job for years. At a time when farmers really need help from extension agents, this would eliminate their jobs."

In its budget recommendation for 1987, the Reagan administration seeks to reduce the Extension Service's $327 million budget by $187 million.

The Extension Service, a division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, was established in 1914. It is the nation's principal system for transferring the latest research from the laboratories of land grant agricultural universities to the fields. The system, which is partly financed by states, employs 16,700 people. Chuck Graves, the service's chief budget officer, said that if the administration proposal was approved 10,000 people would lose their jobs.

The proposed cut has alarmed state officials and university scientists. But at last week's hearing lawmakers from both parties supported Whitten, saying they would not reduce the Extension Service budget.

"We're going to do what's right for farmers and for all those extension people out there," said Rep. William H. Natcher, D-Ky.

Farmers protest extension programs

By The Associated Press

Farmers angry with North Dakota State University's agricultural extension service and its farm programs held a brief protest in the agency's offices, officials said.

About a dozen farmers participated in the noon-hour protest Monday, said Myron Johnsrud, extension service director. They left after Johnsrud agreed to discuss the group's grievances in a public forum, he said.

"We feel that they're (the extension service) not telling the whole story," said Sherman Rasmussen of LaMoure. "We need to support raising prices."

Most of the farmers said they were from the LaMoure area. They claimed no organizational affiliation, but some endorsed the National Farmers Organization's collective bargaining approach and its analysis of current farm problems.

North Dakota Rep. Kelly Shockman, D-LaMoure, was with the group as it prepared near the NDSU Fieldhouse. But he said he did not want recognition as a spokesman for the protesters and left before they entered extension offices.

Shockman is an NFO organizer and in the past has spoken out against extension service programs.

- Bases marketing information on the law of supply and demand. "Supply and demand is not a law, but only a theory that is used against farmers," the handout said.
- Advises farmers to use futures markets, which subjects them to undue risk.
- Promotes overproduction and fails to promote supply management.
- Promotes overseas of farm chemicals.
- Offers information on making a transition from farming to other occupations.
End to county agents suggested

Associated Press

BISMARCK — North Dakota legislators should consider cutting the state’s higher education budget by consolidating the state’s 53 county extension offices into a system of eight regional agencies, says state Budget Director Richard Rayl.

Rayl made his suggestion, which an aide later termed “a trial balloon,” during a report Friday to the interim Budget Committee on Higher Education, which will look at ways of reorganizing the state’s higher education system.

The state cannot afford to continue funding the system at current levels, Rayl said.

The state’s experiment stations and extension agents have a $35 million budget for the next biennium and account for 13.6 percent of the state’s $258.5 million budget for higher education.

Agricultural technology changes so fast that individual extension agents cannot keep up to date and regional offices might be more helpful to farmers, Rayl said. Experiment stations are already arranged around the state on a regional basis.

The state needs to review the system “to see if there is another way of doing it,” Rayl said.

But he said he didn’t know how much his suggested consolidation would save the state, if any.

After Rayl made his proposal, committee members began suggesting benefits of the experiment stations and extension agents.

“There are not a one of those (higher education) programs that aren’t good,” Rayl said. “The question is: Can we afford all that goodness?”

Rep. Robert Nowskii, D-Langdon, said he opposed consolidating the offices.

“At this point in time, farmers need all the advice they can get as cheaply as they can get it,” Nowskii said.

Nowalksi rejected Rayl’s suggestion that extension agents cannot keep up with changes in farm technology.

“I think the experiment stations are on the cutting edge,” he said. “I think we have an excellent track record.”

N.D. Extension Service consolidation opposed

Sen. Donald Moore, R-Forbes, N.D., said Thursday the proposed consolidation of the state Extension Service into eight regional offices should not be considered further because of the effect the plan would have on farmers.

“The proposed consolidation would weaken the Extension Service program by removing the vital ‘county agent’ first link between farmers and North Dakota State University.”

In addition, Moore said, counties now provide 20 percent of the extension budget through mill levies as well as providing office space, so any consolidation would place a greater burden on the state’s general fund.
N.D. extension service to absorb $735,000 in cuts

By Mikkel Pates
STAFF WRITER
North Dakota Cooperative Extension Service Director Myron Johnsrud had bad news and then some worse news for his staff Wednesday.

The bad news: he must find ways of absorbing $735,000 in immediate funding cuts from federal and state coffers. The equivalent of 12 full-time jobs will be cut.

The worse news: the state service must cut some programs to build reserves, in anticipation of even deeper federal and state funding cuts, six months and a year in the future.

"This is not the kind of message a state extension director enjoys presenting to staff. However ... not making reasonable plans and not sharing what is being planned is even more distasteful," Johnsrud said Wednesday, addressing a somber staff at the state's annual extension conference at North Dakota State University.

Immediate cuts will affect 12\% full-time-equivalent jobs, including some part-timers.

Five half-time ag and home economics agents will lose their jobs, as will two full-time staff — an extension safety specialist and a 4-H urban specialist. This amounts to 4\% of the state's 236 so-called "permanent" employees.

Also losing their jobs will be eight half-time-equivalent jobs in the state that are normally contracted on an annual basis.

Funding cuts announced in March include a $182,000 reduction in the state's budget allocation at the federal level. Another $75,000 will be lost in Bureau of Indian Affairs funding for extension workers on Indian reservations.

Also, Gov. George Sinner has requested a 4 percent budget reduction for extension, but that was increased to 5.5 percent by the Board of Higher Education for a total of $388,000 for the 1985-87 biennium.

The Board of Higher Education has asked Johnsrud to prepare an array of budget scenarios for the next biennium, with hypothetical budgets ranging from 70 to 110 percent of existing state funding levels.

Johnsrud said the state has developed a three-phase response to the budget woes.

Phase I began in March and changes are expected to remain in place at least through 1988. The few staff members who will be laid off have been given at least six months "early warning" to avoid unnecessary stress.

Under Phase I, Johnsrud expects to terminate certain programs funded primarily at the federal level, including 4-H community resource development, urban 4-H, and farm safety. He plans to either terminate positions hired on a year-to-year basis, or make critical positions permanent.

He will also require some staff to take on dual roles for at least a year and require the Farm Financial Analyst Program to pay for itself, either through user fees, contracts, gifts or grants.

Johnsrud also announced what he will not do — "buy out" contracts for early retirees. He said such a plan would save no money in the first year and would not affect a significant number of staff members.

The extension director declined to reveal details of Phase II. Final decisions won't be made until further federal cuts are decided in October. He said any unforeseen resignations or retirements might cause savings to forestall staff cuts.

Phase III cuts will become known in the spring of 1987, when the state Legislature completes its biennial budget.
Extension Service announces initial program, position cuts

Faced with immediate reductions of $735,000 in state and federal funding, plus the possibility of more cuts to come, the North Dakota Cooperative Extension Service announced April 2 it will reduce programs and staff to accommodate the new budget squeeze.

Speaking at the annual conference of state and county extension staff in Fargo, Dr. Myron Johnsrud, director of extension, announced that programs in 4-H community resource development, urban 4-H and farm safety will be cut, effective Sept. 30, and that positions assigned specifically to these areas will be eliminated. Any continuation of these programs, he said, will be carried out as part of other related programs.

In addition, he said, the extension service has decided not to fill a vacant editor position in ag communication, not to fill the vacant assistant county agent position in Ramsey county, and not to continue the search for a northwest district director. Several positions funded on an annual renewal basis in the ag communication and home economics departments will be eliminated by Sept. 30.

Other changes announced will affect user fees for certain extension programs. The farm financial analyst program, said Johnsrud, will continue only at the level at which it can support itself through clientele user fees and designated contracts or grants. Plant diagnostic laboratory fees will be increased, he said, and fees for pesticide training and certification will go up.

Changes seen anticipatory

All of these changes, he said, are expected to be effective at least through the 1987-89 biennial period. They come as a result of funding cuts by state and federal government, and in anticipation of cuts which may lie ahead.

Last month the USDA reduced funding for this year’s North Dakota Extension Service budget by $162,000. Also, the Bureau of Indian Affairs cut its contract funds for the North Dakota Extension Service by $75,000 for the year.

And on March 13 the State Board of Higher Education, in announcing it would cooperate with Gov. Sinner’s request for a 4 percent reduction in the budgets of all state agencies, said it would take more than 4 percent out of the budgets of the Cooperative Extension Service and Agricultural Experiment Station.

“While we clearly recognize the seriousness of the state general fund situation,” said Johnsrud, “the bottom line for our budget became a reduction of approximately $500,000.”

Johnsrud said the announced cuts were the first phase of a three-phase budget management process to keep the Extension Service operating effectively within the bounds imposed by current and future funding cuts. Phase two, he said would not be finalized until about Oct. 1, when fiscal ’87 federal budget prospects will be more certain. The phase three decision point, said Johnsrud, will be July 1, 1987, when the Legislature normally completes its biennial budget decisions.

Other policy, operation changes

At last week’s annual conference Johnsrud also announced these changes in extension policies and operations:

• Yearly operating funds for the AGNET computer system have been reduced about $40,000, or 40 percent.

• Reassignment of staff to assume dual job responsibilities for one year will be utilized on a limited basis and consideration will be given to staff wanting less than full-time employment status.

• Contract and gift funds will be utilized on a short-term basis to fund partial salaries for some current staff positions to help offset current federal and state general fund reductions.

• The contract with the NDSU Computer Center for special services will be terminated on June 30.

• Some funds budgeted for timeslip employment will be reallocated for permanent staff position salaries.

• Any vacant positions that must be filled will be filled by internal reallocation to the fullest extent possible. These positions will be announced so interested staff may apply.

“While the federal budget is a major concern,” Johnsrud told the group of extension workers, “You need to reflect on what’s happening and feel proud to be a part of the extension team. And I say that because of the tremendous positive response from the public, being expressed to Congress, about why the Extension Service budget should not be cut. This is happening across the nation.”

Johnsrud added, “Extension has a long, rich history of helping people when they’re having difficult times, and now that we face difficult times, the people are helping us.”
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Barnes Agent Receives N.D. Excellence Award

Barnes County Agent Larry Iverson was presented the North Dakota Cooperative Extension Service at North Dakota State University. Gov. Guy said he was thrilled to find that North Dakota again is furnishing a national leader. He said he established the presidential rocker as a visible award for the state's leaders, built by a North Carolina manufacturing company which made former President John Kennedy's famous rocking chair.

Iverson responded, "It's great to have this honor, and it's great to represent your kind of people," meaning his fellow Extension agents. With him was his wife and three of his sons, Paul, Douglas and Gregory.

Iverson has served as county agent of Barnes County since 1947. Prior to that he served in Bowman and McIntosh counties. He was elected to his national position last August in Corvallis, Oreg.

Trying Out His Prize

Barnes County Agent Larry Iverson tries out rocking chair presented to him by North Dakota Gov. William L. Guy for Iverson's leadership as president of the National Association of County Agricultural Agents. The Kennedy-style rocking chair has Iverson's name engraved in brass. (NDSU Photo)
Governor Wm. L. Guy presented "Rocking Chair Award" to Barnes County Agent Larry Iverson.

A ROCKING CHAIR TO REST AND THINK PRESENTED TO THOSE WITH A NATIONAL LINK

North Dakota's county agents have been active in their respective National Associations. They have been well represented and served on numerous committees at their annual national meetings. Barnes County Agent, Larry Iverson, was especially active in the National Association of County Agricultural Agents and in 1970 was elected President of that National Association.

William L. Guy, Jr., who was then Governor of North Dakota, had established a policy of presenting a President Kennedy-style rocking chair to North Dakotans of National stature. Iverson was greatly surprised when Governor Guy attended Extension's Annual State Conference that year with a rocking chair. He thought the Governor may have hurt his back. He was more surprised when the Governor asked him to sit in it and then presented it to him in recognition of being President of a National Association.

Governor Guy's father was a North Dakota County Agent in Ramsey and Cass Counties, 1919-1926, and a County Agent Supervisor, 1926-27. He left Extension to manage a large farm near Amenia. Governor Guy also had an Extension background having been Assistant Cass County Agent in 1947.

DEDICATED SERVICE AND INTEGRITY HONOR BOTH MAN AND MASTER ETERNALLY

World War II required construction of hundreds of cargo ships called Liberty Ships. Many of those ships were named after individuals who represented substantial efforts towards the war. Extension contributed greatly to the national war efforts and in appreciation the War Department offered to name a Liberty Ship after an Extension worker from each state.

North Dakota submitted the name of Arthur A. Penn for that honor and Liberty Ship #283 from the Permanente Metals Corporation, Richmond, California Shipyard #2, was launched on February 17, 1944 as the U.S.S. Arthur A. Penn.

Arthur Penn started Extension work on May 16, 1920 as Dickey County Club Agent. He became Dickey County Agent on January 1, 1923 and was still serving in that position when he died in August 1934. He served Extension and Dickey County well for more than fourteen years and his named honored North Dakota Extension as Liberty Ship Arthur A. Penn braved hostile ocean waters to carry both wartime and peacetime cargos.

Liberty Ship U.S.S. Arthur A. Penn
E.S.P., WHAT CAN THAT BE?
EXTENSION'S NATIONAL HONOR SOCIETY

Epsilon Sigma Phi is a National Extension Honor Society founded for the twofold purpose of inspiring meritorious Extension work and recognition of Extension workers for meritorious work. Invitation to membership is based on tenure and quality of service and to be elected a member is in itself an honor.

Epsilon Sigma Phi was officially founded on January 10, 1927 at the home of M. L. Wilson at Bozeman, Montana with ten charter members. It was proposed as a National Society and immediately approved as such. Chapters were organized in 26 states before that year was ended.

The stated purpose of the National organization was to maintain the standards, ideals, traditions, morale, prestige and respect of the Extension Service and to develop an effective working relationship and spirit of fellowship among past, present and future Extension workers.

North Dakota Extension workers organized Upsilon Chapter of Epsilon Sigma Phi on January 16, 1928 with thirteen charter members who were:

- Ralph Andrews
- T.T. Kristjanson
- W.C. Palmer
- Geo. J. Baker
- C.F. Monroe
- H.E. Rollie
- T.X. Calhoun
- Ralph Newcomer
- Rex Willard
- Howard Danielson
- A.L. Norling
- Roy C. Dynes
- E.G. Perizek

First officers of Upsilon Chapter were:

- C.F. Monroe — Chief
- Ralph Andrews — Secretary/Treasurer
- H.E. Rollie — Annalist

The chapter's constitution provided for a House of Pioneers which was to include all active, associate and honorary members whose period of service antedated passage of the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914 and who had a total of at least ten years of service.

An early project of the Chapter was establishment of an Extension library at the Extension administrative office. Expenditures of $25 to $50 each year from 1938 through 1955 were made to purchase bookcases and books for use by Extension workers. Books included subjects for inspiration, Extension history, teaching and demonstration methods and techniques, public speaking and local and state history. Books could be checked out by all Extension workers but were not available to students.

By 1956 the library contained approximately 250 books and it was agreed that they should be made available to students as well as to Extension. An arrangement was then made to locate the Extension library books at the University library reserved book

NATIONAL AWARD GOES TO DeLONG

EXTENSION WORKER GAINS NATION RECOGNITION FOR SERVICE TO STATE

Grace DeLong, state home demonstration leader was honored Dec. 13, when she received a certificate of recognition from Epsilon Sigma Phi, national honorary extension fraternity. Formal presentation was made during the annual extension conference.

The award, which is extended each year to not more than 10 outstanding extension workers throughout the U.S., is given for meritorious service. Nominations for the honor are made by one-fourth of the chapters of the fraternity each year. Miss DeLong is the first NDAC extension member to receive the recognition.

Miss DeLong has served on the extension staff since 1921 when she was appointed home demonstration agent at large. Following that she was district home demonstration agent, clothing specialist and assistant state home demonstration leader and upon the resignation of Myrtle Gleason Cole in 1927, she became Home Demonstration Leader.

Clubs Increase

Under Miss DeLong's leadership Homemakers' clubs in the state have increased from 204 in 1927 to 701 permanent clubs at the present time with a program which reaches not less than 20,000 homes each year.

Miss DeLong was born in North Dakota and is a graduate of the University of North Dakota. Her father and paternal grandfather were both pioneer settlers in the state. Before entering extension work, she taught in North Dakota and in Minnesota.

Miss DeLong believes that the greatest asset of any farm is the family on that farm, that crops and livestock are not ends in themselves, but derive their significance only as they contribute to human well-being, either as these agricultural products are utilized fully by the people living on the farm, or as the income from the sale of these products is invested in those satisfactions which represent to each individual family a comfortable standard of living.
area and they were later absorbed into the regular library stacks.

A National Epsilon Sigma Phi committee on awards proposed and it was subsequently adopted by the National Society in 1934 that an appropriate certificate of recognition be awarded to members upon recommendation of their respective chapters. The award procedure provided that “one-fourth of the chapters shall be privileged to nominate one candidate each year for a certificate of recognition from the National Society.” That award was amended in 1978 and made an annual award for each state.

Upsilon Chapter members who have received such recognition are:

1936 — Grace E. DeLong
1940 — Thomas X. Callan
1944 — Edwin J. Haslerud
1948 — Norbert D. Gorman
1952 — Andrew M. Challey
1956 — Jolla E. Brekke
1960 — Benjamin H. Barrett
1964 — Herbert W. Herbstos
1968 — Craig R. Montgomery
1972 — Stanley W. Bale
1976 — Sebastian L. Vogel
1978 — Orville Jacobson
1979 — Banks Sieber
1980 — Anne Green
1981 — Lars Jensen
1982 — Randle Johnson
1983 — Robert Askew
1984 — Le Von Kirkeide
1985 — Ron Anderson

Upsilon Chapter established in 1978 and issued two awards to be issued by that chapter each year.

One award, a certificate of meritorious service, to be awarded to Extension workers who have exhibited superior work habits and results. Those who have received that award are:

1978 — June Winge
1979 — Anne Green, Andrew Boucher, Wayne Coblentz, John Logan
1980 — Larry Ivenson, Wayne Owens, Esther Schoewe
1981 — Robert Arestrup, Donald Hitchens, Dorothy McCallough
1982 — Harold Osgood, Georgia Smith, Walter Mattson, Le Von Kirkeide
1983 — Roger Couture, Katherine Ivenson
1984 — James Berg, Marvin Condon, Ellen Dunlop
1985 — Maxine Frank, Pat Beck, Wilbur Voorhees

The other award to be presented to persons not on Extension's payroll who have demonstrated strong support and friendship towards Extension and called the State Friend of Extension Award. Those receiving that award have been:

1978 — Royal Bertsch, Kathy Coyne, Arlene Siemers
1979 — Arden Burtridge, Al Gustin, George Minkle
1980 — Wilma Galegher, Clark Jenkins, Alvin Kramer
1981 — Arthur A. Grace Links
1982 — Mrs. Elva Thiel, Kyle Miller, Clarence Saude
1983 — Mrs. Judy DeWitt, Donald J. Keena, Sr.
1984 — Stanley Bale, Clair Michels, Lois Sullivan
1985 — Lois Jones, Bernice Johnson

Each year during annual Extension Conference Upsilon Chapter sponsors an all Extension dinner at which awards and recognitions are made. Extension retirees are invited and friendships renewed.

Upsilon Chapter has had much interest in North Dakota Extension history and over the years has appointed several committees to try to “get the job done.”

Extension staff professional improvement has received major emphasis by Upsilon Chapter. Recently a small scholarship fund has been established for professional improvement. Area Home Economist Linda Narum is the first to receive a scholarship from that fund. She is currently completing work towards a master's degree in nutrition at NDSU. Burke County Agent, Dan Dhuyvetter, also received a scholarship and is using it for travel and study in Australia.

Upsilon Chapter had 96 active members and 41 retired life members in 1985.

WHEN FRIENDSHIPS BEGIN TO LAG
IT IS TIME TO HAVE A STAG

North Dakota Extension workers are relatively conservative in their personal activities but their annual Extension Men's Stag is an icebreaker when even the most conservative join the crowd and become better acquainted. Although this annual “steam blower” is called an Extension Stag it is sponsored by Extension's agribusiness friends and attended by workers from all USDA agencies in the area.

E. M. ("Pop") Gregory deserves primary credit for originating the Stag. "Pop" was a North Dakota county agent and District Supervisor who went on to become an Agricultural Development Agent for the Great Northern Railroad. He wanted to maintain contacts with North Dakota Extension workers and thought that a Stag party during the Annual Extension Conference would be a good way to do it. "Pop" was a real organizer and sold his idea to others and the first Extension Stag was held at the Powers Hotel Blue Room in 1946. Early sponsors were mostly former county agents who had become Agricultural Development Agents for the four railroads — Great Northern, Northern Pacific, Soo Line and Milwaukee — that serviced North Dakota.

That first stag was a real "boomer" and paved the way for an annual Extension Stag. Attendance increased year by year as other USDA agencies' workers attended and many other agribusinesses were admitted as sponsors. It outgrew the Powers' Blue Room and moved to such places as the Fargo Knights of Columbus Hall, the Eagles Hall, the Silver Moon Club at Moorhead, the Moorhead Country Club and the American Legion Club before settling down at the Bowler in the late 1960's.

One of the special treats at the stag has been the smoked fish originally arranged for by Paul Wagner of the Great Northern Railroad and more recently by
Rudy Gustafson and Royal Bertsler from Ottertail Power Company.

Although the stag may get a bit noisy with several hundred people all talking at the same time it served its purpose well. It has helped to preserve old friendships with retired Extension and USDA agency workers and helped to establish a closer relationship among all USDA agencies serving this area and agribusiness representatives.

Equal opportunity proponents in the late 1970's campaign for inclusion of Extension women workers at the stag and attendance of a few of the braver ones was welcomed. However, after sampling the atmosphere they lost their enthusiasm and stag sponsors have subsequently sponsored a ladies night held at the same time but at a different place as the men's stag. However, the April 1986 stag was an all Extension Stag and the Extension ladies were welcomed and their company much enjoyed.

NO QUESTIONS ASKED

County agents are often expected to be jacks-of-all-trades and masters of many. They have been asked to answer questions and to perform many unexpected duties. The following related incidents illustrate some experiences which were unusual and did actually happen. Persons involved are all long gone from North Dakota.

A farm lady came to a county agent's office in the early 1930's. He had known her husband for some time but did not know her. She said to the county agent, "Mr. County Agent, you are a smart man and you have helped papa (her husband) with lots of things. Now I have a question for you. How can I get a girl? We have six boys and papa has lots of help with his work but I don't have any help with my work. We can't have more than one more child and I want a girl."

The county agent was somewhat embarrassed but he answered, "Well, I don't know much about people but if it was farm animals I'd tell the farmer to change sires."

About a year later that lady came back to the county agent's office with a baby in her arms and she said, "Mr. County Agent, you are a smart man. We got a girl."

No questions were asked.

AND THEY "HIGHBALED" IT ON ITS WAY

Everyone seemed to be afraid of "Hiball Hank," an 80 year old retired railroad engineer who had homesteaded in western North Dakota and lived in a windowless granary with his dog. He had no electricity or running water but he did have the biggest mountain of old iron in western North Dakota. It was 1942 and the wartime scrap metal drive was on. "Hiball" loved every ounce of that old iron and wasn't about to sell it to anyone. He had a shotgun and a rifle handy at all times and had all junk dealers and salvage yardmen afraid of him. They reported him to the state salvage chairman and he in turn informed the State Federal Marshall.

The Marshall visited the local sheriff's office and proposed arresting "Hiball" and it took much persuasion before he would agree to give the sheriff a few days to handle the situation and get that iron moving.

The sheriff knew that the county agent was well acquainted with "Hiball" and asked him to see what he could do. The county agent took a 16 year old 4-H boy with him and went to visit "Hiball." Word had just been received that a local boy had been killed in WWII and that started the conversation. That led to war shortages and what was necessary to fight the war and before long "Hiball" was ready to do his full part. A community scrap drive was quickly organized starting at his farm and more than 500 tons of scrap iron was hauled from there by volunteer neighbors. That gave impetus to a successful county-wide salvage program and "Hiball" was a hero instead of a villain.

E.T.O. AND J.D. MAY NOT SOUND LIKE MUCH, BUT FAILURE TO KNOW THEM MAY GET ONE IN DUTCH

One of the first requirements for conducting well organized Extension programs is for all Extension workers to know their job responsibilities and how they relate to each other. That starts with a job description for each Extension position and orientation of each worker to the overall function as a team with cooperative working responsibilities between state, area and county staff members. All workers must know and honor the job responsibilities of co-workers as well as to perform their own. County staff chairmen, District Directors and Specialist Section Heads are responsible for coordinating work between work units and maintaining smooth working relationships.
WHO WAS WHERE AND WHEN AND THEIR MOVEMENTS NOW AND THEN?

"Pioneer" is defined by "Webster" with several different meanings and at least four of them well describe the early North Dakota Better Farming Agents and County Extension Agents.

1. To open and prepare for others to follow.
2. To originate or take part in the development of a new thought, method or kind of work.
3. A plant or animal capable of establishing itself in a barren environment.
4. One of the first to work or settle in a territory.

Singly or together those four definitions envision a fresh young person ready to confront all hazards and uncertainties of a new endeavor. But youthful exuberance along with a need to eat probably were major issues for those young college graduates looking for their first job.

Most of that first group of Better Farming Agents were from Minnesota and Iowa which states were much more domesticated than North Dakota was in 1912. Parts of western North Dakota then were still open for homesteading and a pioneer atmosphere prevailed throughout the state. Among pioneers the hardy ones survived and that first group of eighteen agents hired in 1912 was a hardy group with only four dropouts in their first two years.

At the end of 1913 there were twenty-five Better Farming Agents in North Dakota and they were supported primarily by business interests and private subscriptions. When Cooperative Extension took over in 1914 much of those funds were discontinued and both county and state funds were slow in being appropriated. Consequently, by the end of 1916 there were county Extension agents in only sixteen counties which were widely dispersed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adams</th>
<th>Cavalier</th>
<th>Morton</th>
<th>Stutsman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>Dickey</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>Towner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>Ransom</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottineau</td>
<td>McKenzie</td>
<td>Steele</td>
<td>Williams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven of those sixteen counties have had a county Extension agent continuously since their first agent braved their borders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barnes</th>
<th>1912</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dickey</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stutsman</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towner</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County Extension staffs, Extension specialists and others are listed in this report without many of their intermediate titles. Titles such as county agent at large, assistant county agent and associate county agent have been used as much for budget management as for job performance. Many county agents at large and assistant county agents during orientation and training, have been transferred several times before being assigned to an associate or county agent position. There is some overlapping of dates and locations. Date of actually starting work and date of federal appointment are generally not the same and that required intermittent timeslip appointments which may not appear in the permanent records.

Much can be learned from personnel listings at the end of this story. World War I and post War adjustments, government livestock buying programs, feed loans, seed loans, enactment of the federal Agricultural Adjustment program, World War II, Farm and Home Development, Rural Development and other designated emergency programs each injected new responsibilities. Staff size increased and decreased with each new program and conclusion of each program.

Local county support and tenure of county agent has varied greatly between counties. Donald Hotchkiss, Williams County Agent for 38 years, 1943-1981, has had longest tenure of any county agent in one county. Since June 16, 1913 when Evan Hall became Williams County Agent only five agents have held that position with respective tenures of 5, 8, 16, 38 and 5 years for the present county agent, Warren Froelich.

Walter Mattson, Golden Valley County Agent since 1951, has 35 years tenure in that county and is still going strong. His office secretary, Dorothy Stolberg, tops all records with 40 years of service in that same office.

Six counties had no county agent until sometime after August 12, 1933 when agents were appointed to organize for and administer the AAA wheat program. Sheridan County was one of those counties and in contrast to Williams County, ten different county agents have enjoyed work in that county with tenures of about 3, 14, 1, 3, 3, 7, 5, 8, 3 and 6 years for the present agent.

Several counties with larger than average populations have been used as training areas for prospective county agents. That is reflected in the large number of county agents at large and assistant county agents listed for Barnes, Burleigh, Cass, Grand Forks, Ramsey, Ward and possibly some other counties.

Extension county home economists are listed in records by several different titles including home demonstration agent, county home agent, Extension
home economist and associate county agent. Earliest records for county home economists indicate that sixteen women were hired in 1917 during WWI and they were called Emergency Home Demonstration Agents. Most of them were employed for only about six months but some stayed for as much as three years.

Listing of Extension staff members as to titles, relative staff positions and working relationships presents some problems of protocol. Available records are very incomplete in that respect. Extension workers must be "thick skinned" to survive and protocol is not a strong issue among them but an apology is made for any title mistakes or omissions in these listings.

Listings includes primarily only those who have had a professional appointment and professional responsibility for that position. All persons listed during their tenure have had several back up people such as clerks, stenographers, and secretaries to assist them and the services of these people have been invaluable. Many of the back-up people had short tenure but also may have served for 20 to 40 years or more.

Space does not allow for listing of their names but they are not forgotten. A few are listed here to testify to their service.

Joey Dahl started as home economics staff stenographer on September 10, 1928. She moved to become Extension bookkeeper and auditor and retired on June 30, 1963. Joey's records were so clear and accurate that not even Governor Langer's purging robots could find a suspicious misplaced penny.

Doris Nelson started as 4-H stenographer on July 7, 1941 and moved to become Extension stenographer-auditor. She retired June 30, 1977.

Harriet Rehn was Extension's untiring mimeograph operator from December 4, 1942 through June 30, 1972. After those nearly 30 years of service she continued work at that same spot for another ten years but under the University payroll. She retired June 30, 1982.

Dorothy Stolberg knows just about everyone in Golden Valley County. She started as the county agent's secretary in 1946 and is still going strong.

Alice Johansen started as secretary for M. S. Burke in Stutsman County in 1953 and is presently keeping a fourth Stutsman County agent up-to-date.

Vernice Hughes Johnson started work as secretary for Kidder County Agent, Alfred Bye, in 1957. She moved on to become secretary for the county agent leader and district supervisors at Fargo and is presently secretary for the home economics staff.

Jean Sorelie has ruled over the 4-H literature supply for about 25 years.

Lydia Matson was secretary for the Ward County Agent from April 1940 through October 31, 1946. She moved to Fargo and became secretary for Director's Haslerud, Schulz and Johnsrud before retiring in 1976.

Many pages of similar back-up service could be written. Four file's drawers at the state office and many others in county offices are filled with service records of such supportive staff members.