

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search http://ageconsearch.umn.edu aesearch@umn.edu

Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C. NORTH SCOTLAND COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE OF

AGRICULT O-S AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT

> ECONOMIC REPORT NO. 9 SILAGE COSTS 1948

> > BY

J. CLARK.

Albert D. Imper, M.B.E., B.Sc. (Agr.), M.S. (Econ.), Ph.D., N.D.A., Provincial Agricultural Economist.

G. G. Hayes, B.Sc. (Econ.), N.D.A., Senior Agricultural Economist.

J. Clark, B.Sc. (Agr.), N.D.A.) Agricultural Economists. V. Baker, B.Sc. (Econ.)

D. Heggie, B.Sc.(Agr.)) Assistants. D. Godfrey, B.Sc.(Agr.))

G. Cowie) Accountants. W. A. Duthie)

June, 1949.

SILAGE COSTS 1948

An investigation into the cost of making silage, including both grass and arable, was carried out in 1948 on 23 farms spread over the North of Scotland. The total acreage involved was $476\frac{1}{2}$ acres.

In the following costs, overhead charges have been calculated according to the methods agreed on by a committee of Scottish Agricultural Economists, while residual manurial values are based on tables issued by the Department of Agriculture for Scotland. Unproductive work and lost time are taken care of partly in the overhead charges and partly by increasing the cost per man hour which has been taken at 2/5. Horse work is costed at 1/4 per hour, wheeled tractors at 3/6 and track-layers 5/-. The tonnage of silage produced per acre was arrived at by averaging the farmers estimate with the measured cubic content of the silo.

GRASS SILAGE

In the case of silage made from grass, there was difficulty in estimating the amount to be placed against the grazing of the aftermath and in order to make for uniformity the following proportions were taken:-

Grass cut at hay stage - $\frac{1}{3}$ cost of grass to grazing

very young $-\frac{1}{2}$

cut twice $-\frac{1}{4}$

The cost of laying down the grass was based on investigations carried out by this Department over the last few years.

17 farmers completed the necessary records giving a total of 428 acres.

- In 14 cases the grass was cut once.
- In 3 cases the grass was cut twice.

In 9 cases mainly man power was used at harvest.

In 8 cases mainly mechanisation was used at harvest.

Details are given in Table I of the average cost of silage made from grass cut once and Table II cut twice.

TABLE I GRASS SILAGE .

Average Cost per Acre, one cut

		Av	erage Acr	e			Construction of the second		
	urs	Cost			Hours	3	Cost		
	Man	Horse	Tractor	£s.	d.	Man	Horse	Tractor	£ s. d.
Rolling & Sowing Manure	1.23	.13	• 74-	-: 5:	9				
Cutting, Carting, filling and covering	18.27	1.34	6.88	3:10:	7				-
	19.50	1.47	7.62	3:16:	4				
Proportion of cost of layi	ng down	ı grass		1: -:	5				
Rent				1: -:	-				
Manure				2:5:	7				
Miscellaneous Charges				-: 1:	11				
Overhead Costs				2:16:	10		•		
Net Residual Manurial Valu	e B/F			1:1:	10	, t	-		
Gross	Cost pe	er Acre		12:2:	11		•		
Less Net Residual Manuria	l Value	→ C/F	•	-:14:	2	- N	• .		
Aftermath Grazing C	/F			2:6:	5		4		
Net Co	st per	Acre		9:2:	4		1. •		
	•						- - -		
Average weight	acre	3 <u>1</u> to	ons				tons		
Average	cost r	per ton		2:12:	1	-		• •	

Highest cost per acre £13: 4/4 Lowest £5: 8/9Highest cost per ton £ 5: 6/11 Lowest £1: 2/-

-2-

TABLE II GRASS SILAGE

-3-

Average Cost per Acre - two cuts

	Average Acre					Your Acre					
		Но	urs	Cost			Hours	S	Cos	+;	
	Man	Horse	Tractor	£ s.	d.	Man	Horse	Tractor	£s	. d	
Rolling & Sowing Manure	3,05	• 38	1.02	-:11:	5						
Cutting, Carting, filling and covering	31.54	1.54.	10.21	5:13:	5	•					
	34. 59	1.92	11.23	6:4:	10 ·						
Proportion of cost of lay	ing dow	n grass		-:18:	6			2	• • •		
Rent				-:18:	.7				به ۱۹۰۱ ۱۹۹۱		
Manure	•			1:12:	5	••••••	•	· ·			
Miscellaneous Charges				-: -:	-		•	×			
Overhead Costs				3:15:	-			4. 			
Net Residual Manurial Val	ues B/	F		1: -:	8						
Gros	s Cost	per Acr	·e	14:10:	-	•)		*	
Less Net Residual Manuri	al Valu	e C/F		-:10:	4			•		•	
Aftermath Grazing	C/F			1:13:	9	•	а. — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —				
Net	Cost pe	r Acre		12:5:	11					alaine paramentana 12, manta 19 June - June	
Average weight o	of silag	ge per a	lere	. 7	tons					tons	
Average	cost pe	r ton	19	1:15:	2						

Highest cost per Acre £16: 6/1 Lowest £9: 14/6

4

If a farmer makes his silage mainly by man power, he will have a large number of man hours per acre, but this may not have any great practical significance with regard to cost, provided he did the whole job using only his basic staff. In such a case his total wage bill for the year will not be increased. On the other hand a saving in man hours, by mechanisation will be lost unless the time saved is put to useful purpose.

It was found on enquiry that in no case did silage making clash severely with other peak labour periods on the farm and in most cases came between such periods. This "spread over" of labour requirement is of great benefit.

Harvesting methods and hours of work have been set out in Tables III, IV and V (on the opposite page) where it can be seen that the average weight of grass per acre cut once and using man power (Table III) was 4 tons. In Table IV where mechanisation was used the weight of grass was 3 tons. This would indicate that farmers who rely on man power are cutting their grass at a later stage in its growth compared to farmers who are mechanised. This is borne out by the analysis of the silage. The average protein content of samples taken from all silage in Table III was 12%, while it was 17% in the case of Table IV. Short grass is very difficult to pick up by hand methods so that it is evident that the man with the machine tends to make a higher quality product.

The man hours per acre in Tables III and IV are practically the same, so that it would appear that mechanisation in these cases was carried out, not so much from the point of view of reducing the <u>hours</u> of work, but to reduce the <u>burden</u> of work and this would be especially so if the grass was cut at an early stage. It must be noted however, that the man hour requirement depends, <u>amongst</u> other factors, upon the distance of the field from the silo. In the case of Farm No. 8 the haul was over one mile, also in the case of Farm 6 the distance for half the crop was considerable. In all other cases the distance could be described as moderate to very short.

Another point to notice is that with the smaller weight of young grass in Table IV (compared to Table III) the cost per ton has more than proportionally increased compared to costs per acre. This increased cost is compensated by increased protein content.

-4-

TABLE III

-5-

Farm	Acres	Harvesting Method	Man Hou Harves per acre	rs - ting per ton	Yield tons per acre	Total Net Cost of Finished Product per acre per ton			
1 2 3 4 5 6	12 19 24 36 10 10	Mower, rake & man power do. do. do. do. Binder & Man Power	2014 355 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 13	5 <u>34141</u> 2 8 3 2 2 <u>34</u> 5 34	4-4-1001401410 24-4-5-22 30	£9. 5. 4 11.19. 1 10.14. 5 6. 2.11 6.14. 9 7. 4. 6	£2. 6. 4 2.16. 3 2. 7. 8 1. 1. 4 2. 9 2. 1. 4		
Avera	ge		18 <u>1</u>	4 <u>3</u>	4.	8.13. 6	2. 3. 8		

Harvesting mainly by MAN POWER: one cut of grass

Average cost of Labour (Man, horse & tractor) per acre £3.12. 6 Average protein content of dry matter in silage 12%

TABLE IV

Harvesting mainly MECHANISED: one cut of grass

Farm	Acres	Harvesting Method	Man Hou <u>Harves</u> per a c re	rs - ting per ton	Yield tons per acre	Total Ne of Finishe per acre	t Cost d Product per ton
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	32 25 23 76 28 62 11 14	Green crop loader Green crop loader Green crop loader Cutlift Cutlift ¹ / ₂ Cutlift; ¹ / ₂ G.C.Loader Buckrake Buckrake	$\begin{array}{c} 22^{1}_{43}_{43}_{43}_{43}_{43}_{43}_{43}_{43$	4 94994994 722 3 10394-10 7 4 5	5 2 1 5 2 3 1 2	£11. 6. 2 10. 5. 8 7.17. 3 9. 9 11. 4. 6 13. 4. 4 5. 8. 9 6.14.11	£2. 1. 2 4.11. 5 5. 4.10 1.17.10 5.12. 3 3.10. 6 3.12. 6 2.14
Avera	ıge		18 <u>3</u>	6 <u>3</u>	3	9. 8.10	3.13. 1

Average cost of labour (man, horse & tractor) per acre £3.19. 2 Average protein content of dry matter in silage 17%

TABLE V

Harvesting, mainly by can power, two cuts off one field

Farm	Acres	Harvesting Method	Man Hours	- Harvesting 2nd cut	Total net cost of Finished Product
15 16 17	20 4 22	Mower, Rake & Man Power do. do.	13 25 <u>1</u> 94	10 242 124	£10.17. 1 16. 6. 1 9.14. 6
	Average)	16	15 <u>1</u>	£12. 5.11

ARABLE SILAGE

Six farmers completed their records and Table VI gives details of the average cost.

The seed used was mixed grain and pulses. Only two silos were analysed, the percentage of crude protein in the dry matter being 14% in each case.

		. :	AVERAGE	COST						
		Aver	age Acr	е		· .	:			
	Hours			Cost	Hours			Cost		
	Man	Horse	Tractor	£. s. d.	Man	Horse	Tractor	£.	s.	đ.
Ploughing	2.76	-	2.76	16. 4						N
Other Cultivations	1.64	.22	1.38	9. 1		,				
Sowing Seed, Manure & Dung	13.17	4.57	1.51	2. 3. 3						
Cutting, Carting, filling, covering	33.75	5.18	8.93	5.19. 3	· · ·					
	51.32	9.97	14.58	9. 7.11						
Rent				111						
Seed			n K	4.10						
Manure				5.19. 2			•			
Miscellaneous Charges	• •	· ·		8. 7						
Overhead Costs				5. 6		•				
Net Residual Manurial Values	B/F		· •.	1. 1. 1			н Н			•
Gr	ross Co	st per	Acre	27.13. 8						
Less Residual Manurial Value	3.11.5		n An An An A	The summer of the second						
		· ·		24. 2. 3		•				
Average Weight of s	8 ¹ / ₂ tons		·			t	ons			
Averag	ge Cost	per t	on	3. 6					•••••	
	 	1					-			

TABLE VI ARABLE SILAGE

Highest Cost per acre £31.15/5Lowest £14. 5/1per ton £5.15/6£2. 8/4

-6-

The Following Table gives further details of individual cases.

Farm No.	Acres	Harvesting Methods	Man Hour: Harv per acre	s - esting per ton	Yield tons per acre	Total Net Finished per acre	Cost of Product per ton
18	5	Mower & Man power unchopped, silo in field	36 <u>1</u>	44	812	£26.9.5	£3. 2. 3
19	9	Mower & Man power Chopped, silo at steading	31 <u>1</u>	44	7 <u>1</u>	£18.5.3	2. 8. 8
26	. 8	Mower & Man power Chopped, pit at steading	46 <u>7</u>	4 <u>3</u>	10	24.18. 7	2. 9.10
21	10	Binder & Man Power Unchopped, pit at steading	41 <u>3</u>	31	12	28.19. 7	2. 8. 4
22	12	Cutlift Unchopped pit at steading	35	6 <u>1</u>	5 <u>1</u>	31.15.5	5.15.6
23	4 <u>1</u> 42	Buckrake Unchopped pit at steading	10 <u>1</u>	2 <u>3</u> 24	4.	14. 5. 1	3.11. 3
Av	erage		33 <u>1</u>	4 <u>1</u>	7 <u>1</u>	24. 2. 3	3. 6

TABLE VII Harvesting Arable Silage

In the above record the chopping does not appear to add unduly to the man hours. The reason put forward was that uncut mashlum is very rank and difficult to pack, whereas chopped material does not require so much consolidating.

The records in this report as a whole, show that there is a wide divergence of methods used in harvesting and making silage, but they do not show the great variations which were employed by farmers using the same basic method, namely by hand or by the same machine. It is obvious that there is much investigation to be done in order to eliminate wasteful systems in cutting, carting and filling the silo. With costs continually rising this factor of internal work organisation on the farm is becoming of ever increasing importance.

The Economics Department of the North of Scotland College of Agriculture is very grateful to all farmers who assisted by keeping records and it is hoped that by their continued co-operation it will be possible to produce further reports which may be of interest and assistance.