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The present campaign for increased production of home-fed beef has focussed attention on the economics of the enterprise. A considerable body of data has been collected on the profitability of keeping and feeding store cattle, but information on the cost of producing these store animals is limited. During the year of 1948-49, however, the Economics Department carried out an investigation into the cost of breeding and rearing calves up to the age of six or seven months old, and the results obtained are given in this report.

Six groups, totalling 108 cows of the Cross-Shorthorn beef class were recorded.

Three of these groups are situated in Caithness, one in Easter Ross, and two in Aberdeenshire.

The cows were kept solely for the purpose of producing calves, and therefore the cost of the calf, up to the time it is weaned, will be the cost of keep of the cow for the year. . All the calves were reared by the normal method of suckling the cow, and no attempt was made or was necessary to measure the milk consuned. The systems of management employed, and the farming district in which each group is situated, vary considerably, so that average figures would be of little practical significance. For this reason, the individual results of each farm are show. The first part of this report deals with the cost of keeping a cow through the winter and sumner.

## VINTER PERIOD

Information ras obtained of the type and quantity of food consurned, the labour expended on the cors and any other charges attributable to them. The winter period extended from the date the cows were taken inside in the auturn of 1948 , to approximately the end of April when they went out to grass. The values of the home-grow foods used, have been taken at cost of production, determined from the 1948 Crop Report issued by this Department, and are as follows:-

| Turmips | $39 / 6$ per ton | Straw | $38 / 1$ per ton |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Hay | $127 /-$ per ton | Oats | $12 / 3$ per cwt. |

The cost per hour of the cattleman on each farm, was calculated from the actual wage paid including perquisites, and the number of hours worked per week. The range was from $1 / 10 \frac{1}{2}$ to $2 / 5$ per man-hour.

A charge for overhead costs was allowed for on the basis of $5 / 3$ per $£$ of man-labour expended on the cows, as recomended by the Conference of Scottish Agricultural Economists.

The cost of keeping a cow for one week during the winter, on each farm is shown in Table I.
TABLE I COST OF KEEPING A COW PER WEEK - WINTER

| Farm | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | s. do | s. d. | s. d. | s. d. | s. d. | s. d. |
| Turnips | 6. 3 | 2. 6 | 8. 3 | 8. 5 | 10. $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 8. - |
| Straw - Total | 3. 6 | 1. $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 2. 3 | 2. - | 4. 4 | 3.10 |
| Hay | -. - | -. 9 | -. - | -. - | 2. 9 | . |
| Oats | -. | $1.11 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1. 1 | 4. $-\frac{1}{2}$ | -. $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | -. 3 |
| Other Foods | -- | -. 1 | -. - | -- - | -. - | -. - |
| Total Hone-Grom Foods | 9. 9 | 6. 9 | 11. 7 | 14.. $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 17. 7 | 12. 1 |
| Add Purchased Foods | -- |  | -. - | -- | -. $7 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| Total Foods | 9. 9 | 6. 9 | 11. 7 | 14. $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 18. $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 12. 1 |
| Add Man Labour | 1. $6 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1. 9 | 1. $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3. 4 | 4. 1 | 3. 8 |
| Horse Labour | -. - | -. 2 | -. - | -. - | -. - | . - |
| Miscellaneous | -. 1 | -. - | -. - | -. $-\frac{1}{2}$ | -. - | -. $-\frac{1}{4}$ |
| Overhead Costs | -. 5 | -. 7 | -. 4 | -. $10 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1. $6 \frac{1}{2}$ | -. 6 |
| Gross Cost | 11. $9 \frac{1}{2}$ | 9. 3 | 13. $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 18. $8 \frac{1}{2}$ | £1.3.10 | 16. $3 \frac{1}{4}$ |
| Less Resid.Man. Values | 2. 5 | -. 8 | 1. 9 | 2. - | $3.10 \frac{1}{2}$ | 2. $2 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Net Cost per Cow per Week | 9. $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 8. 7 | 11. $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 16. $8 \frac{1}{2}$ | $19.11 \frac{1}{2}$ | 14. $-\frac{3}{4}$ |

The range of cost per cow is considerable frow $8 / 7$ to $19 / 11 \frac{1}{2}$. The lowest cost occurred on a Caithness farm - Farm 2 - where the cows were tumed out on hill-grazing during the day and taken inside at night. This practice was continued, with straw given as supplementary feeding, until February. Thereafter turnips and hay were also fed. The cost of this winter grazing is charged as under Other Foods, and the cost of horse labour - $1 / 4$ per hour - was incurred while carting out the straw. Farn 5 alone used purchased feeding-stuff which was fed during the last three months the cows were inside.

On the farm where the greatest cost per week was incurred the largest quantity of turnips was fed per cow. This is illustrated in Table II where the quantities of food fed and man hours expended, are given.

TABLE II
MANHOURS AND QUANTITY OF FOOD TED - HUNDREDVEIGHTS
PER COW PER WEEK

| Farm | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Turnips | 3.12 | 1.24 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 5.06 | 2.58 |
| Hay | - | . 12 | - | - | . 43 | - |
| Straw | 1.86 | . 75 | 1.18 | 1.04 | 2.24 | 1.37 |
| Oats | - | . 16 | . 09 | . 33 | . 03 | . 01 |
| Other Foods | - | Grazing | - | - | . 03 | - |
| Total | 4.98 | 2.27 | 5.38 | 5.58 | 7.79 | 3.96 |
| Man-hours | . 84 | . 80 | . 64 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.5 |

Farm 2 where the cows had winter grazing, used the least amount of turnips, and had the lowest cost per week. There appears to be a relationship between the cost per week, the quantity of turnips fed and the man hours per animal per week. The latter can be seen to vary to some extent with the total weight of food consuned.

The cost per cow for the winter period only, is shom in the Table below, together with the average duration of the period on each farm.

TABLE III COST PER COW - MITVTFR PERIOD

| Farn | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nunber of Weeks <br> Cost per Cow <br> for Winter | 25.2 | 25.8 | 26.0 | 25.4 | 19.4 | 27.0 |

The average winter period extended to 25 weeks. Farm 5 had the shortest duration of the six groups and this in some measure counteracted this farm's high weekly cost.

## SUMMER PERIOD

The winter period ended when the cows were put out to grass, at the end of April and beginning of May. Records were kept throughout the sumer of the number and type of stock grazing on the farm, up to the date the cows were taken inside again for the winter. The sumer period extended on the average to 25 weeks and ended generally about mid-October.

The number of days grazing of each type of stock was calculated and converted to a comon unit so that each animal might bear a proportionate share of the grazing cost. The scale of units used is given overleaf.

| 1 unit $=$ | 1 Horse |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 1 Cow |
|  | 1 Bull |
|  | 1 2-yr. old Bullock |
|  | 2 Young Horses |
|  | 2 Young Cattle |
|  | 7 Breeding Sheep |
|  | 14 Other Sheep. |

Calves born in the spring have not boen included since they would still be suckling the cows. In the case of young laribs, allowance was made only after the 1 st August, and the scale uscd was 14 lambs $=1$ unit.

Fach field grazed on each farm was costed separately so that variations in the age and manurial treatment of the grass throughout the rotation could be taken into account. The majority of the ficlds trore rotation leys of three or four years duration, but on all but one of the forms older pasture mas also utilised. On one farm in Caithness the covs had the range of 600 acres of hill land, on which the cost of grazing is very low. This is explained on observing the factoris included in the calculation of the grazing cost of one acre. The figures used in Table IV are averages.

TABIE IV AVERAGE GRAZING COST PER ACRE

| Rent | -.16. 3 | 21\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proportion of Laying dom cost | -.13.11 | 18 |
| Man Labour | -. 1. 9 | 2.1 |
| Horse Labour | -. -- | - |
| Tractor Labour | -. 1. 5 | 2 |
| Manures Applied | 1.1.- | 27.1 |
| Residual Manurial Values $\operatorname{B/P}$ 1.17.5 |  |  |
| Less $6 / F$ 1. 6.11 | -.10. 6 | 13.5 |
| Overhoad Charges | $-12.8$ | 16.3 |
| Gross Cost | 3.17.6 | 100.0 |
| Less $2 / 3$ of Cost renoved by Hay where aftermath is grazed | -.5.2 |  |
| Net Cost | 3.12. 4 |  |

On old pasture, residual manurial values and establishnent charges are quite small, while on hill land they are non-existent. Since the proportion of laying dom cost and manurial residues amount to an appreciable percentage of the cost per acre, it follows that on the above types of grazing the grazing cost is comparatively low.

The total grazing cost of each farm was then allocated according to the number of livestock unit grazing days and the cost per aninal per week ascertained.

Table $V$ shows the cost per cor for one weck on the grass.
TABLE V - COST OF KEEPING A COM PER MEEK - SUMMER

| Farra | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grazing Cost | $2 / 11$ | $1 / 5$ | $6 / 6$ | $1 / 10$ | $3 / 4$ | $1 / 6$ |
| Man Labour | $-/ 2$ | $-/ 10 \frac{1}{2}$ | $-/ 4$ | $-/ 6$ | $-/ 1 \frac{1}{2}$ | - |
| Miscellaneous | - | - | - | $-/ 1$ | - | - |
| Overhead Charges | $-/-\frac{1}{2}$ | $-/ 3$ | $-/ 1$ | $-/ 1 \frac{1}{2}$ | $-/-\frac{1}{2}$ | - |
| Net Cost per Week | $3 / 1 \frac{1}{2}$ | $2 / 6 \frac{1}{2}$ | $6 / 11$ | $2 / 6 \frac{1}{2}$ | $3 / 6$ | $1 / 6$ |

Overhead charges were again made, as in the winter cost on each $£$ of direct man-labour on the cows. The cost of labour was incurred by the daily inspection of the cows while grazing. No figures were obtained for this on Farm 6. Farm 2 where the cows were grazing on hill-land had the cheapest grazing at $1 / 5$ per week for each cow. Farn 6, however, although the grazing was largely rotational ley, carried a heavy stocking per acre with the result that the cost was also low. The highest cost occurred on Famn 3, where the number of stock carricd per acre was lower than on the other farms of the sample. The cost per cow for the sumer and also for the complete year are tabulated in the following table.

TABLE VI - COST PER CON - SUNER PERIOD AND YEAR

| Farm | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of weeks grazing <br> Cost for sumaer period <br> Cost for winter period | 26.2 | 23.4 | 26.3 | 24.9 | 26.3 | 22.5 |

The cost per cow for the sumer period amplifies the differences already seen in the weekly cost. The total cost for the year shows a range of fron $£ 14.1 /-$ to £24. 7. 9 per cow - the average being £20.11/-. Farm 2 as expected, has the lowest cost, but the economical winter feeding of Farm 1 is reflected in the total cost.

It will be noted that no allowance has been made for depreciation on the cow. This has been onitted for two reasons (a) the breeding life of the cow is long and (b) the price reccived when the animal is sold is relatively high. The annual depreciation would therefore be quite small.

## BULL SERVICE CHARGE

On the farns where a bull was kept, similar records and information as that obtained for the cows were got. The total cost of keep of the bull was calculated in the same way as has previously been explained, with the addition of the yearly depreciation of the bull. The total cost, thus ascertained, was
then divided by the number of aninals served, and a charge per cow found. These costs are sumarised in Table VII.

TABLE VII - SWHVICE CHARGE PER CON

| Farn | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nuriber of Bulls | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Cost of Keep - Winter <br> Cost of Keep - Sumer <br> Depreciation on Bull | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{rrr} £ 12 . & 1 . & 7 \\ 4 . & 2 . & 2 \\ 8 . & 8 . & - \end{array}\right.$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{r} £ 29.18 . \\ 2.19 . \\ 19 . \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{rrr} £ 24 . & 15 \cdot & 1 \\ 9 \cdot & 1.11 \\ +2 . & -. & -1 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{rrr} £ 20 & 7 . & 1 \\ 3 & 1 . & 6 \\ 22 & - & -. \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{r} £ 1.17 .10 \\ 4 . \end{array} \frac{-.}{}-$ |
| Total Cost of Bull <br> No. of animals served. | $\begin{gathered} 24.11 .9 \\ 32 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51.18 .3 \\ 50 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 31.17 . \\ 20 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45 \cdot 8 \cdot 7 \\ 23 \cdot \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 79. } 3.10 \\ 37 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Costs per Animal | 15/5 | 20/9 | $31 / 10$ | 39/6 | 42/10 |

Farr 5 has been excluded from the above table since the bull used, was hired at a charge of $10 /-$ per cow. Total figures for each period only are given. The range in cost of service is considerable - fron $15 / 5$ to $42 / 10$. On Fam 1 the cost of winter keep is low in comparison with the other fams, and at the other extrene the standard of feeding, on Farms 2 and 6, during the winter is very high. On Farm 2, £29.18. 9 was the cost incurred for the wintering of one buil and on Farri 6 two bulls cost $£ 61.17 .10$ or £30.18.11 each for the same period. In the former casc this high cost is offset by the number of cows served, but on the latter fam only 37 were kept so that the cost per cow was very high.

Depreciation was calculated from the buying price, estimated or actual solling price and the average nuraber of years retained. Appreciation of $£ 2$ occurred on Farn 3, where the price received when the animal was sold exceeded the buying proice.

BREEDING AND REARIIVG COST OF CALVES
The foregoing illustrates the total cost and bull service charge of a coir for one year, and since the cows were kept for no other puipose thon the production of calves, the cost per calf bom and reared can now be deterimed.

The nunaber of calves covered by this investigation is as follows:-

| Births | 98 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Transfers to Cows | 12 |  |
| Purchases | 16 | 126 |
| Sales | 1 |  |
| Deaths | 3 | $\underline{4}$ |
| Total nuaber reared |  |  |
|  |  | $=122$ |

The "transfers to Cows" arose where other calves borm on the farm were reared by the cows.

Analysis of the calving dates show that the majority of the cows calved from February to April.


The net cost per calf shom in Table VIII refers to each calf borm and reared by the cows. Thus, transfers of other calves to be reared by the cows, and any calves purchased have been excluded.

## TABLE VIII - COST PER HOME-BRED CALF REARED

| Farm | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nuriber of Cous <br> Total Winter Cost <br> Total Sumaer Cost <br> Service Charge | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline 20 \\ £ 236.7 .10 \\ 69.8 .8 \\ 15.8 .4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\left.\begin{gathered} 9 \\ \text { €99.17. } 6 \\ 26.15 .11 \\ 9.6 .9 \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ \text { \&266. } 3.6 \\ 163.12 .6 \\ 28.13 .- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ £ 532.3 .2 \\ 72.16 .- \\ 43.9 .- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ £ 193.9 .10 \\ 36.16 . \\ 3 .-1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ 54 .-. \\ 55.13 .8 \\ \$ 58.59 \\ \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Cost of Cows <br> Less sale of suckling calves <br> Add Food to calves | 321. 4.10 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ccc}136 . & 2 \\ - \\ -\end{array}\right.$ | 458. 9. -1 | 648. 8. 2 5. -. - - | $\begin{gathered} 233.5 .10 \\ - \\ 1.6 .8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 694: 19.9 \\ - \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Cost to Calves <br> No. of Calves Sold <br> Calves bom \& reared | $\begin{gathered} 321 . \end{gathered} 4.10$ | $\begin{gathered} 136 .-2 \\ - \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\text { 458. 9. } \begin{array}{r} - \\ - \\ 19 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 643 . \\ 1 \\ 21 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 234.12 .6 \\ - \\ 5 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 694.19 .9 \\ - \\ 24 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Cost per Calf bom and Reared | 18.17 .10 | 17. - - | 24. 2. 7 | 30.12. 9 | 46.18. 6 | 28.19. 2 |

Table VIII shows the cost per calf reared to the age of seven or eight nonths old. It will be seen that the total cost of keeping all the cows for the year has been charged to the calves, less the price received from the sale of suckling calves. On Farm 5, the cost of a small quantity of purchased food fed to the calves has been added. This farm shows the greatest cost per calf borm and reared and is entirely due to the high cost per cow in the winter. Fam 2 continues to have the lowest cost in the sample, but this position is altered in Table IX when calves, purchased and transferred in, are taken into account.

TABLE IX - COST PER CALF REARED

| Farm | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Calves Born \& Reared <br> Number Purchased <br> Number Transferred in | 17 7 5 | 8 | 19 - 1 | 21 2 - | 5 <br> 4 <br> - | $\begin{array}{r} 24 \\ 3 \\ 6 \end{array}$ |
| Total Colves Reared <br> Cost B/F from Table VIII <br> Cost of Purchased Calves <br> Value of Transfd. Calves <br> Food to Calves |  | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ 136 .--2 \\ - \\ - \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{cc} 20 \\ 4.58 . & 9 . \\ - \\ 7 . & - \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{\|ccc\|} \hline 23 \\ 643 . & 8 & 2 \\ 14 . & - & - \\ - & - \end{array}$ | $\left.\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 234.12 . \\ 22.4 . \\ - \\ 2.8 . \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ 694.19 \\ 15 . \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Cost to Calves <br> Cost per Reared Calf | $\begin{array}{r} 418.4 .10 \\ 14.8 .5 \end{array}$ | 136. -22 | 465. 9. -66 | 657. 8. 2 28.11. 8 | 259.4 .6 28.16 .1 | 751.19. 22.15. |

The purchase price of the bought-in calves has been added to the total cost brought forvard from Table VIII and is allocated over all the calves reared. The avcrage price paid was $£ 7.1 /-$ per calf. The calves transferred to the cows for rearing have been valued at $£ 7$ per head.

The calf subsidy during the period covered by this report anounted to $£ 4$ per bull calf and $£ 3$ per heifer calf. No credit has been made for this, since the object of this investigation is the determination of the total cost of production of calves. The costs per calf in Tables VIII and IX show the effect of rearing less than one and more than one calf per cow. For example, in Farm 1, 17 calves were borm and reared on 20 cows. The cost per calf was £18.17.10. Twelve more calves, however, waking a total of 29 calves, were purchased or transferred in, and also reared by the cows. The cost per calf was thus reduced to $\mathbb{E 1 4 .}$. 5. This figure is extrenely small in comparison with the other fams, and is largely accounted for in the low cost of the winter feeding of the cows. On Farm 5, the reduction in cost per calf is even greater - fron $£ 46.13 .2$ to $£ 28.16 .1$.

Although nine cors produced and reared only eight calves on Farm 2, the situation of the farm afforded hill-grazing throughout the sunner and part of the winter, resulting in low costs per cow and therefore low costs per calf. Five of the calves, on this farm, were sold in mid-October, at $£ 25$ each leaving a profit of $£ 8$ per head.

If this sum of $£ 25$ per head is taken as the estinated selling price of seven or eight month-old calves on all the farms in this survey, then on four farns the calves would show a profit and on Farms 4 and 5 they would show a loss. It is significant that on both these farms the standard of feeding and hours of the cattlenen during the winter were very high and therefore the cost per cor was also high.

The profitability of calf-rearing depends on two factors both of which can, to some extent, be varied by the farmer. They are, - (1) the standard of winterfeeding to the cows and (2) the number of calves reared per cow. There can be no question of cutting dorm the winter ration, for the sake of econony to the detriment of both the cow and the calf. Yet in many cases the standard of feeding is cquivalent to that of a feeding bullock, and is surely too high. The number of calves reared per cow appreciably affects the net cost per calf, but with the exceptions of Farm 1, where three calves were reared for every two cows, and. Farm 6 where four calves were put to three cows, only one calf was reared per cow in this survey. Unless the milking quality of the cow is poor, then the advantage of rearing an extra calf should be taken even at the expense of slightly curtailing the suckling period.

There are tro sources of supply of extra calves - the open market and feeding heifers fron which one calf is taken. This latter method of obtaining calves seens to be gaining in favour in this area, and the following illustrates the cost of this systen as it occurs on Parn 1.

## HEIFERS - CALVED AND FATTYNED

On Farm 1, twelve heifers wore recorded in the sane way as was done for the cows, throughout the year. These animals were bred on the farn and were in-calf when taken inside at 1 st Noveraber, 1948. Tro heifers, horever, were found during the winter, not to be in-calf and were graded as fint off the grass in mid-July. The remaning ten calved as follows:- Narch 3; April 4; Hay 3. Five heifers reared their om colves while the other five calves were reared by the cows, and appear in Table IX as being transferred in - Farm 1. These five heifers which did not rear their calves, grazed during the sumer and are being fattened off in the byre this winter.

The cost of keeping the heifers was calculated, using the sane standards and methods already explained. The cost per animal per week for both winter and sumer is sumarised in Table X.

Winter
Sumner

| Turnips | 3. $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{~d}$. | Grazing | 2.11d. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Straw | 3. 6 | Man-labour | -. 2 |
| Man-labour | 1. $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | Overheads | -. $-\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Overheads | -. 4 |  |  |
| Gross Cost | 8. 3 | Gross Cost | 3. $1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Less Manurial |  |  |  |
| Residues of Food | 2. 3 |  |  |
| Net Cost per Week | 6. - | Net Cost per | 3. $1 \frac{1}{2}$ |

The average length of the winter period was 26 weeks making the cost per heifer for that time $£ 7.16 /$-. The winter period ended on the 1 st 1 hy , when the heifers were put out to grass. The grazing period averaged 23.3 weeks per animal so that the sumer cost per heifer was £3.12. 9. The winter cost is low, since only turnips and straw were fed, with the result that the cost for the year £11. 8. 9 - is also very low. No difference was made in the ration to the ten in-calf heifers and the two not in-calf. The heifers were valued at 1 st Novenber - at $£ 32$ each, and the profitability of the two heifers sold fat can be determined. - They were sold on the 13 th July after grazing for 10.3 weeks.

| TABLE XI - PROFITABILITY OF | HEIFERS | SOLD FAT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Open Valuation |  | £32. -. - |
| Cost per Heifer - Winter |  | 7.16. - |
| Summer |  | 1.12. 2 |
| Bull Service Charge |  | - 5.9 |
| - |  | 4.1 .13 .11 |
| Average Selling Price |  | 52.16.9 |
| Net Margin per Heifer - Profit |  | £11. 2.10 |

Both animals graded out super-special at $9 \frac{1}{2}$ hundredweights, and the high profit of £11. 2.10. per head, is largely due to the exceptionally low cost of the winter feeding. The bull service charge has been included although no calf was born. The bull used was on loan from another farm all through the sumer only, so that the service charge per animal was arrived at by dividing the sumer cost of the bull - £4. 0.8 - by the total number of animals served. The number of animals was fourteen and the charge per animal, therefore, was 5/9d.

The result of the heifers which calved and are now being fattened is given overleaf, and is the cost per head up to the end of the sumaer grazing period.
TABTE XII - COST PER HEITER - INOT RWARIIVG CAIF
Opening Valuation $£$ \&32. -.

| Cost per Heifer - Winter | 7.16. - |
| :---: | :---: |
| Sumaer | 4.1.3 |
| Bull Service Charge | -. 5. 9 |
| Gross Cost | 44.3. - |
| Less Value of Calf Transferred to Cows | 7.-- |
| Cost of Heifer at 1st Novenber, 1949 | £37. 3. - |

The value of the calf, transferred to the cows for rearing and taken at $£ 7$ per head, has been deducted fron the gross cost of the heifer. The resulting net cost of the heifer at the end of sumer is low. Even allowing for an increase in the cost of winter feeding in the above table, the hoifer at the end of the sumer will cost less than a feeding bullock bought at that time, and it is reasonable to assume that a definite profit will be realised on the heifer when the animal is fattened and graded. Noreover, the effect of the calf transferred to the corrs for rearing, is to reduce the net cost per calf reared. There scens to be a distinct saving in costs when this method is eriployed, since two products are obtained both of which are much in demand - calves and beef.

The details of the calves bom and reared by the remining five heifers are given in Table XIII. The opening valuation of the heifers is not included since they were kept for the production of the calf only:


The net cost per calf will be seen to be lower than those show in Table IX. Heifers can be kept through the winter more cheaply than breeding cows, and so the cost per calf is much less.

The results of one farm are insufficient to draw definite conclusions regarding this syster, but it seems clear that heifers will produce a cheaper calf than that obtained from breeding cows. If the calf is reared by a breeding cow, the heifer may then be fattened. The cost of keeping the heifer the extra nine nonths is alnost balanced by the value of the calf produced, and it, is probable that a profit may be made when the aninal is fattened.

While the present position of high food and labour costs continue, there appears to be a place in the cattle breeding and feeding systeri, for a method such as this, where two products - calves and beef - are obtained.
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