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During the year 1950-51 the cost of producing and rearine calves was obteince Iron farns in sow on the wain breeding areas on the forth of Bootland and this report deals with the iowuts irom 15 farms in the Countr of Caithness.

The limitations of onterprise costs are Precly recognised and in meny matters arbitrory decisions have to be made.

A syonsis of tho standards used in these costings appears in the fpendix.

## METHOD OF COSTING

The breeding cows are kept mainly for rearing calves and since one calf is usually produced each spring, the cost of keeping a breeding cow for a year will also be the cost of a calf to the age of woning. Minor adjustments have to be made to allow for barren cows and dainy cows. A bull. service charge is also added and in some cases a depreciation cost hes been ircurred. Some of the calves were sold as weaned calves in the Autumn Sales 1951 whilst others are still on the breeding farms to be sold as stores or retained for breeding.

## TYYPE OF FPARMS

The 15 herds wexe scattered fairly evenly through the northern and eastern parts of Caithoss. The farms averaged 2 miles from the sea (range being $\frac{1}{2}$ to 8 miles) and lay between 50-350 ft. above sea level. The average size was 106 acres arable land and 143 acres rough grass on moor. All the farms except 2 had some rough land attached to them.

## SUBSTDIES

Fourteen of the farmers received the hill cattle subsidy and 11 of them received marginal land grants. Only onc farmer received the hill sheep subsidy.

## SIRE OF HERD

Ten of the herds had between 7 and 12 breeding cows ... a size of herd very common in Caithness. The average number of cows kept was 11.5.

## BREIED

Most of the cows wore cross-bred but the herds could be classiried thus.

| Cross Shorthorm | 5 | Cross Gelloway | 2 | Mixed 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cross Angus | 3 | Cross Highland | 1 |  |

18 bulls were used - 12 Aberdeen Angus - 5 Shorthom and 1 Hereford.

## METHOD OF REARTNG

Almost all the calves were suckled and 11 or the herds kept rigidly to 11 calf on 1 cow". In the othcr four heras occasional cows suckled 2 calves.

Eleven farmers had their coms indoors and tied up through the winter. Three farmers let their cows out during the day just bringing them in at night. One herd was out day and night.

## SEASOTH

The winter 1950-51 was very long and many of the cows were on full winter fecd for over 6 monthe. On some rams food ran short and the difficulties were increased by a poor growth of grass in the early summer due to a very ary spell. Grazing in the late sumner and auturnn was generally gooa.

The cost per week and the cost for the whole year of the various items is set out in Table I.

TABLE I
AVERAGY COST CF KHFPING A BRETOING CON FOR 12 MONTHS 1950/51


The cost of winter foods is seen to be easily the biggest item. This is clearer when we consider the percentage due to cost of the various items (rable II).


The cold bleak climate of Caithness means that ample winter feeding is essontial if the cows are to keep fit.

TUPNIPS \& SUIEDES formed the basis of the fecding on 14 of the farms and $57 \%$ of the average winter food cost is duc to turnips which are thus the most important single item in the cost of keeping breeding cows.

It is likely that the amount of Oats fod was greater than would have been used in a normal winter. Several of the farmers had to feed extra sheaves or grain because they were short of turnips. There were only 3 farms on which some oats were not fed and it did seem that the practice on some farms of feeding oats to the cows months before they calved was wasteful. and increased costs unnecescarily. Specially prepared concentrates were fed on two farms to overcome troublesome mineral deficiencies.

TABLE III
AVERAGE FOODS F'ED PER COW: WINTRFR 1950-51


Turnips
Eating Straw
Bedding Straw
Hay
Oats
Concentrates
$\frac{\text { Cwt. } p c r}{\text { Winter }}$
88.1
14.9
13.5
4.8
3.5
0.2

LABOUR
The average hours per cow per week was 1.334. This may seem rather high, but the majority of the steadings are ill designed for labour saving. The variation in labour hours per cow week is shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV
VARIATION IN YAN HOURS PIR COW WEEK: WINTIER 1950-51


The item power comes in on three farms on wich the animals were fed outside.
MISCELLANEOUS costs refer to veterinary trcatment, mincral licks, and any other odd j.tems of expenditure.

## SUMMER COSTS PER COW

The summer costs is only $3 / 7 \frac{3}{4}$ per cow per week compared with $17 / 6$ in the winter. The actual grazing cost itsclf is low in Caithness because there is usually plenty of rough grazing in the summer months.

Grass is the cheapest of foods and the longor the grazing scason the cheaper the cost of keeping the cows. However, in both spring and autumn there is very often competition between sheep and cows for the rotational grass and the Caithness farmers are probably justif ied in giving the sheop priority.

The length of the grazing season varied fron $22 \frac{1}{2}$ to $31 \frac{1}{2}$ veeks, most of the cows boing tuxned out to gross towards the end of liay, 1951 and brought in late in November, 1951.

## COW DEPRECIAITION

On many cows no depreciation cost is incurred because they are kept for several years calving each spring and when at length they are sold they will often makc a good price as cew beef. However, occasional cows die from disease and accidents, and others may be sold barren at a low price so that sometimes a. cow depreciation charge does have to be made. In the present costings a charge was made on 7 of the herds.

## BULI CHARGE

Six of the farmers had no bull and the service charge in such casos was between $4 /-$ and $8 /-$ per cow. Of the remaining herds three used their own bulls under a "premium" scheme whilst the remajning six farmers owned their orm bulls absolutely. The charge per cow for the latter varicd between $13 / 11$ and $44 / 4$ per cow with three of the charges between $22 /-$ and $25 /-$ per cow,

The average cost of the six herds using their own bull is worked out below (Table V). Bull deprociation is the diff'erence between the buying price and the expected selling price divided by the nurnber of seasons it is proposed to use the bull

| TABLE V |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| CATCUT ATOTI | 0 |

Averoge of 6 BuIIs

| Winter Cost of Bull | 222:12:10 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Sumner Cost of Bull | 4:19: $4 \frac{3}{4}$ |
| Bull Insurance | 2:10:10 |
| Deprociation | 9:4:8 |
| Total Cost | £39:7: 83 |
| Number of cows served | 33 |
| Average Charge per cow | 81: $3: 1 \frac{1}{2}$ |

## VARTATION IN THE COST OF KEEPTNG A CON FOR THE YEAR

A very wide range in the costs could be expected in vicw of the different types of cow kept and the methods employed. The range of costs is shown in Table VI.

## TABLE VI <br> VARIATION INY THE COS'S PFAR COW YEAR 1950/51

| Cost per Cow per Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U. <br> No. of Herds | 1 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 250 |

It was to be expected that the herds of the hardy breeds (Highland and Galloway) show the lowest 3 costs. These herds were partially outwintered, and the average cost per cow in the 3 herds was only \&18 compared with £31:10:- for the herds kept indoors through the winter. Low costs are of course not necessarily linked with efficiency.

NUMBERS OF COWS AND CALVES
These appear in Table VII which gives a summary of purchases, births, sales and deaths for both cows and calves.
TABLE VII
NUNBERS OF COWS AND CALVES 1950/51

| Numbers | Start | Born | Purchased | TOTAL | Sold | Died | End |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cows | 174 | - | 1 | 175 | 7 | 6 | 162 |
| Calves | - | 159 | 10 | 169 | - | 6 | 163 <br> $($ Reared $)$ |

Most of the calves were boin from February to May, 1951 with odd ones earlier and later.

TABLE VIII
NUMBER OT CAIVES BORN TIN VARIOUS YONTHS 1951

| Month | Before <br> February | February | March | April | 3ny | After <br> May |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of <br> Calves born | 9 | 19 | 59 | 43 | 19 | 10 |

The time of calving is important. If the calves are to be sold as spent calves February and March are the optimum times for calving sjnce later born calves will be very small at the Autumn Sales. Calving too early is also undesirable since then heavier feeding of the cow may be necessary because the calf will be taking a lot of milk before the cow goes out to grass.

The net cost per calf to weaning is shom in Tlable IX. To the cost of keeping the cows for a year there is added.

1. The cost of additional calves purchased.
2. The cost of keeping any cows sold during the year.
3. Carriage and auctioneers fees for those calves sold in the autumn sales.

In some of the herds one of the cows was a dairy cow and the proportionate cost of the dairy cows has been deducted from the Gross Herd Cost to give the Net Herd Cost. This divided by the number of calves reared in the herd gives the net cost per call to weaning.

## TABLE IX

AVERAGI COST OF RTARTING A CATI TO WPANIVG (1950-51)


Again there is a very wide variation, with the outwintered herds and herds raising more than one calf per cow showing distinctly lower costs than the others. Discussion on these points is deferred to page 8 .

On 8 of the farms some or all or the calves wore sold in the autumn sales at about 6 months old. The margin between the costs and sales is set out in Table $X$.
$\frac{\text { TABLE } X}{\text { RETURNS FOR CALVES SOLD AUTUNN } 1951}$

$\equiv$ This is the "average of the averages" taking each farm as onc. If the total number of calves is considered the average cost por calf is $£ 27$ : 2: 6 $\frac{3}{4}$.

## -7-

AII the farmers made losses except one who made a profit of $\mathfrak{E l}$ : $16 / 5$ per coll. Those farmers who did not sell their calves were asked to give a valuation. It is recogni.sed that such valuations may sometimes be wide of the mark, but in Table XI the average margin between costs and the sale price or valuation is given for all calves costed.

TABLE XI
AVERAGE MAAGIV BECVGEN COSTS AND SATES OR VALUATION
Total No. of Calves 163

| Average Average | , 163 | , | Your Calves |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cost of Rearing Calf | £28: 17: - ${ }^{\frac{3}{4}}$ | $\mathcal{L}$ | : |
|  | Sale Price or Valuation | E19: 2: 4: $\frac{1}{2}$ |  | : |
|  | Net Loss | \& 9: $14.88 \frac{1}{4}$ | £ | : |

All farrns showed a loss.
These figures confirm the opinion of most farmers that calf rearing is not a profitable undertaking as usually practiced in Caithness. Additional factors do however combina to make farimers continue in this enterprise.

1. The hill cow subsidy is usually received ( $£ 7$ per cow rearing a calf). Ir this is included in the receipts the net loss drops to $\mathbb{\& 3}$ : $5 / 3$ per calf and a smanl profit appears for 5 of the farms.
2. In many casess marginal lana grants are received so that the real cost of producing turnips and the other home grom foods is less than has been charged. The precise effect of these grants cannot be measured but it would seem that if they could be taken into account with the hill cattle subsidy the avorage net loss would be wiped out.
3. Those steer calves not sold will bring in an extra £5 per head by way of the calf Subsidy. This was not wholly allowed for in their valuation figures and ir it was added in, then the average loss in Table XI would be reduced by $£ 1: 3 / 3 \frac{3}{4}$.
4. The valuation of heifer colves unsold was based on marlet values. Last yoar these were loiv and there is a good prospect that the heifers unsold vill appreciate in value rapidly.
5. Fost farms are family farms and much of the labour is not paid, although in the costs it has oi course been charged up. Hence the actual monetary expenditure is less than the costs here indicate.
6. Sheep are far more important than cattlo on many Caithness farms and the breeding cows are looked upon as a side line which fit in well with the whole farming system. It is essential that the fortility of the land should be kept in a high state and cattle dung is a safe and sure method of achieving it.

There are therefore circumstances which lessen the relative unprofitability of calf rearing. Nevertheless even when they are fully allowed for these results sill make one feel that from the economic point of view breeding cattle should be reduced to a minimurn and not stand in the way of other enterprises which may well prove nore profitable.

VARTATIONS FROMI THE USUAL SYSTEMA
The usual method of rearing calves is to rear one calf to the corr and to tie the cows up in the byre for the six winter months, and seven of the firteen farms adhered rigidly to this method. Four of the farmers reared one calf to the cor but partially or wholly outwintered the cors; four othors tied the cows up in the winter, but a limited number of the cows suckled two calves.

The cows were of the hardy breeds on three of the farins whilst on the fourth farm they were cross Aberdeen Angus. The mean cost of keeping the cows for the year was £21: $13 / 1 \frac{1}{2}$ compared with 631: 7/9 for the other farms. There was a distinct saving of foods which cost only £10: 4/I六 per cow through the winter compared with £17: 7/7 per cow for the herds kept indoors.

These savings mainly occurred by not feeding much until January. The cows are not heavy in calf in November ond December and there is usually a certain amount of late growth and foggage on the rough land that they can clear up then. After New Year in three cases tumips and straw were fed in amounts similar to the hords tied up, but very little oats were fed. In the other herd hay was the only food givon. The winter grazing was on rough land. The average difference between the cost of producing these calves and their sale price or valuation in autumn 1951 is show in Table XII and compared with the seven hords leept inside in the winter and rearing one colf to the cow.

| HABLE KII ${ }^{\text {TA }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  | Outwintered Herds | Herds Wintered in Byre |
| Cost of Producing Calves | £24: 7: $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | £32: 19: - $-\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Sale Price at Valuation (Autum 1951) | 19: 9: $-\frac{1}{2}$ | 19: -: $9 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Net Loss | £ 4: 18: 2 | \&13: 18: 3 |

(No subsidies taken into account)
From the table it would seem then that it might be better to partially outwinter breeding cows of the hardier breeds. Other factors however need to be stated which show that outwintering on rough land is not the answer to the poor financial returns from breeding cows in Caithness.

The heavy stocking of rough ground with cattle in the sumner months is desirable and will effect a good improvement in the grazing. In the winter however it may well have a disastrous effect. Very often the cattle eat the land bare leaving nothing at all for the sheep and furthermore grass growth in the next summor will also be poor. This had begun to happen on two of the farms under review. Outwintering of cattle may be satisfactory in sheltered and good growine areas in the west of scotland, but in cold windswept Caithness it has yet to be proved. The profitability of breeding cattle is doubtful anyway and it is foolish to exchange the substance of profitable sheep for the shadow of hill coms. Where however the sheep stock is low there is a case for a partial outwintering on rough grazing or (if available) on grass fields to be ploughed up. Costs will be lowered as some saving on food should be possible in the early winter, but it will still bo necessary to allow ample food aftor the turn of the year.

## REARTIVG MORE THAN ONE CATF TO THE COW

In none of the herds wore all the cows suckling two calves to the cow, but the results of the four herds in which a fer (one cow in four) of the cows suckled two calves showed that the cost per calf reared was reduced by $£ 5: 1 / 6$ per calf thus:-

[^0]The average sale/valuation price was £l8: 18/- so that the net loss por calf was s6: $-/ 5 \frac{1}{2}$. As it happened those ${ }^{3}$ of the calves that were sold in the autum sales brought no lower prices than the single suckled calves of the herds costed.

There is a strong tradition in favour of single suckling.in the main brceding areas, but unless top prices are obtained it is of very doubtful profitability. If double or multiple suckling were adopted there can be no doubt that rearing costs would be lowered greatly, although if all. or most of the cows in a herd were given two calves there would likely be some calves of poorer quality.

The Beonomics Department have not cnough data rolating to local mattors to discuss the problems and difficulties which inevitably arise in considering full scale double suckling or multiple suckling. The year's costs do however suggest that it is worth while famers wintering their cows inside to get second calves for those of their cows which milk well and take a second calf without trouble.

## WHEN SHOULD THE CAIVES BE SOID?

This is a question which perplewes many farmers and no generalisation can be made as each farmor has his ow porticular circumstances to consider.

With single suckling many farmers are bound to sell the weaned calves as there is no rood or winter accomodation for them. With double suckling the question may be easicr as not so many cows need be kept and if prices are low in the autum the farmer may be able to hold on to the calves to the yearling or $6 / 4$ stage or whenever prices are good.

AFPROKIVADE COSTS OF REARIIVG
It is found in practico that many farmers are keen to have an approximate idea of the Economics Department's cattle and calf costs for the various stages of production, Relying on data gathered for this report and the Economics Report No. 22 of this deportment the following Table XIII has been compilca. It relates to single suckled calves in Caithness and the figure for double suckled colves should be at least £l0 less throughout. No subsidies have been taken into account in making it up.

TABIE XIII
APPROXTAATE COST OF RFARIVG STOPES
(Cows insiate in winter. One calf suckled to the cow)

|  |  |  | Age | Period Cost | Total Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bom | Spring | 1951 | Born | - | - |
|  | Autum | 1951 | 6 months | At least $£ 30$ | 830 |
|  | Spring | 1952 | 1 year | £9: -: - | £39 |
|  | Autum | 1952 | $\underline{1} \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{yrs}$. | £3: 5: - | £44: 5/- |
|  | spring | 1953 | 2 yrs 。 | £14: 5: - | £58: 10/- |
|  | Auturn | 1953 | $2 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{yrs}$. | £4: 5: - | .862: 15/- |
|  | Spring | 1954 | 3 yrs . | ${ }_{\text {(fattened) }}$ | £79: 5/- |

The previous figures are of course only approximate and their limitations must be realised. Perhaps the obvious feature of the table is the difficulty (for most farmers) of making any profit from single suckling no matter when the animals are sold.
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The costings arc being continued during the 1951/52 year and records from herds not previously costed will be included.

HONE GROW FOODS have been charged at cost of production. A sliding scale was used so that on farms with low yields the cost per cut. or ton was higher. The figures were based on the cost of production figures in Iconomic Report No. 21 of this Department.

PURCHASED FOODS have been charged at purchase price.
LABOUR has been charged at rates recommended by the Conference of Scottish Agricultural Economists.

| These were - Man | $2 / 6$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Horse | $1 / 3$ |
| Wheeled Iractor | $3 / 9$ |

OVFPFIEADS have also been charged at the recommended rates.

$$
\text { s. } \mathrm{d}_{0}
$$

These were - $5 / 9$ per $\&$ dircct man labour
$3 / 6$ per tractor hour or 4 horse hours
$13 / 9$ per acre

HANORIAI, RESIDUES of foods and manures ( $\mathrm{R}_{0} \mathrm{Hi}_{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{V} .{ }^{\prime}$ 's) have been calculated as set dom in Miscellaneous Fublications No. 7 of D.O.A.S.

## CALCULATION OF THE GRAZING COS'A

The total cost of the grass is obtained for each field grazed. A proportion is deducted if hay or silage has been made (usually $2 / 3$ in the case of hay and $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{3}{4}$ for silage).

The feed grass costs are added together to give a grass cost per farm. One sixth is deducted for winter grazing and the remainder is the farm summer grazing cost.

This divided by the number of livestock units grazing the grass gives a grazing cost per livestock unit.

Livestock Units The Table used is:-
I horse, bull, cow, 2-3 year cattle $=1$ unit
I-2 year old cattle $=0.75$ unit

Young horses; cattle 6 months - $1 \mathrm{yr} .=.50$ unit
Sheep over 6 months $=.25$ unit

Sheep $3-6$ months $=.07$ unit
$\begin{aligned} & \text { Lambs under } 3 \text { months } \\ & \text { Calves suckling }\end{aligned}=$ No charge
FIETD GRAZING COST
The itens making up the cost are:-

1. Rent
2. Labour on the Grass
3. Manures applicd and manurial residues
4. Overhead Costs
5. Sowing Down Charge - i.e.

Average Cost of Establishing the Grass
(Estimated Years duration of Lea +1 )


[^0]:    Average Cost per Calf if single suckling had been adopted $£ 30: 2$ : $11 \frac{1}{1}$
    Average Cost per Calf (Some were suckling 2 calves) 24: 18: $5 \frac{7}{2}$

