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ECONOMTC REPORT NO. 25

CATi COSTS 1950/51 - PART IT
by
D. GODFREY

| Srovincial Adyisory oncicer. | Albort D. Irquer, . . B. B. , D.S.S. (Agr.), <br> -S. (Jcon.), Ph. D., M. D. A. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Sonior Advisory Oficor | Gordon G. Heyes, B.Sc. (acon.), J.D.A. |
| Advisory oríicors. | John Clark, B. Sc. (Agr.), N. D. A. Vemon Baker, Bo.Sc. (Econ.). |
| Assistonts | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Alexander Grant, B. Sc. (Agr.), } \\ & \text { Dip. Agrv Econ. } \\ & \text { David Godfrey, B. Sc. (Agr.). } \\ & \text { Hiss iargaret Haughs, B. Sc. (Agr.). } \\ & \text { Hn, A. C. Jones, B. Sc. (Agr.) } \\ & \text { Hiss A. I. Chalmers, B. Sc. (Agr.). } \end{aligned}$ |
| Technical Assistants | George Cowie. Walter A. Duthie. Yiss Agnes C. Paterson. |

Part I of this report concerned the results of 15 herds in the County of Caithness and this the second part concerns results from 20 herds in the other counties of the - North of Scotland.

The 20 herds can be divided into two groups thus:
Group I : Results from 12 herds receiving the Hill Cattle Subsidy
Group II : Results from 8 herds not receiving the Hill Cattle Subsidy.
A synopsis of the standards used in the costings appears in Appendix II. In considering these results it should be constantly renembered that the sample of farms considered was small.

GROUP I - RESUITS FROM 12 HERTDS RECEIVTNG THE HIL工 CATTIE SUBSTDY
The herds were widely scattered, three being in Upper Banffishire, 5 in the Findhorn-Spey Area, 2 in Ross-shire and one each in Aberdeenshire and Kincardineshire.

There was a proportion of rough grazing or hill on each farm, and the average acreage was 162 acres arable and 400 acres hill. This gives a rather false impression since 6 of the farms had under 100 acres arable and on 9 of thom the farmer and his family formed the main part of the labour force of the farm.

IOCATION. The variable nature of these farms is illustrated when we consider the Rlititude and the distance from the sea. Except in parts of Aberdeenshire and Caithness, it is true to say that the higher the land and the, further from the sea it is, the bleaker the climate becomes and Table I shows this data for these farms.

TABLF I
Altitude and Distance from the Sea

| Average <br> Altitude | $0-300 \mathrm{ft}$. | $300-600$ nt. | $600-900 \mathrm{ft}$. | over $900 \mathrm{ft}.$. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No, of Farms | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| Distance from <br> the sea | Under <br> 5 miles | $5-15$ miles | $15-25$ miles | over $25 \mathrm{mls}$. |
| No, of Farms | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 |

SUBSIDIES: The Hill Sheep Subsidy was receivcd on 4 forms and 9 of the farmers received Marginal Land Grants.

SIZE OF HERD The average number of cows kept was 21.5 with three farmers having under 10 cows and 5 between 10 and 20 cows. The average number of cows in the four remaining herds was $22.5,41,49.5$ and. 67 cows respectively.

METHOD OF REARING Wintering: 6 herds were kept inside
3 herds were completely out-wintered
3 herds were partially out-wintered
(being out all day)
Two of the completely out-wintered herds consisted of Highland cross Shorthorn cows whilst the third herd was pure Shorthorn.

The breeds kept in the partially out-wintered herds were -
Highland cross Shorthorn 1: Mixed 1: Aberdeen Angus 1.
The other herds were Aberdeen Angus 3: Mixed 3.
SEASON The winter 1950-51 was very long and the average time of winter feeding was 182 days. On some of the farms food ran short and this was aggravated by the slow growth of grass in the early summer. Later in the season the grazing was good.

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 weaning. Minor adjustments have to be made to allow for dairy cows and barren cows. A bull service charge is also added and in some cases a depreciation cost has been incurred. Some of the calves were sold in Autumn Sales 1951, but the majority were retained on the breeding farm.

COST OF KWFPING THE COWS: YEAR 1950/51
The cost per week and the cost for the whole year are set out in Table II
TABLE II
A.verage Cost of Keeping, a Breediny Cow for 12 months 1950/51

|  | Item | Cost per Week | Cost per |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { WINTER } \\ & 1950 / 51 \\ & 26 \text { weeks } \end{aligned}$ |  | S. do | £. S. d. | $\mathcal{E . ~ S . ~ d o ~}^{\text {d }}$ |
|  |  | 8. - | 10. $7.10 \frac{3}{4}$ |  |
|  |  | 1.10 10 | 2. 8. $8 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
|  |  | 1. 4 年 | 1.15.7年 |  |
|  |  | 1. $8 \frac{1}{4}$ | 2. $3.7 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
|  |  | -. $8 \frac{1}{4}$ | -. 17.103 |  |
|  |  | -. $7 \frac{1}{4}$ | -. 15. $8 \frac{1}{\frac{1}{3}}$ |  |
|  |  | -. $9 \frac{1}{4}$ | 1. $-4 \frac{3}{4}$ |  |
|  |  | -. $-\frac{1}{4}$ | -. $-7 \frac{3}{4}$ |  |
|  |  | 15. $-\frac{1}{4}$ | 19.10. 6 |  |
|  |  | 2. $3 \frac{1}{4}$ | 2.19. $1 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
|  |  | 12. 9 | 16.11. $4 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |
|  |  | 3. $-\frac{1}{\frac{1}{3}}$ | 3.18. $9^{\frac{1}{2}}$ |  |
|  |  | 1. -1 | 1. 5. $8 \frac{1}{4}$ |  |
|  |  | -. $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | -. 7.9 |  |
|  |  | 17. $3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 22. 9. $2 \frac{1}{7}$ | 22. 9. $2 \frac{1}{4}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SUMIIER } \\ & 1951 \\ & 26 \text { weeks } \end{aligned}$ | GrazingLabourOverhead Costs |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3. $2 \frac{1}{4}$ | 4. 2. 91 |  |
|  |  | -88 $-\quad 2 \frac{1}{2}$ -1 | $\begin{aligned} & -17.1-\frac{1}{4} \\ & -\quad 5.10 \frac{3}{4} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | SUMMER COST | 4. $-\frac{3}{4}$ | 5. 5. 8 | 5. 5. 8 |
| GTNERAL | Cow Depreciation Bull Charge |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \cdot 10.11 \frac{3}{4} \\ & 1.5 .- \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  | NET COST PER COW PER YEAR |  |  | £30.10.10 |

Or the various items making up the cost, winter foods are easily the most important and formed $54.2 \%$ of the total cost. Table III compares the results from your farm with the average figures.

TABIE III
Cost of a Corr for the year 1950/51

| Percentage Costs | Average |  | Your Farm |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \& s. ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Porcentage | $E$ s. d. | Percentage |
| Winter Foods | £16: $11: 4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 54.2 |  |  |
| Labour \& Power | 5: 1: 4 年 | 16.6 |  |  |
| Grazing | 4: 2: 9 | 13.5. |  |  |
| Overhead Costs | 1: 11: 7 | 5.2 |  |  |
| Cow Depreciation | 1: 10:113 | 5.1 |  |  |
| Bull Charge | 1: 5: - | 4.1 |  |  |
| Miscellancous | -: 7:9 | 1.3 |  |  |
|  | 630: 10:10 | 100.0 | £ : : |  |

FOODS All the farmers fed the cors quite heavily in the winter months, the lightest feeding occurring on the two fully out-wintered Highland x Shorthorn herds where turnips, silage and straw were the only foods fed. Scven farmers fed hay and seven fed some oats. Drafi was used on one farm and four fed other purchased foods (bran, malt culms, cake). The avorage amounts of foods fed appear in Table IV compared with those for your farm and the average of the three outwintered herds.

> TABLE IV

Average Foods fed per cow per Winter 1950/51

|  | Average lbs. por day | Cuts. per Minter |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Averago | Your Farm | Three Herds Outrintered |
| Turnips | $52 \frac{1}{2}$ | 85.5 |  | 57.9 |
| Eating Stran | $10 \frac{1}{2}$ | 16.9 |  | 21.5 |
| Bodding Straw | 7 | 11.5 |  | - |
| Hay | 2 | 3.1 |  | 1.4 |
| Silage | 4 | 6.4 |  | 38.4 |
| O.ts | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 2.4 |  | - |
| Purchased Foods | 1 | 1.5 |  | - |

LABOUR The average hours per cow per week was 1.19. The herds outwintered show a much lower labour requirement whilst at the other ond of the scale come three small herds kept inside in the winter in small badly designed steadings.

TABLIE V
Variation in Wan Hours por Cow Wook - Wintor 1950/51

| Hrs. per Cow Week | Under .5 | $.5-1.0$ | $1.01-1.25$ | $1.26-1.50$ | Over 1.50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of Farms | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |

POWER This item refers to horse and tractor labour used in feeding cows outside.
GRAZING Not all the cows grazed the whole season on the hill ground and hence those costg averaged out higher than those for the Caithness herds. The average cost per cow per week was $3 / 1 \frac{3}{4}$ and the variation is show in Table VI.

## TABLE VI

Variation in Grazing Cost per L.S.U. Week

| Grazing Cost per <br> L.S.U. Week | Under 2/- | $2 /-$ to $2 / 11$ | $3 /-$ to $3 / 11$ | $4 /-$ and over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of Farms | 2 | 6 | 1 | 3 |

WISCELIANEOUS costs refor to veterinary treatment, mincral licks, and any other odd items of expenditure.

COIV DEPRECIATIUN In vicw of the good prices now obtainable for fat cast cows this would not have amounted to much had not severe losses occurred on one farm of partially out-wintered coris. The death of 5 cows in this small herd has raised the cost per cow by \&15: 12/6. It was docided not to exclude this cost from the averages however, since it demonstrates the roal risk there is in keeping cows and there are undoubtedly occasional years in evcry hera when for one reason or anothor costs become very high.

BULL CHARGE Four farmers had no bull of their orm and a service charge has been included instead. The average cost or keeping a bull for the remaining eight farms is show in Table VII.

TABLE VII
Calculation of the Bull Charge per Cow
Average of Eight Bulls

| Winter Cost of Bull | £23: 3: 3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Summer Cost of Bull | 4: 19: 8 |
| Bull Insurance | 3: 5: |
| Bull Depreciation | 9: 8: |

Average Number of Cowis Served 30
Average Charge per Cow (Unit Average) £1: 12/6
The groatest factor influencing the buil cost is the number of cows each bull serves, and it is here that the larger hords tend to score an advantage thus:

| Total Cost of | No. of Cows | Charge per |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kecping a Bull | Served | Cow |
| 240: 8: 10 | 43 | £-: 19: 3 |
| ¢4.7: 3: - | 18 | £2: 5: 9 |

Six of the herds used a Shorthorn bull and six used on Aberdeen Angus.
VARIATION IN THE COST OF KEEPTNG A COM From the foregoing discussion of the individual items making up the cost it will be clear that the large out-wintered herds will have a much lower cost than the small herds kopt inside in winter, whilst the other herds will be fairly evenly spaced betiveen thern. This tendency is show in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII
Cost per Cow Year 1950/51: Variation per Farm

| Cost per Cor <br> per Yoar | Under £20 | $£ 20-£ 25$ | $£ 25-£ 30$ | $£ 30-£ 35$ | Over $£ 35$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Herds Fart or <br> entirely <br> Outwintered | 2 | 1 | 2 | - | 1 |
| Herds Inside <br> in Winter | - | - | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Some home-grown foods form such on important part of the total cost, another factor which tends to high costs is low yields por acre. \#A A lor yield means that the costs por curt. will be high.

It so happened that the out-wintered herds in this sample were on farms winch also possessed some good arable land and thus the cost per cwt. of home grown foods was relatively low and widened the gap between the lowest and highest costs still further. The five lowest costs were all for outwintered or partially out-wintered herds.

NUGBERS OF COWS AITD CALVES A summary of the numbers of cows and calves is given in Trable IX.

TABLE IX
Number of Cows and Calves 1950/51

| Numbers | Start | Born | Purchased | TOMAL | Sold | Died | Reared |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cows | 255 | - | 24 | 279 | 8 | 7 | 264 |
| Calves | - | 240 | 4 | 244 | - | 11 | 233 |

The month of calving (Table X) is important especially if the calves are to be sold at the Autumn Sales. Calves falling after March are still small in September, but on the other hand, too early calving is undesirable since it adds expense to the feeding of the cow until the grass comes.

## TABLE X

Number of Calves Borm in the Various Months 1951

| Month | Before Jan. | Jan. | Feb. | March | April | May | After May |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of Ca1- <br> ves born | 5 | 32 | 45 | 68 | 63 | 24 | 3 |

COS'I OF A CATH TO WRANTNG
To obtain the net cost of the calves to weaning, the following additions must be made to the cost of keeping the cows for a year:-
a) Cost of any calves purchased.
b) The cost of keeping any cows in the herd for only part of the year.
c) Carriage costs and Auctioneers fees.

This gives the gross herd cost and from this the proportionate cost of keeping any house dairy cows must be deducted. The resultant net herd cost divided by the number of calves reared gives the net cost per calf to weaning.

|  |  | Your Farm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\pm$ s. d. | § S. d. |
| Total Herd Cost for the Year | 511: 9: 6 |  |
| Cost of Purchased Calves | 2:16:8 |  |
| Cost of Part Year Cows | 5:16: 2 |  |
| Cost of Marketing Calves Sold | -: 1: - |  |
| GROSS HEPD COST | 520: 3: 4 |  |
| Deduct: Cost of Dairy Cows | 18: 7: 5 |  |
|  | £501:15:11 |  |
| Calves Reared 19.5 |  |  |
| NET COST PER CALF | $\underbrace{31: 2: 5}$ |  |

The gap between the herds kept indoors and these out-wintered is reduced slightly since the calving percentage worked out better for the herds wintered inside. ( $95 \frac{1}{2} \%$ as against $87 \frac{1}{2} \%$ ).

```
Average net cost per calf: Herds inside in Winter
£35: 1: 7
Herds partly or wholly Outwintered £27: 3: 4
```

On only two farms were calves sold in the Autumn sales but valuations were taken on the other farms and thus an estimated margin between costs and asle price/valuation was calculatca. Table XII shows the average results compared with those of your farm.

## TABLE XII

Average Margin between Costs and Valuation (or Sale) Autumn 1951


Total No. of Calves 233

| Average Cost of Rearing a Calf | $31: 2: 5$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Average Sale Price or Valuation | $19: 3: 2$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

The arbitrary nature of the valuations is recognised and limits the value of the figures. The range of margins is illustrated in Table XIJI.

## TABLE XIII

Range of Margins between Costs and Valuations/Sales

| Margin (per Calf) | $\div 0-£ 5$ | $-0-£ 10$ | $-5-£ 10$ | - over $£ 10$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of Farms | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 |

[^0]The two farms showing a positive return were the two largest herds both out-wintered with Highland X Shorthorn cows. The valuation of their calves was conservative (average f19:-:6) but even so exceeded the costs.

FILL CATTIE SURSIDY. If this is added to the valuation, a positive margin occurs for six of the twelve herds, i.e. the three out-wintered herds, one partially out-wintered and two others both picoducing a very good class of Aberdeen Angus calf. The poorest returns appear from the mixed herds kept inside in the winter.

OTHER SUBSIDIIS. It has not been possible to take into consideration the effect of marginal land payments, grassland fertiliser subsidies and fuel grants which would all reduce costs by lowering the cost of home grown foods. The fact that these grants do accre in most cases should be borne in mind, and if they could have been measured it is probable that most of the herds would have shown a small positive margin.

CONCLUSIONS. The results showed that the best returns came from the herds outwintered but it should be remenbered that these herds were large and on hills linked with good arable farms, the cows being fed quite liberally through the winter.

Costs from the pure bred Aberdeen Angus herds were high but this was off'set by the superior quality of the calves produced. The valuations put upon them were conservative and if these calves are costed until they are sold it is quite likely that they would show good returns. The poorest performances are from the herds producing mediun quality single suckled calves on farms where outwintering is not practised. Generally, these farms are small and the rough ground and arable grazing is not extensive enough for out-wintering and in any case sheep take first priority. Poor quality arable land often aggravates the situation still further and ultimately the breeding cows must be regarded as an expensive way of keeping up fertility. On such small farms top quality cattle are of ten out of the question (no bull is kept) and suckling more than one calf to the cow is chancy although it may pay if tackled carefully. On such farms, these results suggest that the best plan may be to reduce the cattle enterprise to a minimum consistent with good husbandry.

## GROUP II <br> RESUITS FROM EIGGT HERDS NOT RECEIVING HIL工 CATYTE SUBSIDY

These herds are situated on lower ground than those costed in Group I and only one had any rough grazing or hill lond. The average size of holding was $253 \frac{1}{2}$ acres and three of the farms were in Aberdeenshire, 3 in Banffshire and one each in Ross-shire and Kincardine. Only one farm wres under 100, acres in size and three of the famms were over 300 acres.

The average distance from the sea was $8 \frac{3}{4}$ miles and the mean altitude was 282 feet above sea level.

Size of Herd. The average number of cows kept was 15 with the numbers spread evenly from 6 to 23 cows.

Method of Rearing. All the cows were kept inside in the winter months and in no cases were the calves sold at 6 months' old. Four of the farms retained their calves for breeding or fattening whilst the others took the opportunity of selling their calves as young or older stores or even fattening them up according to the state of the markets. Three of the farmers reared one calf to the cow whilst another three reared. 2 calves to the cow. The remaining two farmers had a proportion of cows rearing two calves.

Breed The breeds kept were:- Shorthorn and Crosses Aberdeen Angus \& Crosses Mixed

4 Herds
3 Herds
1 Herd

Six of the farmers used Aberdeen Angus bulls and the other two used Shorthorn bulls.
Method of Costing The methods used are the same as those described on Page 2 for Group I and will therefore not be gone over again in detail.

AVFRAGE COST OF KEFPTNG A BRFEDING COW FOR THE YEAR 1950/1951
TABIS XIV

|  | Item | Cost per Week | Cost per Year. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { WINTER } \\ & 1950 / 51 \\ & \left(27^{2} / 7 \mathrm{wks}_{0}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Foods: Turnips \& Swedes <br> Eating Straw <br> Bedding Straw <br> Oats <br> Hay <br> Purchased Foods |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathcal{E}_{0} \\ \text { s. } \end{gathered} \mathrm{a}_{0}$ | £. s. d. |
|  | GROSS FOODS <br> Less - Residual Manurial Values | $\begin{aligned} & -14.5 \frac{1}{4} \\ & -\quad 2.3 \frac{1}{2} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19.15 . \\ \text { 3. } 2 . \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
|  | NET FOODS <br> Man Labour <br> Power Overhead Costs Miscellaneous | $\begin{aligned} & -12.1 \frac{3}{4} \\ & -1.10 \\ & --7 \\ & -=7 \\ & -\quad-3 \frac{1}{4} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.12 .4 \\ & 2.10 .6 \frac{3}{4} \\ & -07 . \\ & -16.7 \\ & -7.6 \frac{1}{4} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | WINTER COST | -. 14.10 | 20. 7. - | 20. 7. - |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { SUMMER } \\ 1951 \\ (25 \mathrm{wks} . \end{gathered}$ | Grazing <br> Labour <br> Overhead Costs | $\begin{aligned} & \text { - } 3.10 \frac{1}{2} \\ & -\quad-39 \\ & -\quad-\quad 3 \frac{1}{4} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.16 .9 \frac{1}{2} \\ & -.19 .4+\frac{1}{2} \\ & -.6 .9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\cdots$ |
|  | SUMMER COST | -. 4.11 | 6. 2.11 | 6. 2.11 |
| GENERAL | Cow Depreciation Bull Charge |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} -18.3 \\ -\quad 9.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | NET COST PER COW PER | YEAR |  | £28.17. 7 |

The net cost per cow per year varied from £21.10/- to $£ 36$ and the two lowest costs occurred on farms rearing one calf to the cow.

The greatest single item in the costs was winter food and where this was high the total cost also tended to be high e.g. the \% Winter Food Cost per Cow was $62 \%$ for the 4 farms with low total costs, but $73 \%$ for the 4 farms with higher total costs. The average percentage costs of the various items are shown in Table XV which also compares your farm with the average cow costs.


The cost of foods is higher than for the other two groups and grazing is also higher becouse the farms recoiving the Hill Cattle subsidy all have some cheap rough grazing in the summer.

FOODS The amounts of food fed on your farm are compared in Table XVI with the average amounts and also the average amount fed expressed in lbs. per day.

TABLE XVI
Average Foods foc. por Con - Finter 1950/51

|  | Lbs. por Day | $\frac{\text { Average }}{\text { cwts./Winter }}$ | $\frac{\text { Your Farm }}{\text { cuts. Wintor }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Turmips and Strodes | 73. | 124.6 |  |
| Hating Strax: | 1114 | 19.0 |  |
| Bedding Straw | 114 | 19.0 |  |
| Oats | 1 | 1.6 |  |
| Hay | 1 | 1.5 |  |
| Purchased Foods | 1 | 1.4 |  |

The figures show that the sheet anchor of the feeding on lorland farms is turnips and straw and this was true for all cight farms. Four farmers fed a little hay and five fed oats and if the winter had not been abnormally long it is likely that more than one farmer would have got through on turnips and strav alone. Purchased foods consisted of draff fed on two farms and sugar beet pulp fed on one farn.

LABOUR The moan hours per cor week was . 76 with all the farms falling in the range .5 to 1.0 hours per animal week. This j.s low compared. with the other two groups. This is because the farm buildings are bettor planned and moreover bejng larger the farm lends itself to easier work organisation (e.g. cmploymont of a full time cattleman).

GRAZIING The range of costs per week for grazing was from $1 / 7$ to $5 / 7$. Threa costs lay between $3 /-$ and $4 /-$ and another three between $4 /-$ and $5 /-$. The grassland fertiliser subsidy mas obtained for the sumer but has not been taken into account in calculating these costs.

COIT DEPRECIATION This item affected the trend of the costs to a significant extent on only one farm - the smallest herd in the section in which one cor died and another mis sold barren.

BULL CHARGE Scven of the farmers omed their own bulls and the charge variod from 19/- to 55/- per coin. For three herds with under 20 cows the service charge por cow worked out at £2: -/4 $\frac{1}{2}$ compored with £1: 6/10 $\frac{1}{2}$ for the four herds in which tho bull servod over 20 cows per year.

Even so in no case did the bull charge reach 10\% of the total cow cost and it was thereforc probably well worth while for these farmers to own their own bulls.
INUWBER OF COMS AID CALVES These figures togethor with the month of oalving are shown in Iable XVIII. "Transferred in" calves refers to calves bom on the farm and transferred from their dan to the suckling cors being costed.

IVumber's of Corrs and Calves and Time of Calving

|  | No. at Start | Purchased | Born | Transferred in | TO'TAL | Sold | Died | No. at End |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cows Calves | 123 - | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 23 \end{array}$ | $120$ | $24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 131 \\ & 167 \end{aligned}$ | $14$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 116 \\ & 157 \end{aligned}$ |
| Honth of Calving <br> (Inca. Calves Transferred) <br> No. of Calves | Eefore <br> 21 | $\frac{\mathrm{Jan}}{10}$ | $\stackrel{\mathrm{Feb}}{14}$ | $\frac{\text { March }}{45}$ | $\frac{\text { April }}{39}$ | $\frac{\text { May }}{12}$ | $\frac{\text { June }}{3}$ | $\frac{T O T A L}{I 44}$ |

There were rather more carly calves for this group than for the Caithness and upland farns. This was to be expected and partly explains the heavier feeding on these farms.

COST OF A CALT TO WEATITG This has been determined in the same way as in the other two sections, but the calculations are simpler because no dairy cows have been mixed with the breeding cows. (Hence the Gross Ficra Cost and the Net Herd Cost are the same). The average cost per call is obtaincd by taking each herd as equal to one unit. If the average of all the calves is taken, the average cost is £24: 7/9.

## TABLE XVIII

## Avorage Cost of Roaring a Calf to Weaning 1950/51

Your Farm

$$
£ \quad \text { s. } \quad \text { d. } \quad \& \quad \text { s. } \quad \text { d. }
$$

Total Herd Cost for the Year
396: 14: 4
Add Cost of Purchased Calves and

Calves Transferred in
Part Year Cows
Gross Herd Cost
Net Hord Cost
Number of Calves reared
Net Cost per Calf
4.5: 15: 11

32: 17: 8
475: 7: 11
475: 7: 11
19年
225: 3: 11.

Six of the eight costs gave a cost per calf between $\approx 21$ and $£ 25: 10 /-$. One cost was below \&2l and the other is very high partly due to a low calving percentage and partly because the herd was situated in harder and more exposed. country.

FARGIIS None of the calves were sold in the autumn 1951 but valuations were placed upon the calves and compared with the costs incurred. The average results are shown in Table XIX compared with those of your farm.
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\begin{array}{cc} 
& \\
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25: $3: 11$
24: -: -

- \& 1: 3:11

On these farms the valuation exceeded the cost in three cases, the range of results being: Positive Fargin ( $22-84$

2 Farms
Negative Margin $\begin{array}{rl}(80-£ 2 & 3 \text { Farms } \\ 2-4 & 1 \text { Farm }\end{array}$
(Orer $\mathrm{g}_{4} \quad 1$ Farm
If fuel and grassland fertiliser grants could have been taken into account the cost per calf would have been reduced (bocause of the reduction in home grown foods) and it is likely that a small average positive margin would have occurred.

REARING TWO CALVES TO THE COW The better returns for this group arise because of the greater proportion of cows Iearing two calves. In Appendix I the average cost of keeping a cow is seen to differ very little as between the Caithness farms and this group. The cost per calf does however work out much cheaper for these animals since more calves were reared.

## Kese calves

The autumn valuation of the cows is higher than that for the Caithness calves, partly because the lattor contained more late-born (small) calves and partly for geographical (and marketing) reasons.

Within the group itself the farms rearing two calves to the cow showed a better return than those rearing single calves, two of the three positive margins being from herds rearing two calves to the cow. In these herds the cost per calf was reduced by nearly $\& 10$ by adopting doubling suckJing, thus:-

Average Cost per Calfin(6 months old) rearing 2 calves per cow \&21:4:5
Average Cost per Calf if single suckling had been practised
30:19: 9

## Saving in Cost by Double Suckling

£ 9:15: 4

This saving must be set against the poorer quality of the calves and the greater depreciation of the cow. Of the objections to rearing second calves, the two which are fundamental are 1) The difficulty in getting a suitable second calf.
2) Difficulty of selling the weaned calves when it is known that they have been reared more than one to the cow.

On the small farm it may be difficult to get round these problems, but on the large: farms it should be possible to get second calves from heifers which are to be fattoned (in the way described below) whilst the calves need not be sold till they are older and these is less obvious difference between them and single suckled animals. The trend of results on these farms over the last three years does favour "double suckling" and it is suggested that wherever cows are to be kept inside during the winter, farmers should be on the alert to practise it at any rate on the better milking cows. An exception must be made however, for those farms which produce top quality callves.

[^1]Por tho thisa year running details were available from an Aberdeenshire farm Mactising double suckling and getting the second calf by putting young heifers to the br:ll to calve at 2 years old. This year a bunch of 14 heifers calved in spring 1951 and the calves were taken from them and put on to the cows. Ten of the heifers were sold fat in uugust 1951 and the other four in March 1952. The net profit for the group as a whole was $£ 10.13$. 9 per heifer plus the value of the calf.

## TABLE XX

COSTS AND REIURNS OF FATTENING UP COW HEIFFRS
Costs per Animal
Breed: Shorthorn and Crosses
Born: Spring 1949
Opening Valuation October 1950 1年 yrs. old £28. -. 6
Winter 1950/51. Turnips 80.8cnts. £7.17. 101
Eating Straw 30.7cwts. 2.18. $2 \frac{1}{2}$ Bedding Straw 19.4cwts. 1.16. 9

GROSS FOODS . 12.12 .10
Less $\mathrm{R}_{0} \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{V}_{0}$ 's
NEYT FOODS
2.15 .6
9.17. 4

Labour (. 62 man hrs. per week)
Overhead Costs Bull Charge
2. $-12 \frac{3}{4}$
$-11.6 \frac{3}{4}$
13.13.1 13.13.1

COST TO SPRING 1950
£41.13. 7

4 Animals Sold 10 Animals Sold March 1952 August 1951

SUMIER COST | Grazing |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Labour |  |
|  | Overhead Costs |
|  | Miscellaneous |

ADD


Complete costs are set out in Table XX which shows that the 10 animals put off the grass made over twice as much profit as those kept till March. The latter were of course the poorest of the bunch, but even so it is probably wisest to get the animals away fat in the same summer as they calve if it is at all possible. In Table XXI the results of this system for the past three years is shown.


This system of getting the second calf can thus be well recommended, but it will only be successful when livestock management is good and careful since both inbreeding and breeding from the calves of their heifers needs to be avoided and on small farms this may prove difficult.
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COMPARISON OF CALF COSTS - 1950/51

|  | CAITHIESS | NORTH OF SCOTTAND | (Excluding Caithness) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | 15 Farms | 12 Farms (Receive Hill Cattle Subsidy) | 8 Farms (No Hill Cattle Subsiày |
| Size of Farm | 106 acres Arable 143 acres Rough | 162 acres Arable 400 acres Rough | $\begin{gathered} 253 \frac{1}{2} \text { acres Arable } \\ -\quad \text { Rough } \end{gathered}$ |
| Subsidies <br> Hill Cattle <br> HiJl Sheep <br> Marginal Grant | 14 farms <br> 1 farm <br> 11 farms | All Farms 4 farms 9 farms | - |
| Size of Herd | 11.5 cows | 21.5 cows | 15 cows |
| Calves per Cow | 11 herds 1 calf <br> 4. herds $1 \frac{1}{4}$ calves | 1 calf | 3 herds 1 calf <br> 2 herds $1 \frac{1}{2}$ calves <br> 3 herds 2 calves |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { Calves born before }}{\frac{\text { April }}{\text { Housing }}} \\ & \text { Winter } \end{aligned}$ | 11 herds inside <br> 3 part outwintered <br> 1 outwintered | 62. $5 \%$ <br> 6 inside <br> 3 part outwintered 3 outwintered | $69.4 \%$ <br> All inside |
| WINTER |  |  |  |
| Man hours per Animal Week |  |  |  |
| Foods - Turnips | 88.1 cwt . | 85.5 cwt. | 124.6 cvit. |
| Eating Straw | 14.9 cmt . | 16.9 crut . | 19.0 cort. |
| Hay | 4.8 cwt . | 3.1 cwt. | 1.5 cwt. |
| Oats | 3.5 cwt. | 2.4 cwt. | 1.6 cwt. |
| Other |  | (Silage)6.4 cwt. |  |
| Purchased <br> Period of Feeding | 0.2 cirt. $25 \frac{1}{2}$ weeks | 1.5 cwt. 26 weeks | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \cdot 4 \text { cwt. } \\ & 27^{2} / 7 \text { weeks } \end{aligned}$ |
| SUMNER <br> Grass Cost per Week Period of Grazing | $\begin{aligned} & 2 / 7 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{~d} \\ & 26 \frac{1}{2} \text { weeks } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 / 2 \frac{1}{4} a_{0}^{\prime} \\ 26 \text { weeks } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 / 10 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{~d} \\ & 25 \text { weeks } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\frac{\text { Cost per con per }}{\text { Year }}$ | \% | $\%$ | $\mathscr{E}$ |
| Winter Food | £15:12: 74, 54.8 | £16:11: $4 \frac{1}{2}$ 54.2 | £16:12: 4 ¢7.6 |
| Labour \& Power | 5:10: $2 \frac{1}{4} 19.3$ | 5: 1: 4. ${ }^{4}$ 16.6 | 3: 9:111 12.1 |
| Grazing | 3: 9: $6 \frac{7}{2}$ 12.2 | 4: 2: 9 13.5 | 4:16: 91 16.8 |
| Bull Charge | -:16:11年 3.0 | 1: 5: - 4.1 | 1: 9: 44 4.9 |
| Others | 3:-:11 : 10.7 | 3:10: $3 \frac{3}{4} \quad 11.6$ | 2: 9: $1 \frac{1}{2}$ - 8.6 |
| Total Cow Cost | £28:10: $2 \frac{1}{4} 100.0$ | £30:10:10 100.0 | £28:17: 7 100.0 |
| AUTUMN 1951 |  |  |  |
| Cost por Calf | £28:17: - $\frac{3}{4}$ | £31: 2: 5 | £25: 3:11 |
| Valuation of Sale Price | 19: 2: $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 19: 3: 2 | 24: -: - |
| Margin | -£9:14: $8 \frac{1}{4}$ | -\&11:19: 3 | -\&1: 3:11 |
| + Margins | Nil | $2$ | 3 |
| - Margins | Al1 | $10$ | 5 |
| Margin if Hill Cattle |  | -£4:19: 2 | -E1: 3:11 |
| + Margins <br> - Margins | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ \cdot 10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |

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 cwt. or ton was higher. The figures were based on the cost of production figures in Economic Report No. 21 of this Department.

PURCHASED FOODS have been charged at purchase price.
IABOUR has been charged at rates recommended by the Conferonce of Scottish Agricultural Economists.
s. d.

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

OVERFIEADS have also been charged at the recommended rates.

$$
s_{0}, d_{0}
$$

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

MANURTAL RESIDUES of foods and manures (R. $\mathrm{Hi} . \mathrm{V}$. 's) have been calculated as set dom in Miscellaneous Publications No. 7 of D. O.A.S.

## CALCULATION OF THE GRAZING COSI'

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 | $=.75$ unit |
| Young horses; cattle 6 months - I yr. | $=.50$ unit |
| Sheep over 6 months | $=.25$ unit |
| Sheep $3-6$ months | $=.07$ unit |
| Lambs under 3 months | $=$ No charge |
| Calves suckling |  |

## FIELD GRAZING COST

The iterns making up the cost are:-

\author{

1. Rent <br> 2. Labour on the Grass <br> 3. Manures applied and manurial residues <br> 4. Overhead Costs <br> 5. Sowing Down Charge - i.e. <br> Average Cost of Establishing the Grass <br> (Estimated Years duration of Lea +1 )
}

[^0]:    FThis is the "average of the avcrages" taking cach farm as one.

[^1]:    ${ }^{{ }^{z}}$ Average for the three herds suckling two calves to the cow.

