Seeds: Cost of prod. 05

LINSEED COSTS INVESTIGATION 1948.

(INTERIM REPORT)

Department of Agricultural Economics,
University of Nottingham School of
Agriculture,
Sutton Bonington, Loughborough.

February, 1949.

Linseed Costs Investigation 1948.

(Interim Report)

Introduction

The world shortage of agricultural products and the serious economic position of the country have made necessary an ambitious plan for the expansion of agricultural production. In the words of the government's white paper (Economic Survey for 1948) "Home agriculture is a major factor in our hopes of a tolerable standard of diet in the years ahead....." The Agricultural Expansion Programme puts in concrete terms the contribution which farmers are expected to make towards recovery: they are expected to produce one-fifth more in 1951 than was produced in 1946-47. This means an increased net output, at 1946-47 prices, of about £100 millions of which more than half is to be derived from livestock.

One of the most serious limiting factors in our livestock production programmes is the shortage of protein feed. World production of the oilseeds from which oilcakes are derived has declined seriously since 1939, and the expansion of our livestock output depends to a large extent on our ability to develop home production in order to supply the necessary protein feed. The number of crops is limited which fulfil the two requirements of being reasonably easy to grow in this country and of producing a seed of high protein content suitable for balancing livestock rations composed largely of home grown feed. Beans and peas are already widely grown although the acreage of the former has declined owing to the prevalence of chocolate-spot disease and the consequent fall in yields and the uncertainty of securing a reasonable crop. Neither has the high protein content of oilcake, nor are they as suitable as oilcakes for finishing beef cattle and fat sheep. Of the oilseeds linseed would appear to be the most suitable for home production. The linseed plant has been very widely grown in England for fibre over many generations. Special machinery or implements are not required. And in addition the oil is urgently needed for industrial use.

The fulfilment of the livestock production programme is dependent on an adequate supply of protein feed, and much of the increased supply is to come from the home grown linseed crop. The important which is to be attached to the crop is illustrated by the production targets which have been set: 100,000 acres in 1948, 200,000 acres in 1949 and 400,000 acres in 1951. These may be compared with a total linseed acreage for both seed and fibre production in 1939 of under 5,000 acres.

Comparatively few farmers are experienced in growing linseed for seed. Some have had experience of the crop for fibre production, involving a different productive technique, and it is clear that for the majority the crop will be a new enterprise. With this fact in mind the Department of Agricultural Economics has been collecting data on the costs of growing, harvesting and threshing the crop during 1948-49. Not all the co-operating farmers have threshed out their linseed yet but it was thought advisable to present an interim report giving all the information now available. A final report giving full information on costs of production and threshing will be presented later.

Distribution of the Sample.

Records from thirty-four farms have been analysed in this report. Of these ten are in Lindsey, ten in Kesteven, twelve in Nottinghamshire and two in Leicestershire.

Soils

The soils on which the crop was grown varied from heavy clays to Nottinghamshire sand and included examples of fenland soil, gravels, loams and blue clay. Good and poor crops have been produced on all types of soil and the data present no clear indication of the relationship between type of soil and successful crops. It was found however that cold heavy soils do not suit the crop.

Varieties Grown

The main varieties grown were Royal and Redwing. One piece of English Branching linseed was found and also one of Bison. Eight farmers were growing trial plots on both Royal and Redwing for the Agricultural Executive Committees. The Redwing variety was generally more forward than the Royal which grew a greater length of straw.

Examples have been found where the yield from the Royal was better than Redwing. On heavy land in one case the Redwing suffered from drought earlier on in the year, but on sand land Royal yielded better but did not grow long enough in the straw to use a binder.

Weather Conditions in 1948.

The weather has been generally unfavourable for the crop which needs plenty of sunshine. Consequently yields were poor. In addition in some cases the straw grew to such a great length that the crop became laid and was very difficult to harvest. A wet time during the harvesting period also brought about trouble, the crop having to be left in the stook longer than was desirable. The sheaves became matted and often herbage grew round the base, making the collection of the sheaves difficult. Linseed has been found to dry out quickly after a shower however.

Reasons for Growing Linseed

There were mixed motives in growing the crop. The farmers who grew the trials were asked to do so by the Agricultural Executive Committee. Five farmers grew the crop on land with a high wireworm content, others grew it where there was a number of rabbits in the vicinity. Half the farmers had grown linseed before, some regularly for many years. One farmer has incorporated linseed into his regular rotation, growing the crop after his sheep have been on the roots until too late to sow barley, he then undersows the linseed with seeds for the following year. Another farmer regularly under-sows the linseed but has found that germination of the clovers seems to be adversely affected. The average previous yield is estimated at 11 cwts. per acre.

Nearly half the farmers were intending to feed the seed directly to their stock whilst the rest expected to sell the seed and feed their allocation of linseed cake to their stock.

Effects of the Crop on the Land

There are diverse opinions as to the effects of the crop on the land. Some say that the crop is dirty and a greedy feeder and that the effect on the land of growing linseed can be seen for many years afterwards. Others have found that the land has been left both clean and in good heart.

Manuring and Seeding

The majority of the farmers gave the crop some artificial manure, usually a dressing equivalent to that for a corn crop. In two cases muck was applied and one field was limed.

The average seed rate per acre was 79 lbs. the amounts varied from 48 to 168 lbs/acre. In seven cases the seed was broadcast and in the rest it was drilled either with a small seeds drill, a corn drill or a combine drill. No particular difficulties were encountered. It was generally found best not to bury the seed too deeply and thus to enable the crop to make an early start. Cross drilling was not favoured as the crop comes up too thickly and harvesting is made more difficult.

Weed Destruction

In seven cases the crops were sprayed or dusted in order to eliminate annual weeds. Agroxone, Phenoxyl and Sodium N.D.C. were all used with success, and although in certain cases the growth of the linseed was checked for a period, there was no lasting effect on the crop.

Harvesting

Twenty of the farmers used a binder for harvesting the crop, others used a mower because the crop was thick or laid and even scythes were resorted to. On the whole it was found that the crop was not an easy one to harvest but where power binders were used they generally met with success. Care had to be taken that the straw did not wrap round the bearings. One experienced grower recommends cutting with a mower leaving a 6" stubble and then piling into small heaps. This enables the air to pass freely beneath the heap and thus dry the crop out well.

Threshing

Threshing of the crop has been found to be easy but tedious. In one case the straw wrapped round the drum badly, but this was unusual. It was found best to feed the crop slowly into the drum, if possible holding the base of the sheaf slightly to let the drum beat the head well; to close all blowers to prevent the linseed blowing out and to put the Bean plate on the back of the concave to prevent the bolls going through. Some advocate putting the crop through twice but others say that it is only advantageous to put the riddlings through again.

It has been found best to thresh on as dry a day as possible. Only 22 of the costed crops have been threshed so far this year and the average yield is $8\frac{3}{4}$ cwts/acre. The poor yields are thought to have been caused by the bad season. The wet weather resulted in many laid crops and seed has been lost by knocking about during harvesting. The lack of sunshine prevented the seed from filling out well and some samples were light and thin.

Utilisation of the Straw.

Farmers in many parts of the country have indicated that they had difficulty in finding a use for the straw and in previous years it has been either burnt, put at the bottom of crew yards or used for stack bottoms. This year however, some farmers have sold their straw to paper mills or for packing machinery. The prices received have been widely variable but have been a useful contribution to offset against the costs of the crop.

Chaff

In most cases the chaff has been retained on the farm for stock feed and is found to be eaten readily by sheep and cattle. A small amount of seed is unavoidably left in the chaff which thus forms a nutritious food. Two growers sold a part of their chaff, for which they received £6. 0. 0d. per ton.

The Actual Costs (Table 1 & 2).

The first thing to be noticed about the costs is that nothing has been included for overhead costs, management, depreciation on implements (other than tractors) or cultivation residues. In addition the costs in Table 1 are only in the stack, and threshing costs need to be added to arrive at the cost of obtaining the linseed.

Secondly, 1948 was admittedly a very difficult season and for that reason the costs should not be regarded as typical of a normal season.

Thirdly, many growers had little or no previous experience of the crop.

The costs illustrate clearly the great diversity of treatment received by the different fields.

Preliminary Cultivations

These include all cultivations carried out for the crop prior to sowing with the exception of the application of artificials and farmyard manure. The heaviest costs were in the ploughing out of old grass, but costs varied greatly according to the state of the land and the ease with which a good tilth could be obtained. The average cost of this group of operations was £1. 16. 3d. and the majority of costs came within the range of 15s. 0d. to £1. 15. 0d.

Other Operations prior to Harvest

Most growers applied artificials, two applied muck and one limed the land. Little effort was expended in cleaning operations in most cases, but seven of the crops were sprayed with selective weed killers and in one case the whole crop was hand weeded at a cost of nearly £16 per acre.

Taken together these operations cost on average £1.15. 5d. About two-thirds of the records show costs below the average and the high costs of the others are the result of cleaning operations or of the application of farmyard manure.

Harvesting

This operation provided many difficulties which are reflected in the great range in costs. It is clear that there is considerable scope for reducing costs on many farms, and that unless an efficient method of harvesting can be devised many growers will not be prepared to continue linseed production.

Average costs of harvesting were £1. 7. 9d. plus £1. 9. 0d. for loading and stacking. Over half the growers completed the two operations at a cost of under £3. 0. 0d. per acre but as many of the yields were poor it is not safe to generalise as to what can be regarded as a normal cost.

Other Costs

Most farmers applied artificials, and it is important to know whether it is an economic proposition to manure the crop. Blackman ('Agriculture', April 1943) found a negligible effect on yields even on the poorest soils in trials carried out in 1941 and 1942.

Seed costs varied largely with the seed rate and it would appear that more information is needed by growers as to the optimum rate for different soils and conditions. Expenditure on manures averaged only £1.18. 1d. per acre. Ten farmers applied none and of the remainder the majority spent between £1. 0. 0d. and £2.10. 0d. Seed cost per acre averaged £4. 5. 0d. per acre. The majority of rents were between £1. 0. 0d. and £2. 0. 0d., with an average of £1. 8. 2d. Spraying or dusting was done in ten cases, the common range of cost being from £2. 13. 0d. to £3. 5. 0d. Twine has been charged either at cost or at a standard charge of 7s. 6d. per acre. In twelve cases the crop was harvested without tying into sheaves.

Up to date there is little evidence that the better land produced heavier crops than the poor land. A crop expected to thresh out at 12 cwts was grown on scrub which required ploughing in the first place with a prairie-buster hitched to two Fordson Major tractors. And one of the sand farmers, with only a low yield in 1948, has grown as much as 15 cwts per acre on land valued at only 8s. 6d. per acre, and capable only of growing rye as an alternative crop.

Threshing Costs (see table 2)

Threshing costs per acre, which are available for 22 cases, varied considerably, depending on the yield and the difficulties encountered, and range from 18s.10d. per acre for a 5 cwt crop to £6. 16. 8d. for an 18 cwt crop (excluding one abnormal case). Threshing was usually a slow process and the output averaged under four cwts of linseed per hour. Yields were disappointingly low and averaged $8\frac{3}{4}$ cwts per acre on these farms.

Conclusion

The effect of the season on the crop and on the attitude of the farmer to the crop cannot be over emphasised. It has been a bad season with bad effects. Yields have been poor and many farmers who have grown linseed for the first time this year have had many discouragements which may bias them against the crop for the future. Some farmers however are going to grow linseed again this year (1949) not usually in increased amounts, but about the same acreage as in 1948.

Many more farmers would be willing to grow linseed if they could be sure of avoiding the difficulties which have been encountered in 1948. Of these perhaps the most important are those involved in the harvesting operations. Many crops were laid, indicating a need for varieties with stiffer straw. Great difficulties were experienced by many growers in cutting the crop. Some was cut by combine harvester, some by binder, some by mower and some was cut with scythes. Various suggestions were made as to the best method of cutting the crop covering such items as stage of growth, type and speed of the cutter knife, but there was no unaminity of opinion, and some growers experienced no difficulty at all. Second in importance was the difficulty of threshing the linseed out. Normally this was achieved by very slow feeding but this involves a considerable increase in the

cost, and it is possible that improved results would be obtained if threshing contractors were given guidance as to the best setting of their machines. This enquiry has also brought out the need for more information on the optimum rates of seeding and manuring under different conditions.

Many farmers consider the allowance of linseed cake which they receive as being too low. With a yield of 12 cwts per acre the allowance works out at one ton per five acres of linseed grown, and this is regarded as insufficient incentive to make any big change in cropping from established practice. On the other hand it is important in assessing the value of the linseed crop to bear in mind several very relevant facts. There are three products of the linseed plant on which a value can be placed: the seed, the chaff and the straw. The seed is valued at £55 per ton at present for a sample of 90% purity. For better samples a higher price is paid. The chaff is of considerable value for feeding or can be sold for about £6. 10. 0d. per ton. Present indications are that the weight of chaff is about equal to the weight of seed. There is also a market for the straw but prices vary considerably according to the condition of the straw and its freedom from other material. For clean straw in good condition as much as £6. 0. 0d. per ton may be obtained. Second, the linseed cake may be worth very much more to the farmer than its market value if it can be successfully used to increase the output of livestock on the farm. And third, the present state of the market for barley indicates that a comparison of returns between this, the most likely alternative crop, and linseed can no longer be fairly done on the basis of the maximum price of barley. In addition, in special cases, linseed as a crop has much to commend it. It can be grown on poor sandy soils and it is resistant to wireworm attacks. By and large there are real advantages to be gained by growing linseed provided the grower is prepared to make the effort to master a new technique and is willing to tackle the difficulties which may arise. In addition there will be the satisfaction to be gained from helping to carry out a programme which has as its aim the lifting of the country out of the present economic difficulties.

R.M.B.

A.J.W.

February, 1949.

Table 1 Linseed Costs Investigation 1948. Preliminary statement of cost in stack on 34 farms.

Farm No.	County *	Soil Type≠	Acres Costed	Preliminary Cults.	Application of Artificials	Sowing and Covering	Cleaning Cults	Harvesting	Leading and Stacking	Total Labour.
				£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
25	N	Med.	4	1. 2.10.	3.10.	5. 1.	-	FAILED		1.11. 9.
35	N	Cl.	1¼	4. 1.	4. 1.	2. 0.	-	8. 2.	18. 8.	1.17. 0.
36	N	Sand	4	15. 3.	2. 7.	4. 1.	-	1. 3.10.	9. 3.	2.15. 0.
17	Li	Med.	5	18. 8.	-	9. 0.	-	12. 6.	1. 4. 6.	3. 4. 8.
11	K	Cl.	5	7.11.	-	5. 8.	1. 1. 4.	13. 1.	1.12. 1.	4. 0. 1.
23	Li	Med.	6	3. 4. 4.	3. 4½	11. 6½	-	14. 5.	1. 1. 7.	5.15. 3.
7	K	H.	10	3. 4. 3.	-	9.10.	-	16. 5½	1. 1.10½	5.12. 5.
29	N	Med.	6	11.10.	-	12. 1.	-	FAILED		1. 3.11.
6	K	Cl.	5½	1.13. 1.	-	3. 0.	-	1.14. 1.	1. 6.11.	4.17. 1.
18	Li	Light	7¾	2. 4. 2.	7. 5.	17. 9.	-	1.13. 0.	1. 5. 8.	6. 8. 0.
15	Li	Light	7½	2. 9. 8.	-	12. 2.	-	12. 7.	1. 4. 5.	4.18.10.
30b	N	S.& Cl.	26	1. 7. 0.	12. 7.	9. 2.	-	1. 8.11.	1. 4.11.	5. 2. 7.
26	N	Light	1	1.12. 8.	4. 2.	1. 2. 6.	-	18. 6.	10. 2.	4. 8. 0.
22	Li	H.	13	1.10. 5.	1.11.	11. 9.	2. 7.	1.13. 9.	1.11. 6.	5.11.11.
5	K	H.	2	2. 8. 4.	-	15. 3.	-	1. 9. 4.	1.11. 7.	6. 4. 6.
8	K	H.	3	2. 8. 0.	4. 1.	14. 0.	1. 5. 0.	1. 8. 2.	- **	5.19. 3.
9	K	Med.	5	1. 8.11.	2. 8.	6. 6.	2. 8.	10. 8.	1. 6. 6.	3.17.11.
2	K	Med.	11	1. 2. 2.	7. 5.	8.11.	1.17.11.	9. 7.	1. 9. 3.	5.15. 3.
37	Le	H	4	1.14. 4.	-	8. 4.	2. 1.	2. 9.11.	2. 4. 9.	6.19. 5.
39	Le	H	1½	1. 7. 2.	2. 9.	12. 2.	1. 5.	3. 0. 9.	2.16.11.	8. 1. 2.
31	N	Cl.	1	2. 7. 0.	-	12. 8.	16. 8.	2. 5. 4.	4.10. 8.	10.12. 4.
27	N	Cl.	4½	1. 3. 6.	1.10.	7. 9.	-	14. 7.	10. 9.	2.18. 5.
34	N	H.	4	1.14. 4.	-	6. 4.	-	1. 8.10.	1.11. 2.	5. 0. 8.
13	Li	Med.	8½	1. 5. 1½	-	17. 0½	4.10.	1. 0. 2.	1.18. 9.	5. 5.11.
21	Li	H.	7	5. 0. 2.	4. 8.	11. 2.	4.10.	2. 4. 4.	1.11. 8.	9.16.10.
16	Li	H.	3	4.17. 9.	-	7.10.	-	16. 6.	1.12. 4.	7.14. 5.
4	K	Cl.	12	2. 1. 2.	-	6. 2. 9.	10. 0.	1. 0. 0.	18.10.	10.12. 9.
28	N	H.	2½	1.12. 6.	4.18. 8.ø	8. 2.	-	2. 9.10.	2.13. 2.	12. 2. 4.
10	K	H.	3	1.12. 2.	4. 1½	19.10.	10. 3½	2.14. 7.	1. 8.11.	7. 9.11.
20	Li	H.	5	1. 7. 5.	1.17. 9.+	10. 2.	3. 0.	18. 6.	18. 6.	5.15. 4.
32	N	Sand	5	13. 9.	2.16. 1.x	6. 1.	13. 4.	13. 0.	2. 6. 7.	7. 8.10.
33	N	H.	5	1. 5. 8.	5. 1.	9. 1.	-	5.14. 3.	2. 3. 4.	9.17. 5.
3	K	Gr.& Cl	17	3. 3. 3.	-	2. 6.	-	19. 9.	2. 9. 5.	6.14.11.
1	K	Fen	1	1.13. 0.	-	1. 4. 6.	15.18. 9.	2. 4. 6.	1.11. 0.	22.11. 9.
AVERAGE			6	1.16. 3.	7. 9.	13. 8.	14. 0.	1. 7. 9.	1. 9. 0.	6. 8. 5.

* K = Kesteven Li = Lindsey ≠ Cl. = Clay H. = Heavy
Le = Leics. N = Notts. Gr. = Gravel Med. = Medium
S. = Sand

x includes £2.12.0 spreading F.Y.M.
+ " £1.14. 8 " "
ø liming. ** threshed in field.

Table 1 (Contd.) Linseed Costs Investigation 1948. Preliminary statement of cost in stack on 34 farms.

Farm No.	Total Labour	Artificials	Seed	Rent	Spray or dust	Twine	Direct Cost	Plus Manurial Residues	Minus Manurial Residues	Cost.
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
25	1.11. 9.	1. 3. 1.	1.10.11.	2. 0. 0.	-	-	6. 5. 9.	4. 3.	12.10.	5.17. 2.
35	1.17. 0.	2. 8. 7.	1. 2. 0.	1.10. 0.	-	-	6.17. 7.	-	14. 8.	6. 2.11.
36	2.15. 0.	1.14.11.	1. 7. 6.	8. 6.	-	-	6. 5.11.	1. 1.10.	13. 0.	6.14. 9.
17	3. 4. 8.	-	3. 8. 9.	19. 0.	-	7. 6.	7.19.11.	1.13. 5.	16. 4.	8.17. 0.
11	4. 0. 1.	-	2.16. 0.	2. 8. 0.	-	7. 6.	9.11. 7.	4. 3.	1. 1.	9.14. 9.
23	5.15. 3.	1.19.10.	1.17.11.	1. 0. 0.	-	7. 6.	11. 0. 6.	-	1. 3. 5.	9.17. 1.
7	5.12. 5.	-	2.14. 0.	1. 5. 0.	-	7. 6.	9.18.11.	-	-	9.18.11.
29	1. 3.11.	3.12. 8.	4. 6. 2.	1.10. 0.	-	-	10.12. 9.	1.18. 2.	2. 9.11.	10. 1. 0.
6	4.17. 1.	-	4. 2. 7.	1. 2. 6.	-	4. 5.	10. 6. 7.	8. 6.	4. 3.	10.10.10.
18	6. 8. 0.	11. 1.	2. 3.11.	1. 5. 0.	-	7. 6.	10.15. 6.	-	2.10.	10.12. 8.
15	4.18.10.	-	4.16. 0.	1. 5. 0.	-	7. 6.	11. 7. 4.	4. 8.	2. 3.	11. 9. 9.
30b	5. 2. 7.	1. 5. 3.	3. 7. 4.	1.15. 0.	-	-	11.10. 2.	4.10.	1. 2.	11.13.10.
26	4. 8. 0.	1.17. 0.	1.15. 0.	1.10. 0.	-	7. 6.	9.17. 6.	2.10. 0.	10. 0.	11.17. 6.
22	5.11.11.	1.13. 4.	4. 3.10.	1. 5. 0.	-	-	12.14. 1.	6. 0.	19. 2.	12. 0.11.
5	6. 4. 6.	1.18. 6.	2.19. 0.	1. 1. 0.	-	7. 6.	12.10. 6.	5. 8.	12. 9.	12. 3. 5.
8	5.19. 3.	1. 7. 9.	3. 1. 8.	1. 9. 0.	-	7. 6.	12. 5. 2.	14. 2.	12. 6.	12. 6.10.
9	3.17.11.	1. 7. 8.	2.19. 7.	1. 5. 0.	2. 5.11.	7. 6.	12. 3. 7.	1. 4. 4.	15. 5.	12.12. 6.
2	5.15. 3.	1. 7. 7.	4.13. 9.	1. 0. 0.	-	5. 6.	13. 2. 1.	6.10.	11. 1.	12.17.10.
37	6.19. 5.	-	3.13. 1.	2. 0. 0.	18. 9.≠	7. 6.	13.18. 9.	-	-	13.18. 9.
39	8. 1. 2.	18. 9.	4.15. 0.	1. 2. 0.	-	-	14.16.11.	-	10. 8.	14. 6. 3.
31	10.12. 4.	-	1.11. 2.	1. 0. 0.	-	7. 6.	13.11. 0.	1. 7. 4.	9.11.	14. 8. 5.
27	2.18. 5.	11. 6.	1. 5. 6.	2.13. 4.	3. 5. 0.	-	10.13. 9.	7.11. 2.	3.15. 2.	14. 9. 9.
34	5. 0. 8.	-	4.10. 0.	2. 0. 0.	3. 0. 0.	-	14.10. 8.	2. 6.	-	14.13. 2.
13	5. 5.11.	14. 2.	3.18. 4.	1.15. 0.	2.13. 0.	7. 6.	14.13.11.	1. 0. 2.	10. 5.	15. 3. 8.
21	9.16.10.	1. 7. 0.	3. 8. 7.	1.10. 0.	-	-	16. 2. 5.	-	18. 0.	15. 4. 5.
16	7.14. 5.	-	6. 0. 0.	1. 3. 0.	-	-	14.17. 5.	2. 1. 9.	1. 0.10.	15.18. 4.
4	10.12. 9.	11. 4.	3.10. 0.	1. 5. 0.	-	4. 5.	16. 3. 6.	16.11.	3. 1.	16.17. 4.
28	12. 2. 4.	3. 1. 0.	1. 7. 6.	2.10. 0.	1.12. 0.ø	-	20.12.10.	8. 6.	2.17. 6.	18. 3.10.
10	7. 9.11.	2.10. 0.	4.18. 4.	1. 5. 0.	3. 4. 6.	7. 6.	19.15. 3.	1. 3. 4.	1.16. 8.	19. 1.11.
20	5.15. 4.	10. 0. 8.*	5. 5. 3.	1. 0. 0.	1.15. 3.	7. 6.	24. 4. 0.	-	4.10. 0.	19.14. 0.
32	7. 8.10.	13.12. 3.*	1.13. 0.	1. 0. 0.	-	7. 6.	24. 1. 7.	3. 1. 7.	7. 8. 6.	19.14. 8.
33	9.17. 5.	3. 4. 8.	3. 5. 0.	1. 0. 0.	3. 3. 5.	7. 6.	20.18. 0.	3.11.	19. 1.	20. 2.10.
3	6.14.11.	5.18. 3.	4.10.10.	1.15. 0.	2.16. 0.	7. 6.	22. 2. 6.	9.11.	2. 6.	22. 9.11.
1	22.11. 9.	-	3.18. 9.	1. 0. 0.	-	8. 9.	27.19. 3.	4. 7. 0.	2. 0. 0.	30. 6. 3.
Average	6. 8. 5.	1.18. 1.	4. 5. 2.	1. 8. 2.	14. 6.	4. 8.	13.19. 0.	1. 0. 1.	1. 2. 6.	13.16. 7.

* includes F.Y.M. ø P.P. wireworm dust. ≠ Beetle dust.

Table 2 Linseed Costs Investigation 1948. Costs per acre including threshing.

Farm No.	Time taken threshing (hours per acre)	Threshing Costs				Costs up to stacking from Table 1	Total	Yield	
		Regular Labour	Casual Labour	Machine Cost	Total			1st	2nd
	Hours	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	cwts	cwts
36	0.6	6.10.	-	12. 0.	18.10.	6.14. 9.	7.13. 7.	$5\frac{1}{4}$	-
35	1.6	1. 3. 4.	-	16. 0.	1.19. 4.	6. 2.11.	8. 2. 3.	$4\frac{3}{4}$	-
11	1.2	15. 0.	-	1. 4. 0.	1.19. 0.	9.14. 9.	11.13. 9.	$8\frac{1}{4}$	-
30b	0.9	11. 6.	-	10. 5.	1. 1.11.	11.13.10.	12.15. 9.	$7\frac{3}{4}$	-
9	0.8	-	12.10.	14. 4.	1. 7. 2.	12.12. 6.	13.19. 8.	$5\frac{1}{2}$	$1\frac{3}{4}$
30a	2.7 (a)	17. 1.	-	3. 8. 2.	4. 5. 3.	9.18. 7.(b)	14. 3.10.	$7\frac{1}{2}$	-
5	2.3	1. 3.11.	-	1. 5. 4.	2. 9. 3.	12. 3. 5.	14.12. 8.	8	-
8	2.7	16. 8.	-	2.12. 0.	3. 8. 8.	12. 6.10.	15.15. 6.	$13\frac{1}{4}$	
34	1.3	10.11.	6. 3.	16. 5.	1.13. 7.	14.13. 2.	16. 6. 9.	5	-
15	3.2	13. 4.	1.15. 2.	2.12. 0.	5. 0. 6.	11. 9. 9.	16.10. 3.	$12\frac{1}{4}$	-
27	1.1	1. 0.10.	-	1. 1. 8.	2. 2. 6.	14. 9. 9.	16.12. 3.	5	-
2	3.1	2.12. 3.	-	1.12. 9.	4. 5. 0.	12.17.10.	17. 2.10.	$12\frac{1}{2}$	-
21	1.7	1. 1. 5.	-	1.14.10.	2.16. 3.	15. 4. 5.	18. 0. 8.	5	-
13	2.8	1. 3. 6.	-	2. 0. 7.	3. 4. 1.	15. 3. 8.	18. 7. 9.	?	-
39	2.7	1.17. 6.	-	2. 6. 8.	4. 4. 2.	14. 6. 3.	18.10. 5.	10	-
37	3.5	14. 7.	2. 5. 0.	3. 5.11.	6. 5. 6.	13.18. 9.	20. 4. 3.	$5\frac{1}{2}$	1
4	2.3	11. 8.	1. 0. 5.	1.18.11.	3.11. 0.	16.17. 4.	20. 8. 4.	$10\frac{1}{4}$	1
31	4.0	3. 6. 8.	-	3.10. 0.	6.16. 8.	14. 8. 5.	21. 5. 1.	18	-
20	1.6	1. 0.10.	-	1. 0. 0.	2. 0.10.	19.14. 0.	21.14.10.	$3\frac{1}{2}$	2
10	2.7	11. 1.	10. 0.	2. 1. 8.	3. 2. 9.	19. 1.11.	22. 4. 8.	$11\frac{3}{4}$	-
32	2.4	1. 1. 8.	12. 0.	1.17. 4.	3.11. 0.(d)	19.14. 8.	23. 5. 8.	7	6
16	5.0	2. 8. 4.	2. 1. 3.	8. 5. 0.(c)	12. 14. 7.	15.18. 4.	28.12.11.	13	1
1	2.0	1.10. 0.	13. 8.	2. 0. 6.	4. 4. 2.	30. 6. 3.	34.10. 5.	12	-
Average	2.3	1. 2. 7.	8. 6.	2. 1. 2.	3.12. 3.	14. 6. 7.	17.18.10.	$8\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$

(a) = combining. (b) = cost up to cutting. (c) = two drums used. (d) = including cost of dressing seed.

Note: Two cases of crop failure have been omitted from this table.