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## RECENT PTJBLICATIONS

FINhNCILL RESULTS OF Eist OF SCOTLum Firms:-

| Group | $\begin{array}{r} 1946- \\ 1947 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1947- \\ 1948 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1948- \\ 1949 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1949- \\ 1950 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1950- \\ 1951 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1951- \\ 1952 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - - - - - No. of Ferms - - - - - - |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Hill Sheep Farms 2. Stock Rearing Farms | 52 | 48 | 54 | 52 | 53 | 57 |
| 3. Stock Raising and Feeding Farms $\{$ | 153 | 143 | 184 | 175 | 178 | 173 |
| 4. Arable Farms 5.Dairy Farms $\{$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 205 | 191 | 238 | 227 | 231 | 230 |

COSTS OF MILK PRODUCTION 1945-46, 1946-47, 1947-48, 1948-49, 1949-50, 1950-51, 1951-52.

ECONOMICS OF LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION:-
(a) Winter Fattening of Sheep : 1947-48, 1948-49, 1949-50.
(b) winter Fattening of Ce.ttle : 1947-48, 1948-49, 1949-50.
(c) Commercial igg Production : 1949-50, 1950-51, 1951-52.

ENTERPRISE COSTS:- Economics of Silage Making in East of Scotland, 1950, 1951, 1952.

DATRY LABOUR IN THE ZAST OF SCOILAMD.
ECONOMICS OF BRACKEN ERADICATION, 1951, 1952.

Inquiries regarding the above publications
should be addressed to either the Secretary of the College
or the Provincial Agricultural Economist.

This brief report relates to an investigation into the cost of growing wheat in the Last of Scotland - an area, which, on account of its size and favourable geographical position, produces a large proportion of the wheat crop in Scotlend.

Altogether 28 farmers co-operated, six of whom each costed two crops, thus giving a total of 34 completed records. The total area costed was 4.92 acres which gives an average of 15 acres per crop costed.

Most of the counties in the Bast of Scotland were fairly equally represented, Fife furnishing seven records, Roxburgh five, Angus, Midlothian, Peebles and Berwick four each, Perth three, East Lothian two and Selkirk one.

## Soil Conditions

Nearly all of the crops in the sample were grown below the 500 ft . level. The soils were, in the main, medium or medium heavy most suitable for successfiul wheat growing. The average rent per acre was $30 \mathrm{~s} .$, fairly typical of good arable land in the area.

Manures
In the majority of cases, wheat was sown after a crop of potatoes which usuolly received fairly heavy dressings of farmyerà manure. This meant that the charge for manurial residues was fairly high. In addition, in most cases, standard dressings of a compound grain fertiliser were applied.

## Varieties of wheat

Meny varieties were grown but the most populer were Hybrid 46 (4) and Bersee, Eclipse, Squarehead's Master and Scandia (3 each). The majority of these were sown in the autumn.

## Yields

The year 1952 was a good harvest year, and the average yield per acre was slightly over $33 \frac{1}{2}$ cwt. Yields varied from 18 cwt. per acre on a dairy arable farm with important crop sales, situated at over 500 ft . above sea level, to as high as 51 cut. par acre for an arable and feeding farm on the Berwickshire coastal strip. Table I. shows that most of the crop yields were in the $30-40$ group

TABLE I. RGNG OF CROP YIELDS

|  | Under <br> 20 <br> cwt. | $20-$ <br> 29 <br> cwt. | $30-$ <br> 39 <br> cwt. | 40 cwt. <br> and <br> over | TOThL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of crops costed | 1 | 9 | 20 | 4 | 34 |

## Methods of Harvesting

Harvesting by binder, stacking and then threshing by mill was carried out on 27 of the crops costed. In addition, in 4 costs, the binder was used but the crops were threshed from the stook, one by the combine harvester, the other 3 by the mill. In another 3 costs, combine harvesters were used for the complete harvesting operation. It will be seen that not very much wheat is harvested by combine.

The average cost per acre is shown in Table II, and to show extreme variations from the average cost per acre the four highest costs per acre and the four lowest costs per acre have also been set out alongside it.

## $\frac{\text { TABIE II. } 1952 \text { WHEAT CROP : COSIS PER ACRE }}{34 \text { Crops in the Last of Scotlond }}$

| Size of Field Yield per acre | Average Costs |  | Fighest Costs |  | 4 <br> Lowest Costs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15 acres 33.7 cwt. |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \frac{1}{2} \text { acres } \\ & 41.7 \mathrm{cwt} . \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \frac{1}{2} \text { acres } \\ 32 \text { cwt. } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | $2 \mathrm{~s} . \mathrm{d}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per } \\ \text { Cent } \end{gathered}$ | f s. d | Per | £ s. d | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per } \\ \text { Cent } \end{gathered}$ |
| LABOUR AND POWER |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Cultivations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Horse | -. 3.7 | - | -. 3.2 | - | $\cdots$ | - |
| Tractor | -.18.9 | 4 | 1. 9.11 | 5 | 1. -.10 | 5 |
| Contract | -. -.4 | - | -. 5.1 | 1 | - | - |
| Total Cultivations | £2. -. 2 | 8\% | £3. 9. - | 11\% | 81.12.11 | 8\% |
| 2. Harvesting and |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manual | 3.18. - | 16 | 5.13 .10 | 17 | 3.10. 9 | 19 |
| Horse | -. 1. 4 | - | - | 6 | -. -. 3 | - |
| Tractor | 1. 2. - | 4 | 2. -. 4 | 6 | -.18. 6 | 5 |
| Combine Costs | -. $4 .-$ | - | - | 1 | - | 3 |
| Contract | -. 9.8 | 2 | $-3.2$ | 1 | -. 11.10 | 3 |
| Total Harvesting | £5.15.- | 22\% | \&7.17. 4 | 24\% | 85. 1. 4 | 27,6 |
| TOTAL LABOUR \& POWER | £7.15. 2 | 30\% | ¢11.6.4 | 35\% | $£ 6.14 .3$ | 35\% |
| SEEDS | 3.16. - | 15 | 5.2. 2 | 16 | 3. 2. - | 17 |
| MANURES (NET) | 6.14. - | 28 | 7.14. 7 | 23 | 2.14. 6 | 14 |
| RENT | 1.10. - | 6 | 2.3.2 | 6 | 1. -. - | 5 |
| OTHER COSTS | 1.3.- | 5 | 1.7.- | 4 | 1.15.2 | 10 |
| OVERHEADS | 4. 1. - | 16 | 5. 4.5 | 16 | 3.12. 2 | 19 |
| TOTAL OTHRR COSTS | 817. 4. - | 70\% | $£ 21.11 .4$ | 65\% | f12.3.10 | 65\% |
| TOTAL NET COSTS | 1224.19. 2 | 100\% | £32.17. 8 | 100\% | \&18.17. 2 | 100\% |
| $\frac{\text { TOTAL GRAIN COST }}{(677 \text { to Grain) }}$ | 821.8 |  | 228.3. |  | \&16. 3. | 6 |
| RETURNS PER ACRE | ¢50. 5. |  | 265.17. |  | £46.12. | 9 |
| PROFIT PER ACRE | $£ 28.17$. |  | 237.13.7 |  | £30. 9. | 3 |
| COST PER CWT. (GRAIN) | -. 12. | 9 | -.13. 6 |  | -. 10. | 1 |
| SELITING PRICE PER CITT. | 1. 9.1 |  | 1.11. 8 |  | 1.9. | 2 |

For /

For the 34 crops costed, the average costs per acre work out at £21. 8s. (allowing 1/7th of the net cost to the straw) and the total returns per acre at $\approx 50$. 5. 5a., thus giving a net profit of £28.17. 5d. per acre. Labour and power and manures (net) account for a relatively high proportion of the net cost.

Contrasting the four highest cost forms and the four lowest cost farms, it is seen that high costs per acre incurred by the former were more than compensated for by high yields and subsequent high returns. In the next section, however, it will be shown that in the great majority of the enterprises studjed, costs did not vary propor:tionately to yields. On the four farms with the highest costs it will also be noted that $9 \%$ more was spent on manures but $6 \%$ less on what are listed as "other costs".

A distribution of the net costs of the whole sample is shown in Table III. It will be seen that most of the costs are in the £20-£25 per acre group.

TABLE III. RAIGGQ OF COSTS PER ACRE

|  | Under <br> $£ 20$ | $£ 20-$ <br> $£ 25$ | $£ 25-$ <br> $£ 30$ | $£ 30-$ <br> $£ 35$ | Over <br> $£ 35$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of crops costed | 3 | 17 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 34 |

## 2. COSTS, RETURNS AND PROFTTS

To show the relationship between these three factors the yields per acre ranging from under 20 cwts. per acre to over 40 cwts. per acre have been set out in Table IV. below.

TABLE IV. YIELDS, COSTS, RETURNS AND PROFITS

| Yield per hicre | No. of Crops Costed | Average <br> Yields <br> Per Acre | Average Net Cost Per Acre ${ }^{z}$ | Average <br> Return <br> Per Acre | Average <br> Margin <br> Per Acre |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| cwt. <br> Under 20 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20-24 | 4 | 18 | ※17.15. - | 223.17. - | £ 6. 2. - |
| 25-29 | 5 | $27 \frac{1}{2}$ | 20. 9. - | 42. 9. - | 22. -. - |
| 30-34 | 9 | $31 \frac{3}{4}$ | 21. 6. - | 46.18. - | 26.12. - |
| 35-39 | 11 | 37. | 21.18. | 56. 7. - | 34.9. - |
| 40 and Over | 4 | 47\% | 25.13. | 71.14. - | 46. 1. |

$¥$ Charging 6/7ths of the costs to the grain.
It will be seen that 29 of the crops costed i.e. 85 per cent. with yields from 20 cwt . per acre to 39 cwt . per acre varied very little from the average cost of \&21. 8s. per acre and that there was a progressive increase in profits from £6. 1 s . to $£ 34.9 \mathrm{~s}$. per acre. It can be said therefore that for yields from 20 cwt . to 39 cwt . per acre there was little or no variation of costs with yields but a clearly defined one between yields and profits. Yields of 40 cwt . per acre and over, however, proved highly profitable and confirm the fact already brought out in Table JI. that for very high yields it was profitable to spend relatively large amounts mainly on manures, and seeds and labour, these additional outlays being more than covered by additional returns.

It should be borne in mind that the 1952 croy year was one of exceptionally favourable weather conditjons, so that the figures of average costs shown in the report nust be treated with reserve. In order to provide data on variations due to seasonal diferences the investigation is being continued for one odditionel year relating to the 1953 crop, a very difficult year, by comparison. It is hoped that this will be equally well supported by co-operating farmers.

## SUMARRY

1. The average cost per acre from 34 wheat crops costed in 1952 was £24.19. 2a. (incluling cost of straw), for an average yiela of 33.7 cwt. Returns average 250. 5. 5a, per acre thus giving an average profit of 328.17 . 5a. per acre (alloving $6 / 7$ ths of tots 1 costs as a cherge against the grain).
2. The 1952 harvest year was a year of very good wheat yields in the East of Scotland area.
3. Niost of the wheat costed was grown on medium or medium heavy soil with an average rent of 30 s, per acre.
4. Manures and labour were the highest inividual items in the average net cost structure, being $28 \%$ and 20 of the net costs respectively.
5. For yields between 20-39 cwt. pex acre there was no increase of costs with yields but a well defined relation between yields and profits.
6. Yields over 39 cwt. per acre entailed high costs per acre but resulted in more than proportionote returns, reflected in cor:respondingly higher profits.

Of the cereal crops grown in East and South East Scotlond barley is of considerably less importance than oats, but in certain counties, notably East Lothian, Berwickshire, Roxburghshire and Fife, the barley crop occupies an important position. This brief report on the costs of barley production in East and South East Scotland covers results obtained from a sample of 55 farms in this area, 14 in Fife, 13 in Berwickshire, 9 in Angus, 8 in Roxburghshire and the rest spread throughout the remaining counties.

## Yields

The weather conditions in 1952 were generally favourable to barley growing and the average yield per acre for the sample was 33 cwt. The range in yields was wide and the table below shows the distribution.

Distribution of Yields per acre

| Yields <br> per acre | Under <br> 20 cwt. | $21-25$ <br> cwt. | $26-30$ <br> cwt. | $31-35$ <br> cwt. | $36-40$ <br> cwt. | $41-45$ <br> cwt. | Over <br> 45 cwt. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of <br> crops costed | 2 | 8 | 10 | 14 | 13 | 5 | 3 |

## Varieties

Ymer was easily the most popular variety, and was grown on 25 of the 55 farms. Ten costs related to Spratt Archer and 4 each to Carlsberg and Ireja. The average yield of Ymer barley was 35 cwt. per acre, compsed with $25 \frac{1}{2}$ cwt. per acre for Spratt Archer. The four records of Freja showed an average yield of 37 cwt. but the number of crops costed was so small as to make comparison inadvisable.

## Miethods of Harvesting

The only significant differences in the technique of production lay in the methods of harvesting. Twenty-five of the 55 farms used the binder and the remaining 30 used the combine-hervester, 16 owning their own and 14 hiring machines. Two farms who used the combine:harvester, swathed the grain. There was no marked tendency for the short-strawed varieties to be combined and the long-strawed varieties to be' binder-harvested, but all those owning their own combines in this sample grew short-strawed barley and in all cases where long:strawed barley was combined it was done by contract.

## COSTS OF PRODUCTION:

The Table below sets out the average costs of production for the 55 crops costed. The costs have been carried to the dressing stage and include the cost of hending.the straw.

## TABLE I.

## TABLE IO 1952 BRLAY QOP : OOSTS PBR ACLE <br> 55 Crops in the Sest of Scotlena

|  | Average Cost per hacre | Per Cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LhBOUR AND POWER | E s. d. E s. $\mathrm{d}_{\text {。 }}$ | \% |
| 1. Cultivations |  |  |
| Labour | -.16. 5 |  |
| Horse | -. 1.2 |  |
| Tractor | 1.2. 1 |  |
| Contract | -2.2 2.1.10 | 8.7\% |
| 2. Hervesting \& Threshing |  |  |
| Irabour | 2.12. 6 |  |
| Horse | -. 1. 1 |  |
| Tractor | -.15.7 |  |
| Contract | 1.7.9 |  |
| Combine | 1.-.7 5.17.6 | 24.3 |
| TOTAL LASOUR \& POMER | £7.19.4 | 33.0\% |
| SEED | 3.17. 1 | 15.9 |
| MANURES (NET) | 6.1.9 | 25.3 |
| PENT | 1.11. - | 4.6 |
| MISCELI, ANEOUS COSTS | 1. 3.10 | 6.4 |
| OVERHEADS | 3.10. 7 | 14.8 |
| TOTAL HET COST PER ACRE | \&24.3.7 | 100\% |
| YIELD OF GRAIN | 33 cwt. |  |
| RETURIVS PER ACRE | £ 25.10 .11 |  |
| PROFIT PER ACRE | 521. 7. $4^{\text {F }}$ |  |
| COST PER CNT, OF GRAIN | -. 14.11 |  |
| SELIING PRICE PER OMT. | \&1. 7. 5 |  |

* The full costs of production have been charged to the grain and nothing to the straw.

Charging all the costs ageinst the grain, the average cost per cwt. of barley was $14 / 11$. The renge in costs per owt. was from $8 / 6 \mathrm{~d}$. to $38 / 1 \mathrm{~d}$. which is undoubtedly wide, but the great majority fell into the range 10 s . to 17 s . per owt. If one uses the formula of charging $6 / 7$ ths of the totel cost against the grain and $1 / 7$ th against the straw then the average cost per cwt. of grain would be 12/9a.

There was a wide range in oosts per acre as is brought out by the Table below. However, the majority of the crops costed lie in the range of $£ 17$ to $£ 29$ per acre and are fairly evenly distributed about the average.

Range in Costs per Acre

| Average Cost <br> per fore | $£ 14-$ <br> $£ 17$ | $£ 17-$ <br> $£ 20$ | $£ 20-$ <br> $£ 23$ | $£ 23-$ <br> $£ 26$ | $£ 26-$ <br> $£ 29$ | $£ 29-$ | $£ 32-$ <br> $£ 35$ | Over <br> $£ 35$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of <br> crops costed | 5 | 10 | 13 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 2 |

As was to be expected, long-strawed varieties realised a higher selling price per cwt. than did the short-strawed varieties. The overage selling price for long-strawed vorjeties (chiefly Spratt Archer) was 30/10d. per cwt. Which compares with 27 s 。 per cwt. realised for short-strawed varieties (chiefly Ymer). Jelling prices of long:strawed varieties varied between 28s. and 34/4a. per cwt. The short: strawed varieties showed a wider range of selling prices from a minimum of 24 s . per cwt. to one exceptional case of $36 / 3 \mathrm{~d}$. per cwt. at the other end of the scale.

The lower selling price per cwt. of the short-strawed var:ieties was more than offset in this sample by the higher yield achieved ( 37.7 cwt. compared with 26.8 cwt.), and, consequently, the average return was roughly $£ 9.10$ s. per acre higher than was realised from the long-strawed varieties.

None of the crops showed losses; profits ranged from $£ 12$ an acre to over $£ 50$ an acre.

## COST OF HARVESTTNG AND ITHRESHTNG

It is useful to compare the costs of berley production between the binder-harvested group and the combine-harvested group. Examin:ation of the total cost structure of the two groups reveels that the only significant differences in the verious items of cost are in the harvesting and threshing stage. Differences between the two groups in costs of cultivations, seeds, manures and rents were of no consequence.

Combine-Harvested Borley - Average cost per acre Harvesting and Threshing


1952 /

1952 BARLEY COST'S IN EAST OF SCOTTAND
$\frac{\text { Comparison of the structure of Hervesting End Threshing }}{\text { Costs between the two systems }}$

| Item of Cost | Combine-Harvested group (30 crops costed) |  | Binder-Harvested roup (25 crops costed) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Costs per acre | Per Cent | Costs per acre | Per Cent |
|  | £ s. d. | $\%$ | \& s. d. | \% |
| Labour | 1.3. 3 | 21.5 | 4.7.5 | 68.1 |
| Horse | -. -. 3 | . 2 | -. 2. 2 | 1.6 |
| Tractor | -.10. 6 | 9.7 | 1.1.9 | 17.0 |
| Combine | 3.14. 3 | 68.6 |  |  |
| Hire of Thresher |  |  | -.17. 2 | 13.3 |
| TOTAL | ¢5. 8. 3 | 100\% | \&6. 8. 6 | 100\% |

Besides showing the higher total cost involved in the binder:harvested group, this teble brings out forcibly the difference in labour costs between the two systems of harvesting. In the combine:harvested group the proportion of cost chergeable to the combine is roughly the same as that chargeable to labour in the binder-harvested group.

It should be pointed out that the figure for combining costs per acre related to an average of both farm-operated combines and com:bines hired from contractors. Likewise in the binder-harvested group the costs for those hiring a thresher and those using their own threshers have been averaged together and consequently the figure of $17 / 2 d$. per acre is no indication of how much it might cost to hire a thresher for an acre of barley. This latter figure was approximately 30 s. per acre.

## SUMMARY

1. Costs of berley production were compiled for 55 crops in the East of Scotland for the 1952 crop. The average cost per acre was 224. 3. 6d.
2. Yields were generally good and averaged 33 cwt. per acre, giving an average return per acre of $645 \cdot 10.11$.
3. Ymer was the most popular variety, with Spratt Archer second in popularity.
4. The short-strawed varieties were generally more profitable than the long-strawed varieties.
5. There were 30 cases of combine-harvesting and 25 of binder-haryesting; harvesting plus threshing costs for the binder method of harvesting were £1. -. 3d. higher than the costs for combine-harvesting.
III. CATILE REARINA COSTS

General Description of Farms and Herds Studied

This report deals with the cost of rearing suckled calves up to the weaning stage in 27 herds in the Bast of Scotland during 1951-52 (November to November), the first stage in the long process of beef pro:duction. Berwick had the largest representation with six herds, Roxburgh, Angus and Fife had five each, Selkirk three, Peebles two and East Lothian one.

The average size of farm in the sample studied was 928 acres rented at an average rentel of 17/6d. per acre. Farm size ranged from a hill sheep farm of 3213 acres, the largest, to a low ground arable farm of 209 acres, the smallest. The average herd size was 35 breeding cows ranging from a herd of 16 cows to one with 131 cows. The 27 farms can roughly be classified into three broad types - loviena arable farms, semi-upland stock rearing farms and hill sheep farms. As one would expect on the lowland arable farms the majority of the herds were either beef Shorthorns, Blue grey crosses, usually crossed with Aberdeen-Angus Bulls, and either irwintered or out:wintered with adeguate shelter and receiving liberal rations. The hardier breeds - Highland, Galloways and their crosses, were studied on the higher lying farms, outwintered on hill ground.

For purposes of comparison the sample has been divided into two main groups - inwintered cows and outwintered cows. fifurther subdivision of the outwintered group was made, comprising two sub-groups:-
(a) those on lowland farms and receiving liberal rations,
(b) the hardier breeds outwintered on upland farms.

The Table below sets out the cost per cow per annum for each of the three groups.

TABLE I. COST PER COW PER ANNUM

|  | In-Wintered Herds | Outwintered Herds |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (a) <br> Lowland farms | (b) Upland farms |
| No. of Herds | 10 | 7 | 10 |
| Average Herd Size | 41 cows | 44 cows | 25 cows |
| Cost per cow p.a. Foods | $\pm$ s. ${ }^{\text {d }}$. | $\& \text { s. d, }$ | $£ \text { s. d. }$ |
| Purchased | -. 7.1 | -. 5. - | -. 5.11 |
| Home-Grown | $14.140-$ | 13. 2. 5 | 7.11. 2 |
| Grazing Total | $\frac{5.10 .10}{20.11 .11}$ | $\frac{7.12 .9}{21 .-.2}$ | $\frac{4 \cdot 8 \cdot 5}{12.5 .6}$ |
| $\frac{\text { Lebour }}{\text { Winter }}$ |  | 1.10 .11 | $1.10 .3$ |
| - Summer | $\begin{aligned} & 2.7 .11 \\ & -7.7 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.10 .11 \\ -\quad 9.10 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.10 .3 \\ -\quad 8.2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| = Total | 2.15.6 | 2. -. 9 | 1.18. 5 |
| Miscellaneous Costs | 1. 2.10 | 1.19.9 | 2. 5. 2 |
| Herd Maintenance | 1.7.6 | 2.10. 2 | 2. 5. 3 |
| TOTAL COSTS | £25.17. 9 | £27.10.10 | £18.14. 4 |

; Includes overheads, vet expenses, haulage, etc.

Table I. shows how the cost of keeping a cow for a year varies under different environmental and managexial conditions. As might be expected there was not a great variation in total cost between the in:wintered cows and those which were outwintered, receiving liberal rations, but the cost of the cows outwintered on upland farms was very much less than the other two groups. Foods formed by far the greatest single item of costs, accounting for over three-quarters of the total cost in the first two groups while in the case of the hardier breeds outwintered on the hill, food costs made up two-thirds of the total cost.

Labour costs were highest for those herds inwintered; they formed 11 per cent., 7 per cent. and 10 per cent. of the total cost in each of the groups respectively.

Miscellaneous costs were highest for the outwintered group (b) herds mainly due to greater use of tractors in hauling foods to the cows and consequently higher overheads.

The cost of herd maintenance was highest in the outwintered group (a) herds but this may be due to the smallness of the sample and not to any other factor causing a higher rate off replacement in these herds.

## Having ascertained the cost of carrying a breeding cow right

 through the year, we may examine these costs from another angle by setting them out in such a way as to show the cost of producing a weaned calf (approximately 6-8 months old) for ach of the three groups, as set out in Table II. below. The cost per weaned calle produced is slightly greater than the cost of keeping a cow per annum because not all the calves born reached the weaned calf stage and the cost of any purchased calves (although, in the sample studica, not of great significance in the total cost) must also be added to the cost per cow per annum to obtain the actual cost of a calf at the weaning stage.T'ABLE II. COST PER WEANED CALF APPROXTMATLIT 6-8 GONYYS OLD

| Group | In-wintered | Out-mintered |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (a) | (b) |
| Average No. of Weaned Calves per Herd | 39 | 44 | 24 |
| Weaned Calves Produced as per: centage of cows in Herd | 96.2\% | 100\% | 97.7\% |
| Costs <br> Foods - <br> Purchased <br> Home-Grown <br> Grazing Total <br> Labour <br> winter <br> Summer <br> Total <br> Miscellaneous : <br> Herd Maintenance <br> Purchased Calves |  |  | £ s. d. $\begin{array}{r} 5.11 \\ 7.15 .3 \\ 4.11 .- \\ \hline \end{array}$ <br> 812.12. 2 $\begin{array}{r} 1.11 .9 \\ -\quad 8.7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ <br> £ 2. --4 <br> 2. 7.10 <br> 2. 7.11 <br> -. 3.4 |
| TOTAL COST | \&26.17. 4 | £27.12. 6 | $£ 19.11 .7$ |

is Includes overheads, vet. expenses, haulage, etc.

The main point brought out by the above table is the relatively low number of weaned calves produced per 100 cows in the case of the in:wintered herds. This may be due to a higher death rate of young calves because of a greater prevalence of disease in the in-wintered herds but more likely it is due to the smallness of the sample when sub-divided into these groups.

## RaNGe in COSTS PER weanci chilp Prodiced

Table III. shows the distribution of costs for each of the groups.

## TABLE III. DISTRIBUTION OF COSTS

| Group | Under <br> $£ 20$ | $£ 20-$ <br> $£ 25$ | $£ 25-$ <br> $£ 30$ | $£ 30-$ <br> $£ 35$ | Over <br> $£ 35$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In-Wintered | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
| Out-Wintered <br> (a) | - | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| Out-Wintered <br> (b) | 7 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 10 |
| TOML | 8 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 27 |

The cost of producing e. weaned calf showed a wide variation, ranging from the lowest of $£ 10.13$. 8d. per calf on a semi-upland form (where the cows were out-wintered on straw and silage with very little hay) to the highest cost of 239 . 3. 2d. per calf on a low ground orable farm where the cows were out-wintered but were being liberally fed, their rations consisting of turnips, straw, oats, hay and beet pulp. In each group the individual results are fairly well grouped around the average with the in:wintered group showing the widest variation in individual costs.

## RZTURNS AND MARGINS

The Table below shows the average selling price and average margin of profit per calf for each of the groups.

TABLE IV. RETURNS AND MARGINS PER CALF

| Group | Calves sold as percentage of weaned calves reared | siverage cost per Calf | Average selling price per calf | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average } \\ & \text { Margin per } \\ & \text { Calf } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In-inintered | 25\% | $£ 26.17 .4$ | £35. 3.7 | £8.6. 3 |
| Out-Wintered <br> (a) | 22\% | 227.12. 6 | £34. 2.10 | £6.10. 4 |
| Out-wintered <br> (b) | 40\% | £19.11. 7 | ¢27. 2.5 | 27.10.10 |

## * Excluding all subsidies

Table IV. shows that for the sample studied the in-wintered herds were just a little more profitable than the other two groups. The cost of production was high, but heving obtained a good quality calf the selling price was also high leaving a margin of $£ 8$. 6. 3d. per calf. The out:wintered group (a) herds would seem to be the least profitable. It must, however, be remembered that in this case and also in the case of the in-wintered /
in-wintered group the breeding herd forms only a small part of the cattle enterprise on these farms.

It will be noticed also that, as a general rule, the majority of the calves produced by all three types of herds are not sold as weaned calves but are kept on the farm to be sold later. The margin of profit at the weaned calf stage is of more importance to the hill group where 40 per cent. of the weaned calves produced are sold. Those not sold at this stage are usually sold as yearlings or at 18 months old.

Assuming that the weaned calves are sola at the October sales and that managenent and other factors are equal the tendency will be for the early born calf to realise the biggest profit, and as far as late born calves are concerned it might well prove to be more remunerative to keep them on to a later stage, though much will depend on the individual circumstances of each farm.

## SUMMARY

1. The sample consisted of 27 herds of suckling cows widely scattered over the College area. Average farm size was 928 acres rented at 17/6a. per acre. The total number of breeding cows costed was 967 and the average herd size was 35 cows. Included in the sample were hill herds of Highland, Galloway and Cross cows and herds of Shorthorn or Blue Grey Crosses on low ground farms, almost all crossed with either Aberdeen-ingus or Shorthorn bull.s.
2. The average cost of prolucing a weaned calf was as follows:-

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { In-Wintered Herds - £26.17.4 } \\
& \text { Out-Wintered a) on lowland ferms - 227.12. } 6 \\
& \text { b) on hill and uplend } \\
& \text { farms - \&19.11.7 }
\end{aligned}
$$

3. Feeding stuffs were by far the largest item of cost in all cases, accounting for over 75 per cent. of the total cost in the first two groups and 66 per cent. of the total cost for the out-wintered group (b) herds.
4. Individual costs per calf ranged from $£ 10.13$. 8d. for an out-wintered herd receiving only straw and silage to £39. 3. 2d. also for an out-wintered herd receiving liberal rations.
5. A comparison of profit mergins showed the in-wintered herds to be the most profitable with a margin of f8. 6. 3d. per calf sold. The margins for the other two groups were $£ 6.10$. 4d. and $£ 7.10 .10$. per calf sold respectively.
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Grateful acknowledgment is made of the valuable help given by farmers taking part in any of the three investigations covered by this report, not only by keeping the necessary records and furnishing us with all the other information needed, but also for the courtesy unfailingly shown on the occasion of our visits. Each collaborating farmer receives a summary of his own costs set out alongsiale those of the average cost. The investigation into wheat and barley costs is being continued so as to cover the 1953 crop only, but the inquiry into cattle rearing costs is to be carried on for a further two years. It is therefore hoped that wherever possible those farmers who have so far participated in the investigations will maintain their interest therein, and will continue to give their generous help.

1. WHETE, BGRLEY and CATYTE COSTS

## Manual Labour

This was charged at hourly rates ruling on the farm, adjusted to include holidays; any overtime rate was cherged at the rates paid. A charge was made for work done by the farmer.

## Horse Work

Cherged at $1 / 6 a$. per hour.

## Tractor Work

Charged at 4/6d. per hour for wheeled tractors and 6/6d. per hour for track-laying tractors.

## Seeds

| Purchased | - | at cost |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Home Grown | - | at 18 s . per cwt. |

Manures and Menurial Residues
(a) Dung was charged at 17/6d. per ton plus cost of application.
(b) Ertificials ware charged at cost, plus cost of application.
(c) Residual Values brought and carried forward.

Proportion Chargeable to:-

| 1. Dung | 1st Crop | 2nd Crop | 3rd Crop | 4th Crop |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. Compound Manures | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{4}$ | $\frac{1}{8}$ | $\frac{1}{8}$ |
| 3. Phosphates | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{4}$ | $\frac{1}{8}$ | $\frac{1}{8}$ |
| 4. Lime | $1 / 7$ of net cost for 7 ,years |  |  |  |
| 5. After Lea | Where wheat or barley was sown after lea <br> a value was put on the lea according to <br> the following scale:- |  |  |  |



## Foods

Purchased Foods - were charged at purchase price less a deduction for the manurial value of the foods fed.

Home-Grown Foods - were charged on a cost of production basis less a deduction for manurial values. The following viere the net charges per cwt. for the home-grown foods:


## Grazing

The total grazing available on each farm was costed and pro: portioned between the various stock on the following basis of stock equivalents:

Stock equivalent

| Cow . . . . . . . . . . . | 1 unit |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Calf at foot . . . . . . . . | $1 / 3$ " |
| Stirk . . . . . . . . . . . . | $2 / 3$ " |
| Ewes . . . . . . . . . . | $1 /$ " $^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Lambs at foot . . . . . . . . | $1 / 18{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Lambs weaned . . . . . . . . | $1 / 9$ " |
| Feeding Sheep . . . . . . . . | $1 / 6^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Horse . . . . . . . . . . . . | 1 |

## grass to sllow for ley residues.

Other Costs
This included binder or baler twine and any spraying material used and in the case of cattle costs, veterinary expenses and any direct charges attributable to the cattle.

## Contract Mork

This includes both labour and machine costs.

## Rent

Charged at the average rental for the arable land on the farm. iNo rent was chorged directly against the cattle.

Overheads
These were charged at suitable rates agreed by the Scottish Conference of igricultural Economists. No charge has been made for interest on capital or for any managerial work undertaken by the farmer.

