langer from

luced; liabil-

s are largely

be greatly

lengthened.

d only be

egoing there

to be seen ware of the

many cases understand

th cleansing

plaining of

on of their

ut to them

elled by the

overnment.

alled upon red against

can insure

re will still

ent inspec-

it seemed

a traction

ly author-

y a Gov-

ind after

ım Boiler

the hold-

company

inspector ed me to

tchewan.

Act and

· holding

company,

payment

Act reads

ting the

ny boiler

rporated

do busi-

wners of

nspector

produce

ent year

eflection

nvinced

greatly

ne duly

he cost 'ould be

carried,

) would

insures

but it

ımages

expect

out out

the fee

penses

mount

agree

t they

xempt

per of

com-

ing at

ornot

ainst

an be

ey for

y be

ction

their

This

ined.

wing

Labor, stacking

Barle

Barle

Labor, threshing

Threshing bill...

was soon aying, "Its

Stook or Stack Threshing.

An investigation of considerable interest to grain growing farmers was conducted by professors Hay and Parker of the Minnesota Experiment Station, the results of which were published in bulletin 97. Liberal

vents the deterioration in the quality of all small same.

grains. Wheat, oats, and barley, when threshed . The Tables illustrate in a general way the com-

from the stack, have better color, plumper kernels, parative cost of shock-threshing grain per acre and

and a smaller percentage of sprouted and weather-stack-threshing grain. The cost is less under both damaged seeds than when threshed from the shock. methods at Halstad than at Marshall or Northfield, the grain than to thresh directly from the shock, and on account of the more powerful and efficient machinexcerpts are made from this bulletin when the disit is a much disputed question whether the benefits ery employed and on account of smaller yield cussion touches upon the comparative cost of stack and stook threshing, which we trust our readers and stook threshing, which we trust our readers cost. Statistics on this problem are shown in the basis of cost per acre is not absolutely exact and

will follow with interest. This discussion is as Tables, and have especial merit in that they have conclusive unless the yield per acre is the same for been collected from farms in the same neighborhood those fields threshed from the shock and from the It is a well-known fact that stacking largely pre- where wages and prices paid for threshing are the stack in any community. The comparative cost of threshing grain by different methods, to be absolutely exact, should be determined by the varying amounts of labor necessary to the different methods, the cash cost per acre (based upon yield and rate paid per

bushel for threshing) being a constant factor in each case. In the actual work of collecting statistics on this subject it is impossible to secure records from an acreage of grain threshed from the shock where the yield per acre will be exactly the same as from another acreage stacked and stack-threshed. To

avoid this difficulty the cost of threshing grain by various methods may be placed on a more comparable basis by considering the labor cost per acre alone or by reducing the entire cost to the cost per bushel instead of the cost per acre. The labor cost of threshing a crop of grain by any method will not vary with yield to the same extent that the cash cost or threshing bill will vary. The amount of labor per acre involved in threshing a 40-bushel crop of oats, for example,

will vary but little from the amount necessary to thresh a 50-bushel crop, whereas the cash cost or threshing bill varies by 2c. per bushel with every bushel of difference in yield. Thus, labor cost forms an equitable basis for the comparative study of methods of threshing grain as illustrated in Table

the same farming regions. The comparative cost of threshing grain per bushel by various methods is shown in Table XLI. Here the cash cost of threshing is a constant factor for each method, and, by

XL, providing the various methods are compared in

reducing the amounts of labor per acre necessary to each method to the basis of amounts per bushel and adding this to the cash cost per bushel, a more accurate comparison of methods is made than when comparisons are made on the acreage basis.

The Table XLI indicates the fact that the additional cost of stacking and stack-threshing wheat, oats and barley can be met, and in some cases exceeded, by a difference of one grade in the quality of the grain marketed. The average difference in price between No. 1 Northern wheat and No. 2 Northern is about 2c., and the difference in the cost per bushel of threshing wheat from the shock and from the stack is approximately 2½c., as indicated by the statistics collected at Halstad. The average difference in price between No. 3 or No. 4 malt barley and No. 1 feed barley is 2c. to 4c. per bushel, and the difference in the cost per bushel of threshing barley from the shock and from the stack is 1.1c. at North-

field and 1c. at Halstad.

\$120.81

054

28.24

55.34

142.77

142.77

.507

\$0.467

.108

. 388

The possibility of improving the grade of grain enough to pay for the additional cost of stacking and stack-threshing depends in any locality upon the availability of machines, the availability of labor, and the climatic conditions prevailing at harvest. Intelligent stacking of grain during a majority of Minnesota harvests is cheap insurance against bleached, sprouted, and bin-burnt grain. If the weather is favorable and a machine can be put in the field as soon as the grain is fit to thresh, a slight saving will be made as compared with stacking and stack-threshing. On the other hand, if the shocks must weather for several days or in some cases several weeks before a machine can be obtained, the loss in grade is considerable, and stacking the grain would have been profitable.

On the majority of small farms in Minnesota the labor question must also be taken into consideration. in discussing the relative merits of shock and stackthreshing. At stacking time a small crew with the home teams can stack the grain, while if the grain is to be threshed out of the shock a large crew and a large number of teams must be had at a very busy season. If a rainy spell comes at this season of the year, the minute the grain is dry stacking can begin with the regular help, whereas if shock-threshing is to be done the grain must stay out and risk another wetting while the machine and the necessary labor are being brought together. Exchanging help for shock-threshing usually prevents early fall plowing, a practice which is very important in Minnesota with all stubble land not seeded to grass.

The conclusion may be drawn that for a majority of Minnesota farms producing grain under the prevailing conditions of climate, availability of labor and machines, stacking and stack-threshing of grain is better farm management than shock-threshing.

WHEAT THRESHING—COST PER ACRE

MARSHALL	(LYON	COUNTY
----------	-------	--------

	Shock-threshed		ned	Stacked and stack-threshed		
Item	Acres	Total Cost	Cost per Acre	Acres	Total Cost	Cost per acre
Labor stackingLabor Threshing					\$1,097.13	\$0.486
Threshing bill					271.57 797.06	.722
Total						1.454
	HALSTAD (N	ORMAN COUL	NTY)			
Labor stacking				1,869.19		\$0.441
Labor, threshing		\$226.31	\$0.426 .385	718.05	143.23	.199

Note.—Rate per bushel paid to owner of machine was 5c at Marshall and 3½c at Halstad. At Marshall the owner of the machine furnished a larger proportion of the threshing crew than at Northfield or Halstau

OATS THRESHING—COST PER ACRE

NORTHFIELD (RICE COUNTY)

	NORTHFIEL	D (RICE COL	NIY)			
	Sho	ock-threshed	1	Stacked	and Stack-t	hreshed
Item	Acres	Total Cost	Cost per Acre	Acres	Total Cost	Cost per Acre
Labor, stacking Labor, threshing Threshing, bill	1,278.4	\$1,315.41 1,107.09	\$1.09 .866	1,028.44 1,028.44 1,028.44	\$788.81 650.41 890.00	\$0.767 .632 .865
Total			1.895			2.264
	MARSHALL	(LYON COU	NTY)			
Labor, stacking Labor, threshing Threshing, bill				918.81 603.76 603.76	\$596.13 187.58 760.74	\$0.649 .317 1.260
Total						2.226
	HALSTAD (NORMAN COU	NTY)			
Labor, stacking Labor, threshing Threshing, bill	130.69		\$0.432 .542	426.38 168.20 168.20	\$194.73 39.20 80.48	.233
Total			-974			1.168
Note.—Rate per bushel paid to owne			Northfield, 3	cat Marsha	ll, and 2c at	Halstad

BARLEY THRESHING—COST PER ACRE.

NORTHFIELD (RICE COUNTY) \$0.565 Labor, threshing. 113.08 \$0.860 60.59 113.42 .610 Threshing, bill. 72.11 44.66 128.93 72.84 Total... 1.497 1.664 MARSHALL (LYON COUNTY) Labor, stacking...... \$450.50 \$0.572 Labor, threshing.... 534.60 148.30 .259 750.18 Threshing bill... 819.94 1.924 HALSTAD (NORMAN COUNTY)

Note.—Rate per bushel paid to owner of machine was 2c at Northfield, 2c at Halstad, and 31c at Mar-

\$76.37 64.86

LABOR—COST PER ACRE OF THRESHING GRAIN.

127.00

127.90

Crop	Route.	Shock-threshed.	Stacked and stack- threshed.
Wheat Wheat Oats Oats Barley Barley	Marshall Halstad Northfield Marshall Halstad Northfield Marshall	\$0.426 1.029 .432 .860	\$0.732 .640 1.399 .966 .690 1.099
Barley	Halstad TABLE X L I.—COS'	-597 I PER BUSHEL OF TH	.665 RESHING GRAIN.
Wheat Wheat Oats Oats	Marshall Halstad Nort hfield Marshall Halstad	\$0.074	\$0.101 .101 .052 .053

rmal ie to lieve kely

> fee, the ledy