

FOOD-CONSUMPTION AND GROWTH-RATE RESULTS.

Table 6 sets out the growth-rate and economy of food-consumption results calculated on a dressed-weight basis.

Table 6.—Series C: Effect of Supplementing over varying Weight Ranges.

	Group 1: Control.	Group 2.	Group 3.	Group 4.	Group 5.
<i>Growth-rate.</i>					
* Initial weight	272 lb.	276 lb.	283 lb.	284 lb.	274 lb.
Average	34 lb.	34.5 lb.	35.4 lb.	35.5 lb.	34.2 lb.
† Final weight	1,167 lb.	1,195 lb.	1,166 lb.	1,138 lb.	1,175 lb.
Average	146 lb.	149 lb.	146 lb.	142 lb.	147 lb.
* Gain in weight	895 lb.	919 lb.	883 lb.	854 lb.	901 lb.
Average	112 lb.	115 lb.	110.4 lb.	107 lb.	112.6 lb.
Average days on trial ..	187½	170	177½	155½	173
* Average daily weight-gain	0.59 lb.	0.67 lb.	0.63 lb.	0.69 lb.	0.65 lb.
<i>Food-consumption.</i>					
Total—					
Buttermilk	7,520 gals.	5,459 gals.	6,578 gals.	4,304 gals.	6,217 gals.
Meal	1,109 lb.	349 lb.	1,366 lb.	768 lb.
Per 100 lb. gain of dressed weight—					
Buttermilk	840 gals.	594 gals.	745 gals.	504 gals.	690 gals.
Meal	120 lb.	40 lb.	160 lb.	85 lb.

* Dressed weight calculated from live-weight.

† Actual cold dressed weight.

Examination of the results in Table 6 will indicate that the growth-rate and fattening-time of the respective groups was in keeping with the amounts of meal fed, groups receiving the larger quantities fattening at a faster rate. It will also be noted that the growth-rate of all groups was lower than that obtaining in the previous trials. This effect is considered to be due to the more severe climatic conditions existing during the progress of this series. Weather was markedly colder, and rainfall abnormally higher for the season as compared with the conditions obtaining during the previous series. With pigs fattened out-of-doors it was only to be expected therefore that growth would be slower. This lower efficiency in growth-rate was similarly carried to economy of food-consumption, each group showing a higher food requirement for the production of 100 lb. of dressed-weight gain than in Series A, where the trial covered a similar growth-range.

The relative efficiency of the different systems of supplementing can be more clearly seen from Table 7, where the relative amounts of meal fed and milk saved per 100 lb. of pig-meat produced allow the milk saved per pound of meal fed to be calculated (Column 5).

Table 7.—Series C: Efficiency of Meal-utilization.

No. of Group.	Meal used per 100 lb. Gain.*	Milk saved per 100 lb. Gain.	Milk saved.	Days saved per Pig.	Milk saved per Pound Meal used.
	(1.)	(2.)	(3.)	(4.)	(5.)
Group 2	Lb. 120	Gals. 246	Per Cent. 29.3	17½	Gals. 2.00
Group 3	40	95	11.4	10	2.37
Group 4	160	336	40.0	32	2.10
Group 5	85	150	18.0	14½	1.77

* Dressed weight.