From the figures in Column 5, Table 7, it appears clear that the efficiency of meal-utilization is greater when concentrates are fed over the early stages of growth than over the later stages. A high level of efficiency is also apparent when they are employed so as to take advantage of the greater efficiency of food-utilization of the pig at young stages of growth. by being fed throughout the whole fattening-period. Thus Group 3, where the meal was fed up to porker weights only, thereafter being discontinued, shows the highest efficiency, with 2.37 gallons of milk saved per pound of meal fed. Group 4, where a heavy rate of feeding occurred up to pork weights, followed by a lighter rate to bacon weights, shows up well with a slight advantage over Group 2, where meal was fed at the same rate throughout. In both these cases Ilb. of meal saved approximately 2 gallons of buttermilk. Feeding meal from pork to bacon weights only produced the least efficient results. I lb. of meal saving 1.77 gallons of milk (Group 5).

A further significant feature from these results is the fact that, although Group 3 shows the maximum efficiency of utilization, the gross effect is small, as indicated by the total amount of milk saved of II per cent. as compared with a saving of 40 per cent. in Group 4 and 30 per cent, in Group 2. This is due to the small total quantity of meal fed, as must be the case when it is employed in such limited quantities to small pigs. This point is of practical significance: while the feeding of meal during the early stages of fattening only would appear to result in the most efficient utilization per pound of meal fed, the total effect on milk-reduction is small. A system of feeding as in Groups 2 and 4 which takes advantage of the former point but which, in addition, through the use of a greater total quantity of meal, produces a far greater gross effect in milk-saving and fattening-time, would appear to be the better method of feeding. The results are also suggestive that a still heavier rate of supplementing during the early stages only might be advantageous.

## ECONOMY OF RESULTS.

The relative cash returns per 100 gallons of buttermilk are set out in Table 8 for various prices for bacon and meal.

Table 8.—Series C: Cash Returns per 100 Gallons Buttermilk (deducting Cost of Meals).

|   | Group 2.                             |                      |                  | Group 3.         |                  |                  | Group 4.                             |                  |                  | Group 5.             |                                      |                      |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Price of Bacon  | 4d.                                  | 5d.                  | 6d.              | 4d.              | 5d.              | 6d.              | 4d.                                  | 5d.              | 6d.              | 4d.                  | 5d.                                  | 6d.                  |
| Control group   | 47·5d.                               | 59·5d.               | 71·5d.           | 47.5d.           | 59·5d.           | 71·5d.           | 47·5d.                               | 59·5d.           | 71·5d.           | 47·5d.               | 59*5d.                               | 71·5d.               |
| Meal at £6 ton Meal at £8 ton Meal at £10 ton Meal at £12 ton | 53·od.<br>48·od.<br>43·od.<br>38·od. | 65 · od.<br>60 · od. | 81·5d.<br>76·5d. | 48·5d.<br>47·2d. | 61·7d.<br>60·4d. | 75·2d.<br>73·9d. | 56·5d.<br>48·5d.<br>40·5d.<br>32·5d. | 68·5d.<br>60·5d. | 88·od.<br>80·od. | 45 · od.<br>40 · od. | 63·5d.<br>58·5d.<br>53·5d.<br>48·5d. | 73 · od.<br>68 · od. |