_
5
(Continued
H
Š
ž
e
Table
-

Beseler Six B J. Baithrop B H J. Baithrop G H J. Baithrop B H W. Huston G H W. Huston B D W. Huston G H W. Huston G H O'Bryan Ranch B H Historial G H O'Bryan Ranch G H Historial G H O'Bryan Ranch G H Historial G H Historial G H Manhattan G D Manhattan G D		PRODUCTION DATA	N BATA!	The state of the s		-	l		CARCASS DATA	-	
J. Baithrop B H 165 1.68 378 27.6 1.38 4.92 54.7 Wichita G H 172 1.47 27.5 1.13 4.74 54.7 J. Balthrop B H 186 1.27 412 28.0 1.05 4.33 56.4 Wichita G H 181 1.42 28.0 1.07 4.54 56.4 Wichita G H 181 1.42 28.0 1.07 4.54 56.4 Wichita G D 151 1.86 38.9 28.0 1.07 4.64 56.4 Wichita G D 162 1.86 38.9 28.0 1.73 4.64 56.4 O'Bryan Ranch B H 160 1.73 3.4 28.4 0.95 5.87 61.1 O'Bryan Ranch G H 146 1.65 33.0 28.4 1.79 68.3	Breeder	813	20.	Age at 200 Ibs. (days)	A.D.G. Dec.	Feed eff.	F. e.	8.4 7.4	2 H 2 H 2 H 2 H 2 H 2 H 2 H 2 H 2 H 2 H	₽, J.	Index
G H 172 1.47 27.5 1.13 4.74 54.7 B H 186 1.27 412 29.2 1.05 4.33 56.4 B H 181 1.42 412 29.2 1.05 4.33 56.4 B D 151 1.86 339 28.0 1.67 4.64 56.4 B H 152 1.45 330 36.1 1.38 4.52 5.87 61.1 B H 162 1.73 344 29.4 1.10 3.82 5.87 61.1 G H 160 1.73 344 29.4 1.10 3.82 5.87 61.1 G H 160 1.25 33.02 1.00 4.58 58.3 G H 160 1.25 32.9 1.05 5.48 60.2 B H 160 1.25 32.9 1.43 4.03	J. Balthrop	В	I	165	1.68	378	27.6	1.38	4.92	54.3	88.0
J. Balthrop B. H. 186 1.27 412 29.2 1.05 4.33 56.4 Wichita G. H. 181 1.42 35.9 1.07 4.64 56.4 W. Huston G. H. 151 1.86 339 28.0 1.67 4.64 56.4 Americus G. H. 152 1.45 350 28.1 1.67 4.64 56.4 O'Bryan Ranch G. H. 162 1.73 3.44 29.4 1.10 3.82 5.87 5.11 O'Bryan Ranch G. H. 160 1.73 3.44 29.4 1.10 3.82 5.83 O'Bryan Ranch G. H. 160 1.27 3.02 3.02 1.00 4.58 58.3 O'Bryan Ranch G. H. 1.60 1.25 3.26 3.56 4.59 5.80 Haltville G. H. 1.43 1.44 1.44	Wiebita	<u>ٿ</u>	Η	51 1- 1-	1.47		10 10 10 10	1.13	+ +	54.7	93.6
Wiehita G H 181 1.42 28.0 1.67 4.64 56.4 W. Huston B D 151 1.86 339 28.0 1.62 3.57 49.4 Americus G D 162 1.86 38.0 1.62 5.40 1.6 5.40 1.7 4.6 1.7 4.6 1.7 4.6 1.7 4.6 1.7 4.6 1.7 5.8 5.87 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 61.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1	J. Balthrop	B	H	186	1.27	412	29.3	1.05	4.33	5.6.4	t- 6
W. Huston B D 151 1.86 389 28.0 1.62 3.57 49.4 Americus G D 162 1.86 28.1 1.38 4.52 54.0 O'Bryan Ranch B H 152 1.45 380 36.1 0.95 5.87 61.1 Hatriville G H 160 1.73 344 29.4 1.10 3.82 5.87 61.1 O'Bryan Ranch G H 160 1.73 344 29.4 1.10 3.82 5.83 O'Bryan Ranch G H 179 1.65 330 28.9 1.10 4.58 58.3 O'Bryan Ranch G H 160 1.27 28.6 6.87 4.79 60.1 O'Bryan Ranch B H 160 1.26 32.9 28.9 1.47 4.79 60.1 Chryan Ranch B H 160 1.26 32.6 1	Wichita	ტ.	Ξ	181	1.42		28.0	1.07	4.64	56.4	105.2
Americus G D 162 1.86 28.1 1.38 4.52 54.0 O'Bryan Ranch B H 152 1.45 330 36.1 0.93 5.35 61.7 Histrylle G H 162 1.78 344 29.4 1.10 3.82 5.37 61.1 O'Bryan Ranch G H 146 1.52 330 28.9 1.10 3.82 58.3 O'Bryan Ranch G H 179 1.65 330 28.9 1.12 5.00 57.7 Histrylle G H 120 1.27 28.8 0.87 4.79 60.1 O'Bryan Ranch B H 160 1.25 32.9 1.06 4.58 58.3 O'Bryan Ranch B H 160 1.25 32.9 1.65 6.48 6.2 6.1 6.1 Hattylle B B B B B 1.44	W. Huston	В	Д	151	1.86	339	28.0	1.62	10,00	49.4	6.99
O'Bryan Ranch B H 152 1.45 350 36.1 0.93 5.35 61.7 Histrylle G H 162 1.30 28.4 0.95 5.87 61.1 O'Bryan Ranch G H 146 1.73 344 29.4 1.10 3.82 58.3 Histrylle G H 179 1.65 33.02 1.00 4.58 58.3 O'Bryan Ranch G H 210 1.27 28.6 0.87 4.79 60.1 O'Bryan Ranch B H 160 1.27 28.6 0.87 4.79 60.1 O'Bryan Ranch B H 160 1.26 32.9 1.05 5.48 60.2 Histville B H 143 1.44 29.5 1.05 5.48 60.2 KSU B D 149 1.61 1.61 1.61 1.63 4.03 63.7 I D STOR<	Americus	<u>ت</u>	D	162	1.86		28.1	1.38	4. 52. 54.	54.0	100.6
Histrytille G H 162 1.30 28.4 0.95 5.87 61.1 O'Bryan Ranch B H 160 1.73 344 29.4 1.10 3.82 53.9 Histryille G H 179 1.65 330 28.9 1.12 5.00 57.7 Histryille G H 179 1.27 28.8 0.87 4.79 60.1 O'Bryan Ranch B H 160 1.25 33.2 28.0 0.87 4.79 60.1 O'Bryan Ranch B H 160 1.26 33.2 28.0 0.87 4.79 60.1 Histryille G H 143 1.44 29.5 1.05 5.48 60.2 KSU Manchattan G D 149 1.61 29.4 1.18 4.03 58.8 O'Bryan Ranch G H 149 1.61 29.4 1.18 4.03 68.8 O'Bryan Ranch G H 149 1.61 29.0 1.25 3.92 48.7 O'Bryan Ranch G H 149 1.61 29.4 1.18 4.03 68.8 O'Bryan Ranch G H 149 1.61 29.0 1.25 3.92 48.7 O'Bryan Ranch G H 149 1.61 29.0 1.38 3.92 48.7 O'Bryan Ranch G H 149 1.61 29.0 1.38 3.92 48.7 O'Bryan Ranch G H 149 1.61 29.0 1.38 3.92 48.7 O'Bryan Ranch G H 149 1.61 2.88 2.90 1.30 3.92 48.7 O'Bryan Ranch G H 149 1.61 2.88 2.90 1.30 3.93 3.93 5.15 O'Bryan Ranch G H 149 1.60 1.89 3.93 3.93 3.93 5.15 O'Bryan Ranch G H 149 1.60 1.89 3.93 3.93 3.93 5.15 O'Bryan Ranch G H 149 1.60 1.60 1.90 1.90 1.90 1.90 5.15 O'Bryan Ranch G H 140 1.60 1.60 1.90 1.90 1.90 1.90 1.90 1.90 1.90 1.9	O'Bryan Ranch	В	Н	100	1.45	330	30.1	0.93	10 00 10	61.7	111.8
O'Bryan Ranch B H 160 1,73 344 29,4 1.10 3.82 53.9 Histrollie G H 146 1.52 33.02 1.00 4,58 58.3 O'Bryan Ranch G H 179 1.65 330 28.9 1.12 5.00 57.7 Histrylle G H 10 1.27 32.8 6.87 4.79 60.1 Chrysn Ranch B H 160 1.25 332 28.6 6.87 4.79 60.1 Chrysn Ranch B H 143 1.44 29.5 1.05 5.48 60.2 KSU B D 138 1.83 36 27.8 1.18 4.03 63.8 Manhattan G D 149 1.61 1.61 29.4 1.18 4.03 63.8 Resedens 38 Pigs (26B + 12G) 160 1.69 286 27.8 1.23 4.03	Histiville	. G	Ħ	162	1.36		4. 85 4. 85	0.95	5.87	61.1	131.8
Histrylle G H 146 1.52 33.02 1.00 4.58 58.3 C F7.7 C Strongle G H 179 1.65 330 28.9 1.12 5.00 57.7 Histrylle G H 210 1.27 28.8 0.87 4.79 60.1 C H 143 1.44 29.5 1.05 5.48 60.2 Histrylle G H 143 1.44 29.5 1.05 6.48 60.2 Histrylle G H 143 1.44 29.5 1.05 6.48 60.2 KSU B D 138 1.88 366 27.8 1.43 3.92 48.7 Manhattan G D 149 1.61 29.4 1.18 4.03 63.8 10 Broceders 38 Pigs (26B + 12G) 160 1.69 384 29.0 1.25 4.48 64.7 64.7 64.7 64.7 64.7 64.7 64.7 64.7	O'Bryan Ranch	В	Ξ	160	5. E	344	29.4	1.10	3,85	53.9	82.0
O'Bryan Ranch G H 179 1.65 330 28.9 1.12 5.00 57.7 Historille G H 210 1.27 28.8 0.87 4.79 60.1 1 C G H 143 1.27 28.8 0.87 4.79 60.1 1 C G H 143 1.44 29.5 1.05 5.48 60.2 Historille G H 143 1.44 29.5 1.05 5.48 60.2 KSU B D 138 1.88 366 27.8 1.43 3.92 48.7 Manhattan G D 149 1.61 29.4 1.18 4.03 63.8 10 Broceders 38 Pigs (26B + 12G) 160 1.69 382 29.0 1.25 4.48 54.03 63.8 10 Broceders 38 Pigs (26B + 12G) 1.69 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20			Ξ	146	1.0 10.1		33.03	1.00	4.58	58.3	109.3
Hiatrville		ර	н	179	1.65	330	28.9	1.12	5.00	57.7	99,5
nch B H 160 1.25 332 28.0 0.85 4.59 62.7 B D 138 1.88 366 27.8 1.43 3.92 48.7 C D 149 1.61 29.0 1.25 4.13 63.8 SUMMARY SUMMARY 38 Pigs (26B + 12G) 1.69 1.26 4.18 64.7 21.0 1.26 2.85 (2.90 1.72) 6.87 (4.84) 22.0 1.26 4.18 64.7		5	Н	210	1.27		28.8	18.0	4,79	60.1	112.3
B D 138 1.88 366 27.8 1.43 3.92 48.7 B D 138 1.88 366 27.8 1.43 3.92 48.7 SUMMARY SS Pigs (26B + 12G) 160 1.63 334 29.0 1.25 4.18 (134 (2.08 (2.08 (0.93 (3.57 (4.84)) 1.26) 1.26) 1.26 (1.94 (2.08 (2.08)) 1.26) 1.72 (4.85)	O'Bryan Ranch	В	Н	160	1.9	01 00 00	28.0	0.85	4.59	62.7	117.3
B D 138 1.88 366 27.8 143 3.92 48.7 G D 149 1.61 29.4 1,18 4,03 53.8 SUMMARY SS Pigs (26B + 12G) 160 1.69 384 29.0 1.25 4.48 54.7 210 1.26 2.85 (27.0 6.93 (3.57 (48.4)	Hiattville	ο.	Н	143	1.44		29.5	1.05	5,48	60.2	117.38
38 Pigs (26B + 12G) 160 1.63 284 1.18 4.03 58.8 50.00 1.69 3.84 29.0 1.25 4.48 54.7 (48.4 2.08 2.85 (27.0 0.93 (3.57 (48.4 2.0) 1.26) 1.12) 1.12) 5.87 (48.4 5.2)	KSU	В	D	138	88.1	366	8.7.5	1.43	3.92	48.7	74.9
SUMMARY 29.0 L25 4.48 54.7 (2.68 + 12G) 160 L69 334 29.0 L25 4.48 54.7 (134 (2.08 (2.85 (2.70 (0.93 (3.57 (4.8.4 2.0) 1.26) 112) 3.10) 1.72) 5.87) 6.27)	Manhattan	9 .	Q	149	1.61		29,4	1,18	4,03	63,8	87.6
38 Pigs (26B + 12G) 160 1.69 334 29.0 1.25 4.48 54.7 (134 (2.08 (285 (27.0 (0.93 (3.57 (4.8.4 2.09 1.9.1 1.72) 5.87) 5.87)							SUMMA	RY			
(134 (2.08 (285 (27,0 (0.93 (3.57 (48.4 are)) 1.72) 5.87) (48.4 are)		(26B +	- 12G)	160	1.69	*#* 60 60	29.0	1,25	4.48	64.7	63.9
				(134	(2.08	(285	(27,0 31.0)	(0.93	(38.10 (8.10 (8.10	62.7)	(66.9

an average for two pigs ful together.

% L.C. = % lenn cuts on carcass weight basis;
of loin eye and 15% of live weight in trimmed 1.B = broad; A.D.G. = average daily gain during test period; Fred efficiency = 1.2 Lg(b) = carcass length; R.F. = average carcass backfat; L.E. = loin eye area; Thanks = ladex according to 1962 National Barrow Show Index (a pig with £.00 sq. in, ham will index 10c0).

3. Highest indexing carcass meeting or exceeding all certification requirements.

Table 25 Swine testing expenses-summer 1962

Slaughter charge (42 pigs @ 87.00)	8	294.00
Labor (297.5 hours @ \$1.15)		342.12
Electricity		000.00
Feed (9 tons)		516.97
Veterinary service and medicine		58.70
Bedding and fly spray		20.00
Supplies and equipment		00.00
Postage, envelopes, etc.		6.00
Depreciation and maintenance (42 pigs @ \$5.00)		210,00
	SI	.447.79
\$1,447.79 ÷ 42 = \$34.47 per pig (Rounded to \$34.00)		

Table 26 Swine testing expense-winter 1962-63

Slaughter charge (38 pigs @ \$7.00)	\$ 266.00
Labor (123 hours @ \$1.15)	141.45
Electricity (Oct. through Feb.)	78.60
Feeds (8 tons)	482,16
Veterinary service and medicine	26,50
Supplies and equipment	11.00
Bedding and fly spray	10.00
Postage, envelopes, etc	13.75
Depreciation and maintenance (38 pigs @ \$5.00)	190.00
	050 40

\$ 959.46

\$959.46 ÷ 38 = \$25.25 per pig (Rounded to \$25.00)

Actual production cost was \$18.25 per pig or approximately \$13.00 per 100 pounds of gain.

Concrete Floor vs. Elevated Wooden, Slotted Floor (Project 110). B. A. Koch

The practice of raising pigs on an elevated slotted floor is receiving wide publicity. Slotted floors have been used in various parts of the world for many years, but they have only recently been used extensively in this country. Slotted floors take some of the labor from swine production and permit pigs in growing-finishing units to be crowded.

Experimental Procedure

Twenty-four feeder pigs weighing approximately 50 pounds each were divided into two similar groups for this study. The pigs had previously been vaccinated for hog cholera and erysipelas and had been wormed with piperazine. They were placed in two adjacent pens. One pen had a slotted floor raised nine inches above the original concrete floor. The other pen had a concrete floor. Manure was allowed to collect under the slotted floor.

The slotted floor sections were made up of oak slats 1 1/4 inches wide with %-inch slots between slats. The sections were purchased commercially. Railroad crossties were used to elevate the floor above the concrete.

Pigs on concrete had approximately 15 square feet of floor space each while those on slats had approximately 8 square feet of floor space each. Both groups of pigs were self-fed complete meal ration number S-35. The ration formulation is listed in Table 23. Both groups drank from automatic water fountains and there was one mist-type logging nozzle over each pen. Each pen was partially under roof.

Observations

Table 27 summarizes the average performance of pigs in each pen. Pigs on the slotted floor were always clean. All manure went through the floor and no cleaning was ever necessary. Pigs on the concrete floor were always dirty, even though the pen was scraped each day. The whole area was sprayed regularly to control flies.

During hot weather pigs on the slotted floor suffered noticeably from the heat and/or humidity. One pig became overheated and died August 6. Maximum temperature that day was 98° F, with high relative humidity. In contrast pigs on the wet, dirty floor showed little evidence of discomfort from heat even on the warmest days. Apparently the concrete floor helped cool the pigs.

Since feed efficiency figures are similar for the two groups, it is suggested that differences in weight gain were due to differences in feed intake due to temperature effect. It would be possible to overcome this effect in a properly designed slotted floor unit.

Table 27

Performance of pigs on a concrete floor vs. those on an elevated wooden, slotted floor.

June 7, 1962, to September 15, 1962-99 days.

	Concrete floor	Slotted floor
No. pigs	12	12
Ration no	S-35	S-35
Av. initial wt., lbs	54	55
Av. final wt., lbs	214	178
Av. daily gain, 1bs	1.61	1.28
Standard error	± 0.04	生0.03
Av. feed eff., lbs	3.30	3.35
Feed cost per cwt. gain	\$10.06	\$10,22

One pig died August 6. Post-mortem examination indicated heat prostraion.

Corn vs. Sorghum and Pellets vs. Meal for Growing-finishing Swine (Project 110).

B. A. Koch

This is a continuation of feeding trials comparing the feeding value of corn and sorghum grain under Kansas conditions,

Experimental Procedure

Forty feeder pigs, 12 Poland Chinas and 28 Durocs averaging 55 pounds each, were randomly divided by breed and sex into four groups. All pigs had been previously vaccinated for cholers and erysipelas and wormed with piperszine.

The pigs were fed and housed on concrete where each pig had 18 square feet of space. There was an electrically heated, automatic waterer in each pen, Each group of 10 pigs had access to a three-hole fence line self-feeder.

Ration formulations are listed in Table 23. Rations 34 and 34A contained corn while 35 and 35A contained sorghum grain. Sorghum grain replaced corn on a pound-for-pound basis with no other changes in formu-

lation. In each case one ration was fed as meal and one as pellets. Individual pigs were removed from test as they reached market weight. Carcasses were examined on the rail after slaughter.

Observations

Table 28 summarizes performance and cost data for the study. There was no significant difference between average daily gain figures for the various lots. In a previous study, pigs eating pelleted rations gained somewhat faster than those eating meal rations. The pigs eating the pelleted rations were more efficient than those eating meal. This was also true in a previous study.

Pigs performed as well on sorghum grain as on corn whether the ration was pelleted or in meal form. The corn and sorghum used in this study had similar protein levels, thus the change in grain did not change the crude protein level of the rations.

Under prices at the time of the study the sorghum grain rations produced cheaper gains than the corn rations. Pelleted rations produced gain more efficiently than meal rations in both comparisons even though the cost per ton of the pelleted rations was higher.

Carcasses from the various lots did not differ significantly in USDA grade.

Table 28 Corn vs. sorghum grain. (Feeding period began December 16, 1961.)

Ration no.'	35	34	34A	35A
Av. % crude protein	16	1.6	16	1.6
Grain	Sorghum	Cuen	Corn	Sirghum
Preparation	Meal	Meal	Pellet	Pellet
No. of pigs	10	10	1.0	10
Av. on-test wt., lbs,	52	54	5.6	5.6
Av. off-test wt., Ibs	215	206	222	220
Av. daily gain, Ibs	1.60	1.51	1.61	1.60
Standard error	± 0.07	± 0.07	± 0.08	± 0.07
Av. feed efficiency, 1bs	372	365	349	346
Av. feed cost per cwt. gain	\$ 9.93	\$10.73	\$10.61	\$ 9.58

1. See Table 23 for ration formulation.

Feed cost per ton

Swine Breeding Investigations (Project 242) (Progress Report), B. A. Koch

\$53.40

\$58.80

\$60.80

\$55.40

A crossbred barrow sired by a Duroe boar (University Charm 16753), and out of a Poland China sow (Prince's Maiden 20-521492), was first-place crossbred barrow at the 1962 Kansas State Fair. The barrow produced the champion careass when slaughtered.

Carcass data follow:

Carcass length, 29.9 inches; backfat, 1.06 inches; loin eye area, 5.80 square inches; lean cuts, 53.67% of carcass weight and 39.1% of live weight.

Vitamin A Levels for Growing-finishing Pigs (Project 311).

B. A. Koch

Vitamin A supplementation recommendations vary considerably from station to station. Most research indicates that supplementation recommendations are generally much higher than actually necessary. This