How to Produce 20 POUNDS OF BEEF FOR LESS THAN ONE DOLLAR

MONTE BELL

Eighteen field trials in five Northern California counties involving 739 individually weighed calves were conducted by farm advisors on cooperating ranches from 1969 to 1974.

The purpose was to determine the effect of DES and RAL implants in suckling calves on weaning weight and on subsequent performance.

The following results were obtained:

- Suckling steer calves receiving one implant of 12 or 15 mg. DES gained 20 pounds (7 percent) more than controls and 11 pounds (3 percent) more than calves implanted with 36 mg. RAL over the 185 days between implanting and weaning.
- Suckling heifer calves receiving one 36 mg. implant of RAL gained 21 pounds (11 percent) more than controls.
- Implants at suckling age had no effect on postweaning gains if the animals received growth stimulants during the growing and finishing period.
- Postweaning gains were slightly depressed in calves receiving no growth stimulant following suckling calf implants, but total gain to slaughter still favored implanted calves.
- Carcass grade and cutability were not adversely affected by suckling calf implants except in one trial where calves received a third implant within 65 days of slaughter.
- Heifers receiving 36 mg. RAL at suckling age showed some teat elongation but had no adverse side effects and no fertility problems when bred at yearling age.

A survey of farm advisors in Nor-

thern California indicated that surprisingly few cow-calf producers utilize DES or RAL implants to increase gains in suckling calves. Various reasons were given: (1) the ban on DES stopped some producers and they have not started again (many suppliers do not stock DES — it must be special-ordered); (2) they do not know DES is now legal (it may be implanted up to 120 days before slaughter, and RAL up to 65 days prior to slaughter); (3) they feel buyers use implants as a bargaining point (as they used to do with brockle faces; 12 to 15 mg.implanted calves usually show more bloom, but levels of DES over 36 mg. may cause high tail heads); (4) they think calves have to be on full feed to benefit from implants (grass gains are improved too).

Cooperating ranches and counties included Eidman, Sexton and Groteguth in Glenn; Alvernaz, Keegan and Mathis in Colusa; Carr and Butte Creek in Sutter; Wiswall in Tehama; and Friden in Siskiyou.

Calves in Northern California are normally branded and marked at 1½ to 3½ months of age. The trials

Implanting suckling steer calves with 12 or 15 mg. DES (not to be implanted within 120 days of slaughter) and heifer calves with 36 mg. RAL (not to be implanted within 65 days of slaughter) at marking and branding time is practical and clearly economical. Implanting costs less than \$1.00 and will result in 10 to 30 additional pounds per calf at weaning without adversely affecting slaughter cattle given the usual growth stimulants during the finishing period. DES and RAL are available from veterinary product suppliers.

consisted of implanting at random a group of calves and leaving a similar number of controls. All calves were identified and individually weighed. Results were measured by individually weighing the calves at weaning time about six months after implanting and observing them for any side effects. In several trials individual postweaning and carcass data were obtained. Analysis of variance was used to determine significance of mean differences.

Available literature was reviewed and comparisons made with local results.

The results of Northern California trials up to weaning age are shown in table 1 for steers and table 2 for heifers. For comparison, several research station results are shown in table 3. In most of the trials, implanted steers gained more than controls — 10 to 30 pounds more for DES implants and 0 to 24 pounds more for RAL. RAL-implanted animals experience smaller and more variable weight gains than DES-implanted cattle. Wilson (Sutter County) found that RAL response

TABLE 1. EFFECT OF DES AND RAL IMPLANTS ON GROWTH OF STEER CALVES TO MEANING.

				lni-		ADG		lant to			Gain increase % & (1bs)		
Cooperator	County	Year	No.	tial wt.	Days	lowest group	No im- plant	RAL RAL	12-15 mg DES	No im- plant	RAL	DES	
Eidman	Glenn	1969	34	329	148	1.97	292		315	0		8% (23*)	
Wiswall Friden	Tehama Siski-	1969	49	116	229	1.62	372		389 351	0		5% (17*)	
	you	1970	20	166	195	1.68	328		(30 mg)	0		7% (23*)	
Alvernaz	Colusa	1971	19	208	193	1.53	302	295	320	0	-2% (-7)	6% (18)	
Alvernaz	Colusa	1972	22	216	180	1.53		279	276		0	-=1 (-3)	
Groteguth	Glenn	1971	16	162	200	1.55		309	333		Q.	B% (24)	
Grotemath	Glenn	1972	30	212	200	1,13		226	234		Ó	4% (8)	
Sexton	Glenn	1972	73	237	221	1.67		368	385		0	5% (19*)	
Carr	Sutter	1972	63	270	134	7,11	292	283	292	0	- 3% (-9)	0	
Carr	Sutter	1973	79	356	36	2.07	178	196	204	0	10% (18*)	15% (26*)	
Butte C. Same trial	Sutter	1974	82	384	76 125	1.61	122 209	146 229		0	20% (24*) 10% (20*)		
Malhis	Colusa	1974	51	281	232	1.58	366		399	0		9% (33*)	
Unweighted	average	538 h 12 tri		245	185	1.81				J	+4% (9)	+7% (20)	



Implants should be placed between the skin and cartilage in the back of the ear at least 1 inch away from the head.

decreases rapidly after 75 days and the manufacturer's recommendation is implantation each 100 days. Heifers, however, seem to respond as well to 36 mg. RAL as steers do to 12 or 15 mg. DES.

In one trial in Humboldt County (correspondence with Lawrence), teat length was longer in DES and RAL heifers. Bell found a similar effect in lambs. In general, the rancher's opinion was that the implanted calves showed more bloom and fleshiness than did controls.

In spite of the teat growth, calving records on Sexton, Keegan, and Groteguth ranches show no effect on fertility of heifers bred to calve as two-year-olds.

The effect of implants at suckling age on postweaning gains and carcass traits is shown in table 4 for Northern California and in table 5 for some experiment station reports.

Individual weights and carcass measurements were taken, and in the trials where the postweaning treatment was recorded, there was no consistent difference in postweaning gain where DES or Synovex implants were used or where DES was fed (before FDA restrictions). Two Iowa studies showed depressed gains where postweaning growth stimulants were not used; however, preweaning plus postweaning gains still favored the calves implanted at suckling age. Minnesota, Kansas, and Tennessee tests showed depressed postweaning gains, but use of growth stimulants after weaning were not reported.

The Northern California tests on the other hand showed trends for increased gain when suckling calves were implanted again in the feedlot compared to those implanted for the first time in the feedlot. In all tests the final weight favored the calves implanted at suckling age.

In the Glenn County experiments, marbling score was not affected by the suckling calf implant. In the Siskiyou test, marbling score was lower in the calves that had a total of three implants. The final implant was 65 days before slaughter. Cutability did not suffer as a result of preweaning treatment.

Monte Bell is a Farm Advisor, [Glenn & Colusa Counties]. Ralgro, trade name for RAL, was supplied by Commercial Solvents Corporation for many of these studies.

TABLE 2, LEFECT OF DES AND RAL IMPLANTS ON GROWTH OF HEIFER CALVES TO WEARING.

Cooperator							AOG	Gain im	piant to	wearing	Sain 1	ucrease » e	(102.)
	Caunty	County	Year	No.	initial wt.	Days	Lowest group	No im- plant	36 mg RAL	15 mg DES	No Im- plant	RAL	DES
Friden	Siski- you	1970	21	150	195	1.67	325		379	0		1% (4)	
Groteguth Groteguth	Glenn Glenn	1971 1971	, 11	174 319	200 200	1.47 1.15	293 229	3 13 250		D 0	7% (20) 9% (21)		
Sexton Sexton	Glenn Glenn	1972 1974	39 62	241 248	221 172	I.46 1.46	322 251	347 268		0	8% (25*) 7% (17*)		
Keegan	Colusa	1974	62	252	109	1.33	145	169		0	17% (24*)		
Unweighted	average			201	156	1.42				0	11% (21)		

*P < .05

TABLE 3. SEFECT OF DESIGNO RAL IMPLANTS ON GROWTH OF CALVES TO WEAKING -- A REVIEW.

Experiment				Initial			n implar weaming		Gain increase over No implant % (lbs.)		
station	Years	%92	No.	wt.	Days	No Implant	3A1.	207.5	RAI.	DES	
Ok lahoma Ok lahoma Minnesota	56-61 56-61 55-63	S II S	210 173 115	200-350 200-300	≃ 125 ≃ 125	734 216 259		256 245 277		9% (22) 13% (29) 7% (16)	
Kansas	57-64	S	204			387		404		4% (17)	
Mississippi	53-64	S	395			181		195		9% (14)	
Tennessee	63-64	5	219			219		233		6% (34)	
Michigan	63	\$	70			141		137		- 3% (-4)	
No. Oakota	67-70	5	183	130	113	23.0		212		1% (2)	
Iowa Iowa Califor∩ia	59-60 59-60 70	ና ባ S	58 52 40	235 225	≃ 120 ≃ 120	201 185 150		229 211 184	 	14% (28) 14% (26) 23% (34)	
Yortana	68-69	2	159	145	146	275	285	281	4% (10)	2% (6)	
Indiana	70	5	79			258	255	267	-4% (-12)	0 (-1)	
Meyada Gregor	7.2	s \$	л4 36	198 269	205 106	105 206	137 215	128	30% (32) 4% (9)	22% (23)	
Unweighted av	erage		2062						5% (10)	2% (16)	

TABLE 4. FFFECT OF DESIGNORAL IMPLANTS IN SUCKITING CALVES ON POST WEATING GAINS AND CARCASS TRAITS.

Compenator	No.	Sex	Pre- weaning treatment	Post wearing treatment	Gain weaning to sitr,	Car- cass wt.	Car- nass WDA	Yarb- ling ₁ / score	Cut- ability %	Retail cuts/day of age
Endnian	17 17	2	0 DES 15 mg	DES fed DES fed	2.33 2.51	649 691 ² /	1.34	17.5 19.0	40 48	.654/ .68
Friden	10 10	S S	0 (18.8-30 mg	2X DES 30 mg 2X DES 30 mg	2,92 1.99	594 606	I.25 1.28	14.7 ₃ /	51 51	.62 .64
	19 11	H	0 0FS 15 mg	/X DES 15 mg 2× DES 15 mg	1.67 1.80 ³ /	513 ₃ /	1.08 ₃ /	$\frac{13.3}{11.12}$ /	52 52	.55 .57
Sexton	25 27	2 8	9AL 35 mg 9ES 15 mg	055 30 mg 065 30 mg	2.23	656 673	1.38	12.1 12.0	49 49	.67 .69
	9 10	Я Я	0 8AL 36 ⊞q	Symov H Symov H	2.42 ₅ / 2.51 <u>5</u> /	581 ₃ /	1.29	14.0 13.7	49 50	.64 .67

 $\frac{1}{13}$ -14-15 = small; 16-17-18 modest

 $\frac{2}{r}$ < .001

 $\frac{3}{4}$ P < .05 $\frac{4}{9}$ < .01

5/P < .10

TABLE 5. EFFECT OF DESIGNPLANTS IN SUCKLING CALVES ON POST WEARING SAINS -- A REVIEW.

Experiment				Post.	Gain post weaning oreweaning treatment		Change - from O	Gain pre- weaning plus post weaning		Change from O	
station	Years	Sex	No.	treat.	0	DL2	% (1bs.)	0	DES	% (1bs.)	
Oklahoma Oklahoma Minnesota Kansas	56-61 56-61 55-63 57-64	Steers Steers	59 42 115 204	OFS fed OFS 24 mg	365 385 284 462	367 405 277 450	1% (2) 5% (20) -2% (-7) -3% (-12)	597 626 543 849	627 665 554 8 54	5% (30) 6% (39) 2% (11) 1% (5)	
Tennessee	63-64	Steers	46		428	402	-6% (-26)	647	635	-24 (-12	
Iowa Iowa	59-60 59-60	Steers Helfers	58 52	0 0	236 213	219 210	-7% (-17) -[% (-3)	437 398	448 421	3% {11) 6% (23}	
California	70	Steers	40	DES 36 mg	406	404	-<1% (-2)	556	588	6% (32)	