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This report contains data on O.A.C. trials. It is not complete in that only the data summarized by April 1, 1962, are included. The report is prepared for use of the members of the Crop Science Department and for those associated with the forage program.

A federal-provincial program is in operation in variety and mixture testing and in orchardgrass breeding. This report contains some of the data collected by the Field Crops Division, Western Ontario Agricultural School, and by the Field Husbandry Division, Kemptville Agricultural School, but does not include data collected by federal stations in the co-ordinated program. The complete data from all stations for the co-ordinated program, are available in the report of the annual meeting of the Forage Crop Sub-committee for Recommendations, November, 1962.
(Year refers to year trial was seeded, and number in brackets is experiment number)
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| TEMPERATURE |  | APRIL | MAY | JUNE | JULY | AUCUST | SEPTEMBER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Harrow | Max. | 57.2 | 74.5 | 78.8 | 77.8 | 78.6 | 68.8 |
|  | Min. | 37.5 | 53.4 | 59.4 | 60.8 | 60.9 | 52.9 |
| Ridgetown | Max. | 56.4 | 73.3 | 76.3 | 78.4 | 78.5 | 67.8 |
|  | Min. | 36.1 | 51.4 | 57.6 | 58.4 | 59.3 | 51.0 |
| Guelph | Max. | 53.0 | 70.2 | 72.8 | 73.3 | 77.8 | 65.3 |
|  | Min. | 33.3 | 47.4 | 53.3 | 54.5 | 53.6 | 44.7 |
| Kemptville | Max. | 50.0 | 69.8 | 76.6 | 77.1 | 77.9 | 65.7 |
|  | Min. | 30.0 | 44.5 | 51.2 | 52.7 | 55.8 | 46.6 |
| Ottawa | Max. | 50.3 | 69.3 | 76.6 | 75.8 | 76.5 | 64.6 |
|  | Min. | 31.3 | 47.3 | 54.4 | 53.0 | 56.6 | 46.8 |
| New Liskeard | Max. | 43.4* | 66.1* | 72.5* | 76.7\% | 74.4 | 60.9* |
|  | Min. | 24.7\% | 42.9* | 43.6* | 49.4* | 50.9 | 43.0* |
| Kapuskasing | Max. | 40.8 | 62.7 | 71.4 | 73.5 | 69.8 | 57.3 |
|  | Min. | 19.9 | 37.5 | 40.1 | 48.0 | 43.3 | 40.3 |
| Gore Bay | Max. | 46.4 | 63.8 | 71.2 | 76.2 | 73.9 | 62.8 |
|  | Min. | 29.4 | 42.9 | 50.8 | 55.2 | 55.5 | 47.8 |
| Fort Francis | Max. | 45.3 | 62.7 | 72.2 | 73.5 | 74.6 | 63.3 |
|  | Min. | 24.5 | 42.9 | 52.0 | 53.0 | 53.1 | 42.2 |

## RAINFALL

| Harrow | 1.23 | 1.41 | 2.02 | 6.08 | 3.40 | 2.67 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ridgetown | 1.72 | 1.12 | 4.60 | 3.61 | 5.65 | 2.97 |
| Guelph | 2.12 | 0.94 | 3.36 | 3.04 | 2.00 | 2.67 |
| Kemptville | 2.49 | 1.68 | 2.60 | 3.82 | 1.75 | 2.92 |
| Ottawa | 2.38 | 1.52 | 2.88 | 5.09 | 2.21 | 2.77 |
| New Liskeard | inc.* | inc.* | 2.00 | 3.27 | 1.95 | 2.44 |
| Kapuskasing | 0.76 | 6.38 | 2.02 | 4.74 | 6.29 | 5.05 |
| Gore Bay | 1.86 | 3.41 | 0.68 | 0.75 | 2.40 | 4.09 |
| Fort Francis | 0.74 | 7.12 | 3.67 | 5.59 | 2.90 | 4.11 |

FROM NORMAL

| TEMPERATURE |  | APRIL | MAY | JUNE | JULY | AUGUST | SEPTEMBER |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Harrow | Max. | +1.1 | +6.1 | -.1 | -6.0 | -3.3 | -5.9 |
|  | Min. | +1.3 | +6.6 | +1.7 | -2.6 | +.9 | -1.5 |
| Ridgetown | Max. | +3.7 | +8.5 | -.4 | -3.5 | -1.6 | -4.3 |
|  | Min. | +.6 | +5.6 | +1.3 | -2.7 | -.4 | -2.9 |
| Guelph | Max. | +2.3 | +6.6 | -1.3 | -5.6 | +.5 | -4.6 |
|  | Min. | +.9 | +4.5 | +.7 | -2.4 | -2.0 | -4.3 |
| Kemptville | Max. | -1.5 | +3.3 | +.1 | -4.3 | -.9 | -4.4 |
|  | Min. | -1.8 | +.4 | -2.5 | -5.3 | -.2 | -1.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ottawa | Max. | +0.5 | +4.0 | +1.4 | -4.0 | -1.3 | -4.2 |
|  | Min. | +.1 | +4.1 | -1.4 | -4.5 | -1.6 | -1.1 |
| *New Liskeard | Max. | -2.5 | +3.9 | +.1 | -.1 | -.4 | -4.0 |
|  | Min. | +.4 | +6.5 | -3.9 | -3.7 | +.2 | -.1 |
| Kapuskasing | Max. | -1.4 | +5.1 | +2.0 | -1.0 | -1.5 | -3.9 |
|  | Min. | +.5 | +3.6 | -5.0 | -3.2 | -6.3 | -1.3 |
| Gore Bay | Max. | -1.4 | +5.5 | -.1 | -1.5 | -1.5 | -1.5 |
|  | Min. | +2.1 | +4.4 | +2.4 | +.5 | +1.9 | +.4 |

## RAINFALL

| Harrow | -1.3 | -1.0 | -1.0 | +3.8 | +1.2 | +.2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ridgetown | -1.3 | -2.0 | +1.7 | +.7 | +3.2 | +.1 |
| Guelph | -.6 | -2.2 | +.2 | -.5 | -.9 | -.3 |
| Kemptville | -.1 | -1.6 | 0.0 | +.3 | -.8 | -.3 |
| Ottawa | -.2 | -1.3 | -.5 | +2.4 | -.8 | -.3 |
| New Liskeard | - | -- | -1.3 | -.3 | -1.0 | -.9 |
| Kapuskasing | -1.0 | +4.0 | -.7 | +1.4 | +3.0 | +1.9 |
| Gore Bay | -.4 | +1.1 | -1.8 | -1.2 | +.3 | +1.0 |
| Fort Francis | -1.4 | +4.5 | -.2 | +2.0 | -1.0 | +.8 |
| * Incomplete data |  |  |  |  |  |  |

NORMAL GROWING SEASON WEATHFR RECORDS FOR CERTAIN ONTARIO STATIONS

| TEMPERATURE | APRIL | MAY | JUNE | JULY | AUGUST | SEPTEMBER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Harrow Max. | 56.1 | 68.4 | 78.9 | 83.8 | 81.9 | 74.7 |
|  | 36.2 | 46.8 | 57.7 | 62.2 | 60.0 | 54.4 |
| Ridgetown | 52.7 | 64.8 | 76.7 | 81.9 | 80.1 | 72.1 |
|  | 35.5 | 45.8 | 56.3 | 61.1 | 59.7 | 53.9 |
|  | 50.7 | 63.6 | 74.1 | 78.9 | 77.3 | 69.9 |
|  | 32.4 | 42.9 | 52.6 | 56.9 | 55.6 | 49.0 |
| Kemptville | 51.5 | 66.5 | 76.5 | 81.4 | 78.8 | 70.1 |
|  | 31.8 | 44.1 | 53.7 | 58.0 | 55.6 | 48.1 |
| Ottawa Max. | 49.8 | 65.3 | 75.2 | 79.8 | 77.8 | 68.8 |
|  | 31.2 | 43.2 | 53.0 | 57.5 | 55.0 | 47.9 |
| New Liskeard Max ${ }_{\text {Min }}$ | 45.9 | 62.2 | 72.4 | 76.8 | 74.8 | 64.9 |
|  | 24.3 | 36.4 | 47.5 | 53.1 | 50.7 | 43.1 |
| Kapuskasing | 42.2 | 57.6 | 69.4 | 74.5 | 71.3 | 61.2 |
|  | 19.4 | 33.9 | 45.1 | 51.2 | 49.6 | 41.6 |
| Gore Bay Max. $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { Min. }\end{aligned}$ | 47.8 | 59.3 | 71.3 | 77.7 | 75.4 | 64.3 |
|  | 27.3 | 38.5 | 48.4 | 54.7 | 53.6 | 47.4 |
| Fort Frances $\begin{aligned} & \text { Max, } \\ & \text { Min. }\end{aligned}$ | 48.0 | 62.3 | 71.5 | 77.6 | 74.3 | 64.0 |
|  | 28.4 | 41.2 | 51.1 | 55.6 | 54.1 | 45.3 |

## RAINFALL

| Harrow | 2.5 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ridgetown | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2.9 |
| Guelph | 2.7 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 3.0 |
| Kemptville | 2.6 | 3.3 | 2.6 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 3.2 |
| Ottawa | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| New Liskeard | 1.7 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 3.3 |
| Kapuskasing | 1.7 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| Gore Bay | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 3.1 |
| Fort Frances | 2.1 | 2.6 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 3.3 |

PROVINCIAL HAY - PASTURE MIXTURES FOR AREAS OF GOOD DRAINAGE, SERIES A
Percentage of the number of times that the mixture is equivalent to the highest yield.

| No. | Mixture | Hay | Aftermath | Season Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Vernal 8 Dupuits 2 Climax 6 | 37.5 | 66.6 | 54.1 |
| $\delta$ | Vernal 5 Dupuits 5 Climax 4 Lincoln 6 | 75.0 | 95.8 | 95.8 |
| 3 | Vernal 8 Lasalle 2 Climax 6 | 58.3 | 62.5 | 58.3 |
| 1 | Vernal 8 Lasalle 2 Climax 4 Lincoln 6 | 70.8 | 54.1 | 66.6 |
| 2 | Vernal 8 Lasalle 2 Climax 4 Orchard 3 | 47.6 | 45.8 | 37.5 |
| 10 | Vernal 6 Lasalle 4 Climax 2 Iincoln 5 Orchard 4 | 66.6 | 33.3 | 58.3 |
| 4 | Vernal 10 Lincoln 10 | 79.1 | 66.6 | 75.0 |
| 9 | Vernal 10 Climax 6 | 54.1 | 58.3 | 54.1 |
| 5 | Vernal 6 Lasalle 3 Climax 5 Iincoln 6 Ladino 1 | 66.6 | 75.0 | 58.3 |
| 6 | Vernal 5 Lasalle 3 Climax 3 Lincoln 5 Orchard 2 Alsike 1 Ladino 1 | 70.8 | 41.6 | 41.6 |

[^0]Analysis of Variance Table for Hay Yields
Mean Squares of Locations

Zone and Station

| Variables | d.f. | 1 \& 2 <br> Ridgetown | Guelph | Mindemoya | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ \text { Kemptville } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Ottawa | Ft. William | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & \text { n Ft. William } \end{aligned}$ | 8 Kapuskasing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Replications | 3 | 288381.3 | 5358664.0 | 2900032.0 | 215194.7 | 320786.7 | 1846277.3* | 5323586.7 | 1599512.3 |
| Years | 2 | 4555240.0 | 56906912.0* | $12948680.0^{\text {* }}$ | 2319128.0* | 5487808.0 | $72536407 .{ }^{* * *}$ | 10C205110.0 ${ }^{\text {K* }}$ | 3112889.5 |
| Error A | 6 | 218801.3 | 7419058.7 | 127901.4 | 337021.3 | 366486.0 | 260877.3 | 4909192.0 | 722727.8 |
| Mixtures | 7 | 1799676.6 | 1020608** | 1203392.0゙0 | 2209806. ${ }^{\text {* }}$ ¢ | 563877 **** | 239028.6 | 819278.8 | 459119.6* |
| Mix $x$ Years | 14 | 374349.7 | 730386 ** 9 | 632876.5 | 1108514.9 | 251892. ${ }^{\text {喈 }}$ | 266804.6 | 472281.7 | 705488.3 |
| Error B | 63 | 19914.7.7 | 189167.4 | 175528.5 | 278735.8 | 95339.0 | 461701.2 | 696849.3 | 179053.9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & * \\ & * \\ & * \end{aligned} \quad \text { sig }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fican } \\ & n \end{aligned}$ | a.t $5 \%$ level. <br> " $10 \%$ ". |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

ANALYSIS OF VARIANGE TABLE FOR AFTERMATH YIELDS
MEAN SQUARES OF LOCATIONS

| Variables | d.f. | $\begin{gathered} 1 \& 2 \\ \text { Ridgetown } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Guelph |  | Zones and Stations |  | $\stackrel{7}{7} \text { Ft.William Ft.William }$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ \text { Kapuskasing } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ \text { Kemptville } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Ottawa |  |  |  |
| Replications | 3 | 834839.9 | 124921.3 | 187933.0 | 429096.0 | 832750.7 | 462717.0 | 938958.8 | 435022.0̂ |
| Years | 2 | 101199520.0 | 14750124.0 | $2827884.5$ | 85301558.0 | 84763769** | 6014486.5 | 4117729.0 | 3408179.5 |
| Error A | 6 | 263627.3 | 283066.7 | 247105.0 | 261524.0 | 295182.7 | 101330.7 | 219617.0 | 67019.9 |
| Mixtures | 7 | 264945.7 | 1965478. ${ }^{\text {\% }}$. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 376130.1 | 879465 粊 | 484346. 3 | 89480.3 | 428645** | 570269.3 |
| Mix x Years | 14 | 273832.6 | 387493.4 | 127915.6 | $387182.0^{* *}$ | 130107. 4 | 57392.7 | 1193800.7 | 545572 娄 |
| Error B | 63 | 218662.7 | 107964.0 | 108423.8 | 69778.9 | 57300.9 | 87191.0 | 107759.5 | 58724.4 |
| * ** | nififica | at $5 \%$ lev t at $10 \%$ lev |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES FOR SEASON TOTAL YIELDS

Mean Square of Locations

| Variables | I \＆2d．f．$\quad$ Ridgetown |  | Guelph Mindemoya |  | Zones and Stations |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Kemptville | Ottawa | $\text { Ft. William }{ }^{7}$ | $7 \text { Ft. William }$ | 8 Kapuskasing |
| Replications | 3 | 157042．1 |  |  | 5226880.0 | 2236093.3 | 2446768.0 | 1600528．C | ： 3714853.3 | 3792088.0 | 3659133.3 |
| Years | 2 | 145270900．${ }^{\text {皆 }}$ | 124580750．＊${ }^{\text {\％}}$ | 22231708．0\％ | 134400500．${ }^{\text {筸 }}$ | 120008520.0 | 178491780.0 答 1 | 138305070. 皆 | 6997247.0 |
| Error A | 6 | 476378.7 | 9732261.4 | 2063762.7 | 1711309.3 | 808672.0 | 396949.3 | 3320342.7 | 897752.9 |
| Mixtures | 7 | 1805677 ${ }^{\text {\％\％}}$ | 3399812 娄 6 | 2204301．${ }^{\text {\％}}$ 7 | 4176640.0 | 922187.4 | 409222.9 | 1213500.6 | 595833.7 |
| Mixtures Years | 14 | 942884．6 | 1118249＊＊ | $736747.9$ | 1785984.0 | 341377．1 | 300352.0 | 359445．7 | 2183833.6 |
| Error B | 63 | 477700.3 | 324105.1 | 367685.9 | 1311077.3 | 178545.3 | 636367.8 | 637917.7 | 317739.8 |
| C．V． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Purpose: To determine the growth curve of sone of our hay forage syecties and varieties to learn the best time to cut these crops for

1. Maximum dry matter yields of
(a) the first crop taken at weekly intervals
(b) the second crop taken as early hay
(c) succeeding crops taken as pasture aftermath
(d) total yield of dry matter.
2. Digestible dry matter through growth period of the first crop.
3. From the growth and digestibility data, to predict the yield and feed value of these hay crops on a certain date or stage of growth, plus the time interval required for the aftermath to be at a certain stage of growth and its yield.

Location: Sections B and C, Ranges 2-5.
Procedure: Establish each spring new seedings of the following:
Alfalfa - Vernal - 12 lbs./acre
DuPuits - 12 1bs./acre
Brome - Canadian - 15 1bs./acre
Saratoga - 15 lbs./acre
Orchard - Frode - 10 1bs./acre
Ottawa 100 - 10 lbs./acre
Timothy - Climax - 8 1bs./acre
Essex - 8 lbs./acre
Design: Split-split plot - 6 replications. Main plots - species; sub plots varieties; sub-sub plots - cutting dates. Plot size - 51 x 121; harvested $31 \times 91$.

Data Collected: 1. Weekly yield of dry matter - May 8, 15, 22, 29, June 5, 12, 19, 26 , July $3,10,17,24$, and succeeding crop yields.
2. Percent dry matter at all harvests
3. Weekly height measurements
4. Percent leaf at weekly intervals
5. Stages of growth and development at weekly intervals
6. Ground cover and vigor in fall and following spring
7. Percent digestible dry matter at weekly intervals
8. Percent crude protein at weekly intervals
9. Residual effect on yield in the succeeding hay crop

TEST 151 - HAY GROWTH CURVE - 1961
First Crop Digestibility Data

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cut } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Date Cut | Stage Cut | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yield } \\ \text { D.M. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { D.D.M. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yield } \\ & \text { D.D.M. } \end{aligned}$ | Stage Cut | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yield } \\ \text { D.M. } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{\%}{\text { D.D.M. }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yield } \\ & \text { D.D.M. } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VERNAL |  |  |  |  |  | DUPUITS |  |  |  |
| 1 | 5-8 | Veg. | 86 | 48.8 | 67 | Veg. | 291 | 54.3 | 169 |
| 2 | 5-15 | Veg. | 1071 | 69.9 | 756 | Veg. | 1141 | 71.5 | 829 |
| 3 | 5-23 | Veg . | 1836 | 79.1 | 1645 | Veg. | 2960 | 75.1 | 1548 |
| 4 | 5-29 | Veg. | 3348 | 78.3 | 2299 | E. Bud | 3033 | 74.4 | 2107 |
| 5 | 6-5 | E. Bud | 3343 | 75.9 | 2655 | E. Bud | 3603 | 71.2 | 2628 |
| 6 | 6-12 | Bud | 4390 | 69.6 | 3001 | Bud | 4308 | 69.5 | 3072 |
| 7 | 6-19 | Bud | 4672 | 68.6 | 3036 | Bud | 4983 | 66.4 | 3388 |
| 8 | 6-26 | Bud | 5434 | 63.5 | 3308 | E. F. | 5780 | 63.4 | 3761 |
| 9 | 7-3 | Full F. | 5898 | 63.3 | 3643 | Full F . | 6240 | ---- | ---- |
| 10 | 7-10 | Full F . | 6959 | 65.1 | 3461 | E. Seed | 7396 | 63.9 | 4920 |
| 11 | 7-17 | Seed | 6864 | 57.5 | 4397 | Seed | 7758 | 58.3 | 4694 |
| 12 | 7-24 | Seed | 6350 | 57.5 | 3586 | Seed | 7051 | 54.5 | 4056 |
| CLIMAX |  |  |  |  |  | ESSEX |  |  |  |
| 1 | 5-8 | Veg. | 292 | 50.7 | 161 | Veg, | 445 | 46.9 |  |
| 2 | 5-15 | Veg. | 762 | 66.5 | 513 | Veg. | 702 | 67.5 | 486 |
| 3 | 5-23 | Veg. | 1588 | 73.4 | 1232 | Veg. | 1549 | 68.6 | 1123 |
| 4 | 5-29 | Veg. | 2220 | 74.3 | 1553 | Veg. | 1659 | 71.8 | 1174 |
| 5 | 6-5 | Joint | 3401 | 67.6 | 2425 | Veg. | 3254 | 66.6 | 1694 |
| 6 | 6-12 | Joint | 4218 | 64.6 | 2675 | Joint | 3762 | 64.0 | 2293 |
| 7 | 6-19 | Boot | 4964 | 62.8 | 3000 | Joint | 4797 | 62.4 | 2996 |
| 8 | 6-26 | Head | 5941 | -- | ---- | Boot | 5684 | 60.9 | 3337 |
| 9 | 7-3 | Head | 6480 | 54.4 | 3634 | Head | 6355 | 54.4 | 3480 |
| 10 | 7-10 | F1. | 7641 | 51.7 | 3952 | Head | 7892 | 54.1 | 4265 |
| 11 | 7-17 | F1. | 7793 | 49.0 | 3818 | F1. | 8603 | 52.4 | 4507 |
| 12 | 7-24 | F1. | 8184 | 44.9 | 3893 | F1. | 8696 | 46.2 | 4153 |

TEST 151 - HAY GROWTH CURVE - 1961
First Crop Digestibility Data










Alfalfa - with both varieties cut 5 which was removed in early September had the highest survival, yield, fall and spring vigor indicated by height.

Brome - with both varieties cut 5 removed on September 5 and cut 12 which was cut only twice during the previous season gave the highest residual yield. They were the tallest and most vigorous in the fall and early spring.

Orchard - Varieties that were tall in the fall were also taller in mid-May, but at harvest time there were little height differences. Those present and yield differences were associated with the number of times the crop was cut in the first harvest year.

Timothy - Cuts 5 and 12 gave the highest yields and were taller in the fall and early spring. The yield did not appear to be closely associated with the time and number of cuts taken.

TEST 151 - HAY GROWTH CURVE
Residual Effect - 1962 Harvest

| CutNo. | Date Last After. Cut | Height in cms. |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Stand } \\ 5 / 11 / 62 \end{gathered}$ | No. <br> Cuts <br> 161 | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \mathrm{D} . \mathrm{M} . \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yield } \\ \text { D.M. } \\ \text { acre } \end{gathered}$ | Date <br> Last <br> After. <br> Cut | Height in cms. |  |  |  | No. <br> Cuts <br> 161 | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { D.M. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yield } \\ \text { DM. } \\ \text { Acre } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 11/7 | 5/11 | 6/12 |  |  |  |  |  | 11/7 | 5/11 | 6/12 |  |  |  |  |

VERNAL

| $9-11$ | 14 | 18 | 77 | 73 | 4 | 21.0 | 3877 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $9-18$ | 7 | 16 | 77 | 62 | 4 | 20.4 | 3606 |
| $9-18$ | 7 | 16 | 76 | 62 | 4 | 21.5 | 3661 |
| $9-18$ | 6 | 16 | 74 | 62 | 4 | 21.4 | 3611 |
| $9-5$ | 12 | 21 | 75 | 75 | 3 | 21.8 | 4154 |
| $9-18$ | 6 | 19 | 76 | 67 | 3 | 21.4 | 3945 |
| $9-11$ | 8 | 18 | 79 | 67 | 3 | 21.4 | 3907 |
| $9-11$ | 8 | 19 | 77 | 67 | 3 | 22.1 | 3914 |
| $9-18$ | 7 | 17 | 78 | 61 | 3 | 21.4 | 3979 |
| $9-18$ | 7 | 17 | 78 | 59 | 3 | 21.4 | 3739 |
| $9-18$ | 7 | 16 | 74 | 57 | 3 | 21.2 | 3791 |
| $9-18$ | 8 | 16 | 77 | 57 | 3 | 21.1 | 3484 |

SARATOGA
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

TEST 151 - hay growth curve
Residual Effect - 1962 Harvest


## TEST 151 - HAY GROWTH CURVE

$$
\text { Residual Effect - } 1962 \text { Hay Harvest }
$$

| Variance Due To | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Squares | C.V. in \% for |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reps | 5 | 7,270,438.94 |  |
| Species | 3 | 31,379,448.87** | 28 |
| Main plots | 23 | 7,472,406.78 |  |
| Error a | 15 | 2,758,320.98 |  |
| Varieties | 1 | 52,778,405.29** | 28 |
| Varieties x Speciea | 3 | 1,920,133.69 |  |
| Sub plots | 47 | 5,181,591.29 |  |
| Error b | 20 | 2,725,272.15 |  |
| Dates | 11 | 4,793,475.52** | 5 |
| Dates x Species | 33 | 2,326,314.84** |  |
| Dates x Varieties | 11 | 342,239.96** |  |
| Dates x Varieties $\times$ Species | 33 | 2,763,153.42** |  |
| Error c | 440 | 93,263.44 |  |
| Total | 575 | 790,453.19 |  |

Alfalfa

1. Dry Matter Yield - The two varieties gave similar dry matter curves with DuPuits higher throughout. Both curves started to level off once the flowering stage of growth was reached about June 18.

In 1961 the yield curves were very similar again, DuPuits was slightly higher throughout. The yield level reached in the two years was similar for Vernal, higher for DuPuits in 1961.
2. Height - DuPuits was taller than Vernal throughout the 1962 growing season. The height curve started to flatten the same time as the dry matter curves; i.e. on June 18, not on a stage basis.

1961 crop heights were similar to those in 1962 , attaining about the same length of stem.
3. Percent Dry Matter - Again in 1962, the crop was cut only when dry. The dry matter percentage was lower for DuPuits until the stage when the buds emerged. The two varieties were similar after that date, both showing a marked increase in dry matter between June 25 and July 3, a late flower stage.

In 1961, the curves were very similar but came together sooner. The varieties were higher ia percent dry matter in 1962.
4. Percent Crude Protein - In general the two varieties were the same in protein content, Vernal being slightly higher during the bud to full bloom stage.

In 1961, both varieties were identical throughout in protein content on any date. The crude prote: $n$ content ranged from approximately 33 to 14 percent both years.
5. Percent Digestible Dry Matter - The two varieties gave similar shaped curves with Vernal slightly aigher in digestibility on a date basis, particularly in the bud to early flower stages. With Vernal, this early flower stage gave 1500 to 2000 lbs. more dry matter than the bud or late bud stage with a reduction of only $3 \%$ in D.D.M. below the late bud anc still well over $60 \%$ D.D.M. content.

In 1961, the two varieties were also similar on any date and at the bud to bloom stages. gain the early flo jer stages gave high digestibilities and marked increases in yield over the bud stages of growth.

In general, the curves of $t$ he percent protein, leaf, digestibility and dry matter were very similar in 1961 ard in 1962 , with all shapes changing on the same date.
6. Leaf - Vernal alfalfa had a higher percentage and a higher yield of leaves at any date or $a^{+}$any similar stage than DuPuits. Both varieties had their maximum yield of leaf at full bloom after thich more leaves were lost than were formed. The leaf percentage hit a plateau witl. both varieties from the late bud to late bloom stages. The atems increased in yilld throughout the season.

In 196 I , Vernal was also a glier in percent leaf than Dupuits but similar in yield at any dite or stage. Again, both varieties decreased very little in percent leaf during bud to the flower stages of development.

## TEST 157 - HAY GROWTH CURVES - 1962

First Crop Data (Yield lbs./acre)

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Weekly |  |  | Weekly |  | \% | Yield | \% | Yield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cut | Date | Stage | Height | \% | Yield | Increase | \% | Yield | Increase | Yield | Crude | Crude | Digestible | Digestibla |
| No. | Cut | Cut | cms. | D.M. | D.M. | D.1. | Leaf | Leaf | Leaf | Stem | Protein | Protein | Dry Matter | Dry Matter |

VERNAI

| 1 | 5-7 | Veg. | 17 | 21.8 | 279 | ---- | ---- | - | ---- | -- | 32.3 | 89 | 74.8 | 206 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 5-14 | Veg. | 20 | 19.6 | 519 | 240 |  | --... | --... | --.-- | 29.9 | 187 | 75.3 | 445 |
| 3 | 5-22 | Early Bud | 38 | 20.4 | 1748 | 1229 | 55.3 | 967 | ---- | 781 | 23.9 | 420 | 75.0 | 1341 |
| 4 | 5-28 | Early Bud | 51 | 20.2 | 2307 | 559 | 56.3 | 1299 | 332 | 1008 | 22.9 | 521 | 76.4 | 1646 |
| 5 | 6-4 | Buds En. | 62 | 21.7 | 3442 | 1135 | 49.8 | 1714 | 415 | 1728 | 21.8 | 750 | 71.2 | 2582 |
| 6 | 6-11 | Late Bud | 75 | 21.3 | 4171 | 729 | 46.8 | 1952 | 238 | 2219 | 20.3 | 839 | 65.8 | 2628 |
| 7 | 6-18 | Early F1. | 93 | 21.3 | 5486 | 1315 | 45.4 | 2491 | 539 | 2995 | 19.2 | 1053 | 63.2 | 3518 |
| 8 | 6-25 | Full F1. | 101 | 22.5 | 5615 | 129 | 44.0 | 2471 | - 20 | 3144 | 18.2 | 1022 | 62.0 | 3523 |
| 9 | 7-3 | Late F1. | 96 | 26.0 | 6222 | 607 | 38.0 | 2364 | -107 | 3858 | 16.3 | 1018 | 57.8 | 3463 |
| 10 | 7-9 | E. Seed | 101 | 27.2 | 6806 | 584 | 36.7 | 2498 | 134 | 4308 | 16.8 | 1139 | 60.6 | 4345 |
| 11 | 7-16 | E. Seed | 106 | 28.2 | 6356 | -450 | 33.2 | 2110 | -388 | 4246 | 14.8 | 939 | 59.9 | 3706 |
| 12 | 7-23 | E. Seed | 98 | 30.4 | 6471 | 115 | 31.4 | 2032 | - 78 | 4439 | 14.4 | 935 | 57.4 | 3721 |

DUPUITS

| 1 | 5-7 | Veg. | 25 | 15.9 | 817 | --..- | -… | ---- | --... | --** | 34.1 | 277 | 74.3 | 588 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 5-14 | Veg. | 33 | 16.0 | 1344 | 527 | --... | ---" | --** | --." | 31.5 | 423 | 80.2 | 1131 |
| 3 | 5-22 | Buds En. | 54 | 17.3 | 2635 | 1291 | 48.3 | 1273 | ---- | 1362 | 24.2 | 637 | 73.9 | 1972 |
| 4 | 5-28 | Buds Em. | 65 | 19.6 | 3270 | 635 | 48.5 | 1586 | 313 | 1684 | 21.8 | 711 | 73.0 | 2348 |
| 5 | 6-4 | Late Bud | 76 | 21.1 | 3936 | 666 | 43.4 | 1708 | 122 | 2228 | 20.0 | 784 | 69.7 | 2692 |
| 6 | 6-11 | Early Fl. | 88 | 21.5 | 4555 | 619 | 41.1 | 1872 | 164 | 2683 | 18.5 | 844 | 65.2 | 2991 |
| 7 | 6-18 | Full Fi. | 102 | 22.4 | 5819 | 1264 | 41.7 | 2426 | 554 | 3393 | 17.4 | 1014 | 63.6 | 3712 |
| 8 | 6-25 | Late Fl. | 107 | 22.1 | 5592 | -227 | 41.1 | 2298 | -128 | 3294 | 17.4 | 971 | 60.0 | 3317 |
| 9 | 7-3 | Late Fl. | 107 | 27.2 | 6460 | 868 | 33.2 | 2145 | -153 | 4315 | 17.0 | 1103 | 60.5 | 3829 |
| 10 | 7-9 | E. Seed | 105 | 28.9 | 7174 | 714 | 34.3 | 2461 | 316 | 4713 | 15.8 | 1132 | 60.0 | 4241 |
| 11 | 7-16 | E. Seed | 108 | 28.6 | 5878 | -1296 | 32.7 | 1922 | -539 | 3956 | 14.1 | 843 | 59.3 | 4439 |
| 12 | 7-23 | E. Seed | 111 | 29.2 | 6531 | 653 | 24.5 | 1600 | -322 | 4931 | 13.9 | 860 | 55.6 | 3758 |

## TEST 157 - HAY GROWTH CURVES - 1962 <br> Height Yellowing Lower Leaves of Alfalfa (cms.)

| Variety | Date | Total Height | Leaf Height |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vernal | 5-22 | 38 | 12 |
| Dupuits |  | 54 | 20 |
| Vernal | 5-28 | 51 | 14 |
| DuPuits |  | 65 | 24 |
| Vernal | 6-4 | 62 | 21 |
| DuPuits |  | 76 | 29 |
| Vernal | 6-11 | 75 | 27 |
| DuPuits |  | 88 | 36 |
| Vernal | 6-18 | 93 | 31 |
| DuPuits |  | 102 | 40 |
| Vernal | 6-25 | 101 | 52 |
| DuPuits |  | 107 | 57 |
| Vernal | 7-3 | 96 | 51 |
| Dupuits |  | 107 | 62 |
| Vernal | 7-9 | 101 | 58 |
| Dupuits |  | 105 | 61 |
| Vernal | 7-16 | 106 | 61 |
| DuPuits |  | 108 | 67 |
| Vernal | 7-24 | 98 | 72 |
| DuPuits |  | 111 | 84 |


VERNAL ALFALFA - 1962

DUPUITS ALFALFA - 1962



IEST 157 - GROWTH CURVES - 1962
Aftermath Yields (Lbs./A.)

```
First Cut Aftermath Harvest Dates
```




Duruits


Heights and Stages - Alfalfa


Timothy

1. Dry Matter Yield - The two varieties gave similar growth curves with Essex yielding approximately 500 pounds less although ending at the same level. Climax curve started to flatten a week before Essex but this occurred when both were at the same stage of growth.

In 1961 the yields and curves were almost identical throughout.
2. Height - Essex was shorter throughout than C1imax, but both were similar when the same stages are compared.

In 1961 the height was taken to the flag leaf with Climax taller from jointing to heading after which they were similar. However, at the same stage of growth, the varieties were the same height.
3. Percent Dry Matter - Essex was higher in dry matter percentage until the late joint to boot stage, after which Climax was higher in dry matter. The variety curves in 1962 were identical in shape.

In 1961, the varieties appear to have performed the same as in 1962 with the dry matter percentages crossing at the joint stage.
4. Percent Crude Protein - The protein content of the two varieties gave curves which were very similar throughout on all dates.

In 1961, Essex was $2-4 \%$ higher until the jointing stage, after which the two varieties were similar on any date.
5. Percent Digestible Dry Matter - On any date, Essex was higher in digestibility than Climax in 1962, with the exception of June 4, when they were similar. Up until that date, Essex was $4-5 \%$ higher and this difference widened $7-8 \%$ and was $5 \%$ at the time of the last cut.

In 1961, the two varieties were very similar with Climax being slightly higher in the late vegetative stage. Essex was $\mathbf{2 - 3} \%$ higher than Climax for the last few cuts. They were similar, however, at the same stage of growth.
6. Leaf - Essex was higher at any date in percent leaf than Climax, but these differences narrowed as the flowering stage approached. At the same stages of growth, however, these data were similar as were leaf and stem yields.

In 1961, Essex was higher in percent leaf than C1imax at any date, but performed similar as in 1962 with the same stages of growth giving similar percent leaf and leaf yield.

```
TEST 157 - hay growth Curves - 1962
```

First Crop Data (Yield lbs/acre)

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Weekly |  |  | Weekly |  | \% | Yield | \% | Yfeld |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cut | Date | Stage | Height | \% | Yield | Increase | \% | Yield | Increase | Yield | Crude | Crude | Digestible | Digestible |
| No. | Cut | Cut | cms. | D.M. | D.M. | D.M. | Leaf | Leaf | Leaf | Stem | Protein | Protein | Dry Matter | Dry Matter |

## CLIMAX

| 1 | 5-7 | Veg. | 23 | 19.9 | 599 | ---- | ---- | --... | ---- | ---- | 28.7 | 172 | 71.9 | 443 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 5-14 | Veg. | 28 | 20.5 | 1175 | 576 | ---. | ---- | ---- | --.-- | 23.2 | 275 | 70.4 | 863 |
| 3 | 5-22 | Veg. | 41 | 20.2 | 2385 | 1210 | ---- | --.- | ---- | ---- | 17.9 | 437 | 67.0 | 1519 |
| 4 | 5-28 | Joint | 53 | 18.7 | 2878 | 493 | 73.7 | 2121 | ---- | 757 | 15.9 | 461 | 65.6 | 1919 |
| 5 | 6-4 | Boot | 70 | 21.7 | 4283 | 1405 | 55.8 | 2390 | 269 | 1893 | 13.4 | 571 | 66.7 | 2964 |
| 6 | 6-11 | Boot | 78 | 20.2 | 4820 | 537 | 49.2 | 2371 | - 19 | 2449 | 11.4 | 514 | 61.8 | 3191 |
| 7 | 6-18 | Head | 90 | 24.9 | 5589 | 769 | 43.5 | 2431 | 60 | 3158 | 10.2 | 569 | 58.1 | 3420 |
| 8 | 6-25 | Head | 102 | 28.0 | 6631 | 1042 | 34.9 | 2314 | -117 | 4317 | 9.3 | 619 | 52.5 | 3643 |
| 9 | 7-3 | Flower | 113 | 36.4 | 6890 | 259 | 33.3 | 2294 | - 20 | 4596 | 7.8 | 538 | 50.0 | 3578 |
| 10 | 7-9 | Flower | 113 | 37.7 | 7579 | 689 | 31.0 | 2349 | 55 | 5230 | 7.0 | 520 | 48.3 | 3771 |
| 11 | 7-16 | Seed | 114 | 41.8 | 7440 | -139 | 32.5 | 2418 | 69 | 5022 | 6.5 | 483 | 49.5 | 3779 |
| 12 | 7-23 | Seed | 115 | 41.7 | 7752 | 312 | 23.5 | 1821 | -597 | 5931 | 6.7 | 513 | 47.6 | 3824 |

## ESSEX

| 1 | 5-7 | Veg. | . 22 | 20.9 | 485 | -- | ---- | --..- | --.-- | ---- | 30.7 | 149 | 74.3 | 343 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 5-14 | Veg. | 24 | 22.1 | 808 | 323 | --.- | ---- | -..- | ----- | 23.9 | 193 | 73.6 | 633 |
| 3 | 5-22 | Veg . | 38 | 22.2 | 1929 | 1121 | ---* | --." | ---- | ---- | 18.7 | 360 | 70.3 | 1433 |
| 4 | 5-28 | Joint | 45 | 22.6 | 2455 | 526 | 87.7 | 2153 | ---- | 302 | 15.6 | 383 | 70.9 | 1792 |
| 5 | 6-4 | Joint | 58 | 22.3 | 3523 | 1068 | 64.9 | 2286 | 133 | 1237 | 14.6 | 518 | 66.2 | 2538 |
| 6 | 6-11 | Joint | 68 | 20.9 | 4291 | 768 | 59.5 | 2553 | 267 | 1738 | 12.9 | 558 | 64.4 | 2922 |
| 7 | 6-18 | Boot | 80 | 22.1 | 4813 | 522 | 52.1 | 2508 | - 45 | 2305 | 10.8 | 522 | 64.5 | 3327 |
| $\varepsilon$ | 6 -25 | Head | 87 | 25.1 | 5941 | 1128 | 41.2 | 2448 | - 60 | 3493 | 10.1 | 598 | 58.4 | 3482 |
| 9 | 7-3 | Head | 101 | 31.1 | 6734 | 793 | 35.3 | 2377 | - 71 | 4357 | 8.5 | 570 | 56.1 | 3742 |
| 10 | 7-9 | Flower | 99 | 34.3 | 6803 | 69 | 34.4 | 2340 | - 37 | 4463 | 7.7 | 526 | 54.0 | 4033 |
| 11 | 7-16 | Flower | 108 | 38.5 | 7654 | 851 | 33.4 | 2556 | 216 | 5098 | 6.7 | 508 | 55.3 | 4411 |
| 12 | 7-23 | Seed | 107 | 38.8 | 7412 | -242 | 32.0 | 2372 | -184 | 5040 | 6.8 | 504 | 52.5 | 4127 |

CLIMAX TIMOTHY - 1962


ESSEX TIMOTHY - 1962



TEST 157 - GROWTH CURVES - 1962
Aftermath Yields (Lbs./A)


Heights and Stages - Timothy
First Growth

| $\left[\begin{array}{l} \mathrm{Cut} \\ \mathbb{N} ? \\ \text { : } \end{array}\right.$ | Yield | Ht | Stg | 5-14 | 5-22 | 5-28 | 6-4 | 6-11 | 6-18 | 6-25 | 7-3 | 7-9 | 7-16 | 7-23 | 7-30 | 8-8 | 8-16 | 8-20 | 8-28 | 9-4 | 9-12 | 10-3 | 10-29 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L $\frac{1}{5-7}$ | 599 | 23 | A | 14 A | 28 A | 39 B | 52 B | 65 C | 78 D | 88 D | 0 | 0 | 13 A | 19 A | 25 A | 28 A | 34 B | 39 B | 41 C | 143 F |  |  | 13 A |
| $2 \quad 5-14$ | 1175 | 28 | A |  | 25 A | 35 B | 48 B | 66 c | 76 D | 88 D | 0 | 7 A | 14 A | 23 A | 28 A | 36 A | 41 C | 46 D | 50 D | 53 F |  |  | 12 A |
| 3 5-22 | 2385 | 41 | A |  |  | 15 A | 27 B | 36 B | 47 D | 64 D | 5 A | 8 A | 13 A | 21 A | 26 A | 31 A | 35 B | 37 B | 39 c | 44 C |  | 65 F | 13 A |
| 4 5-28 | 2878 | 53 | B |  |  |  | 6 A | 20 A | 31 A | 46 B | 53 C | 9 A | 13 A | 19 A | 23 A | 27 A | 31 B | 32 B | 35 | -37 |  | 46 D | 12 A |
| $5 \quad 6-4$ | 4283 | 70 | C |  |  |  |  | 0 | $14 . \mathrm{A}$ | 28 A | 35 A | 40 B | 42 B | 48 C | 16 A | 19 A | 23 A | $24 . \mathrm{A}$ | 24 A | 25 A |  | 25 A | 12 A |
| $6 \quad 6-11$ | 4820 | 78 | C |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 15 A | 26 A | 29 A | 32 A | 37 B | 39 B | 18 A | 23 A | 24 A | 26 A | 26 A |  | 26 A | 12 A |
| $7 \quad 6-.28$ | 5589 | 90 | D |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | $1{ }_{4} \mathrm{~A}$ | 19 A | 22 A | 28 A | 33 B | 44 B | 50 D | 16 A | 20 A | 22 A |  |  | 15 A |
| 8 6-25 | 6631 | 102 | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 11 A | 18 A | 26 A | 36 A | 46 B | 50 B | 56 B | 17 A | 21 A |  |  | 17 A |
| 9 7-3 | 6890 | 113 | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 6 A | 19 A | 27 A | 34 A | 44 B | 46 B | 50 C | 13 A |  |  | 13 A |
| 10 7-c, | 7579 | 113 | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 A | 19 A | 29 A | 39 A | 47 B | 52 C | 56 D | 14 A |  |  | 15 A |
| 117 | 7470 | 71/4 | G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 A | 18 A | 33 A | 43 A | 45 B | 49 C | 52 C |  |  | 14.4 |
| $12 \quad 7-23$ | 7752 | 115 | G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 A | 25 A | 39 A | 40 A | 46 B | 48 B | 50 C |  | 15 A |
| F'ssex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1 \begin{array}{ll}1 & 5-7\end{array}$ | 485 | 22 | A | 12 A | 24 A | 32 B | 42 B | 57 C | 68 C | 78 D | 0 | 0 | 10 A | 18 A | 20 A | 25 A | 28 B | 30 A |  | 35 C |  |  |  |
| $2 \quad 5-14$ | 808 | 24 | A |  | 23 A | 30 B | 39 B | 58 B | 71 C | 82 D | 0 | 0 | 10 A | 19 A | 22 A | 27 A | 30 B | 32 B | 33 c | 35 c |  |  | 13 A |
| 3 5-22 | 1929 | 38 | A |  |  | 16 A | 25 A | 37 B | 50 C | 63 D | 4 A | 9 A | 11 A | 17 A | 21 A | 26 A | 28 B | 30 B | 30 c | 31 c |  | 41 F | 12 A |
| 4 5-28 | 2455 | 45 | B |  |  |  | 15 A | 26 B | 38 B | 53 C | 61 D | 5 A | 10 A | 13 A | 20 A | 22 A | 25 A | 25 A | 24 B | 27 B |  | 30 B | 12 A |
| $56-4$ | 3523 | 58 | B |  |  |  |  | 0 | 15 A | 30 A | 38 A | 42 B | 44 B | 49 C | 17 A | 20 A | 23 A | 24. | 26 A | 27 B |  | 29 B | 13 A |
| $6 \quad 6-17$ | 4291 | 68 | B |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 15 A | 27 A | 31 A | 33 A | 38 B | 37 B | 18 A | 22 A |  |  | 23 A |  | 23 A | 13 A |
| $7 \quad 6-18$ | 4813 | 80 | C |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 13 A | 21 A | 22 A | 28 A | 31 B | 37 B | 42 C | 14 A | 18 A | 20 A |  |  | 14 A |
| \% 6-25 | 5941 | 87 | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 14 A | 21 A | 27 A | 37 B | 42 B | 43 B | 16 A | 19 A |  |  | 15 A |
| 9 $7-3$ <br> 10 $7-9$ | 6734 6803 | 101 | $\underset{\text { E }}{\text { E }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 7 A | 18 A | 26 A | 32 A | 39 B | 42 B | 46 C | 12 A |  |  | 14.4 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}710 & 7-9 \\ 71 & 7-16\end{array}$ | 6803 | 99 | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 11 A | 24 A | 34 A | 40 A |  | 47 C | $13 A$ |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll}11 & 7-16 \\ 13 & 7-23\end{array}$ | 7654 | 108 | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 A | 19 A | 32 A | 41 A |  | $\begin{array}{ll} 45 & B \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 47 \mathrm{c} \\ \hline 10 \end{array}\right.$ |  |  | $\frac{14}{11} \mathrm{~A}$ |
| 123 | 7412 | 107 | G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 A | 24 A | 34 A | 37 A | 39 B | 40 B | 42 c |  |  |

## Orchardgrass

1. Dry Matter Yield - The curves of the two varieties were very similar in shape. Frode grew faster and outyielded Ottawa throughout the season on any given date but both leveled off after the seed stage and ended at the same level. However, at similar stages of growth they had the same yield.

In 1961, the yield was very similar to 1962, Frode again being slightly higher on any date but similar at the same stage.
2. Height - The two variety height curves were very similar. Frode was taller on all dates but like yield, both varieties ended at the same height. They were the same height at the same stages of growth.

In 1961, the height curves were similar to those in 1962, Frode being taller, both ending the same and again being similar at the same stage of growth.
3. Percent Dry Matter - Varieties were similar in thevegetative stage. Once headed, Frode was higher and this difference gradually widened. There appears to be little similarity at the same stage of growth.

In 1961, again they were similar at the vegetative stage, gradually widened as in 1962, and were not similar at the same stages of growth.
4. Percent Crude Protein - The two varieties started at the same content but Frode was lower at all dates, similar at a given stage, until both were in flower, after which they were the same.

In 1961, the protein content was lower than in 1962, but the same general characteristics as above.
5. Percent Digestible Dry Matter - The curves on digestibility were very similar with the two varieties. Ottawa was $2-3 \%$ higher throughout than Frode but very similar at the same stage of growth.

In 1961, the curve shapes of the two varieties was very similar. Ottawa was again higher throughout but the two were similar at the same stage of development.
6. Leaf - In percentage and yleld of leaf, Frode was lower at all dates and stages of growth than Ottawa. The Frode leaf yield leveled off, the Ottawa continued to increase with succeeding cuts.

In 1961, the percentage and yield of leaves was very similar on any one date, Yield increases were largely due to an increase in stem weight.

## TEST 157 - HAY GROVTH CURVES - 1962

First Crop Data (Yield lbs./acre)

|  | Date Cut | Stage Cut | Height cms. | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { D.M. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yield } \\ \text { D.M. } \end{gathered}$ | Week1y Increase D.M. | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Leaf } \end{gathered}$ | Yield Leaf | Weekly <br> Increase Leaf | Yield Stem | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Crude } \\ \text { Protein } \end{gathered}$ | Yield <br> Crude <br> Protein | Digestible Dry Matter | Yield Digestiole Dry Matter |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

FRODE

| 1 | 5-7 | Veg. | 27 | 16.2 | 675 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | --.- | 29.5 | 200 | 76.2 | 556 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 5-14 | Veg. | 34 | 17.7 | 1341 | 666 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | 22.9 | 310 | 77.6 | 1161 |
| 3 | 5-22 | Boot | 52 | 18.1 | 2561 | 1220 | 59.6 | 1526 | ---- | 1035 | 16.9 | 462 | 72.2 | 1914 |
| 4 | 5-28 | Head | 64 | 19.5 | 3429 | 868 | 53.4 | 1831 | 305 | 1598 | 13.9 | 480 | 72.1 | 2567 |
| 5 | 6-4 | Head | 89 | 23.2 | 4616 | 1187 | 43.7 | 2017 | 186 | 2599 | 11.9 | 547 | 67.6 | 3022 |
| 6 | 6-11 | Flower | 107 | 23.3 | 5134 | 518 | 40.4 | 2074 | 57 | 3060 | 10.0 | 556 | 60.5 | 3208 |
| 7 | 6-18 | Flower | 116 | 27.8 | 5444 | 310 | 41.8 | 2276 | 202 | 3168 | 9.0 | 488 | 57.4 | 3079 |
| 8 | 6-25 | Seed | 116 | 30.8 | 6093 | 649 | 30.4 | 1852 | -424 | 4241 | 7.7 | 472 | 48.4 | $29+2$ |
| 9 | 7-3 | Seed | 118 | 35.8 | 5891 | -202 | 34.7 | 2044 | 192 | 3847 | 7.5 | 438 | 48.9 | 28;7 |
| 10 | 7-9 | Seed | 119 | 38.8 | 6295 | 404 | 39.4 | 2480 | 436 | 3815 | 7.3 | 462 | 46.5 | $30 \div 8$ |
| 11 | 7-16 | Seed | 122 | 41.8 | 5385 | -910 | 38.2 | 2057 | -423 | 3328 | 6.6 | 356 | 46.4 | $25 ? 6$ |
| 12 | 7-23 | Seed | 121 | 41.7 | 5191 | -194 | 39.7 | 2062 | 5 | 3129 | 6.1 | 317 | 39.0 | 2155 |

OTTANA 100

| 1 | 5-7 | Veg. | 21 | 18.0 | 384 | --- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | 32.2 | 124 | 76.5 | 256 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 5-14 | Veg. | 25 | 17.5 | 654 | 270 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | 27.6 | 183 | 77.7 | 619 |
| 3 | 5-22 | Joint | 42 | 18.6 | 2042 | 1388 | 93.7 | 1913 | ---- | 129 | 21.3 | 438 | 73.6 | 1541 |
| 4 | 5-28 | Boot | 53 | 19.1 | 2809 | 767 | 73.2 | 2056 | 143 | 753 | 17.4 | 491 | 74.9 | 2142 |
| 5 | 6-4 | Head | 70 | 21.7 | 3473 | 664 | 60.2 | 2091 | 35 | 1382 | 14.0 | 487 | 72.2 | 2508 |
| 6 | 6-11 | Head | 89 | 21.2 | 4535 | 1062 | 51.6 | 2340 | 249 | 2195 | 12.6 | 513 | 65.3 | 3033 |
| 7 | 6-18 | Flower | 108 | 24.2 | 4872 | 337 | 50.0 | 2436 | 96 | 2436 | 11.0 | 540 | 62.4 | 2906 |
| 8 | 6-25 | Flower | 109 | 27.1 | 5137 | 265 | 41.6 | 2137 | 299 | 3000 | 9.5 | 489 | 54.8 | 2999 |
| 9 | 7-3 | Seed | 119 | 33.0 | 6100 | 963 | 46.3 | 2824 | 687 | 3276 | 8.5 | 515 | 49.7 | 2974 |
| 10 | 7-9 | Seed | 115 | 34.3 | 6361 | 261 | 44.5 | 2831 | 7 | 3530 | 7.8 | 499 | 49.1 | 3139 |
| 11 | 7-16 | Seed | 114 | 36.7 | 5949 | -412 | 46.1 | 2742 | - 89 | 3207 | 7.0 | 416 | 50.0 | 2816 |
| 12 | 7-23 | Seed | 121 | 33.7 | 5661 | -288 | 56.8 | 3215 | 473 | 2446 | 6.9 | 394 | 47.5 | 2689 |
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TEST 157 - GROWTH CURVES - 1962
Aftermath Yields (Ibs./A)


TEST 157 - HAY GROWTH CURVES - 1962
Heights and Stages - Orchard Grass

| jut First Growth |  |  |  | Aftermaths |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ho. Iate | Yield | Ht | Stg | 5-14 | 15-22 | 5-28 | 6-4 | 6-111 | 6-18 | 6-25 | 7-3 | 17-9 | 7-16 | 7-23 | 7-30 | /8-8 | 8-16 | 8-20 | 8-28 | 9-4 | 10-3 | 10-29 |
| $\frac{1}{7} \frac{1}{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1{ }^{1} 5-7$ | 675 | 27 | A | 13 A | 31.4 | 42 C | 63 D | 86 F | 98 F | $22{ }^{2}$ A | 31 A | 36 A | 38 A | 40 A | 39 A | A 42 A | 21.4 | 24. | A 23 A | A 31 A |  | 24 A |
| $25-1 / 4$ | 1341 | 34 | A |  | 28 h | 38 C | 61 D | 82 E | 94.7 | 22 A | 32 A | 34 A | 37 A | 38 A | 35 A | A 40 A | 20 A | 24.4 | A 26 A | A 29 A |  | 204 |
| 3 5-22 | 2561 | 52 | C |  |  | 16 A | 30 A | 39 A | 56 A | 79 F | 19 A | 26 A | 32 A | 36 A | 36 A | A 40 A | 41 A | 42 A | A 43 A | A 44 |  | 14. ${ }^{\text {A }}$ |
| $45-28$ | 3429 | 64 | D |  |  |  | 19 A | 30 A | 44. | 60 h | 65 A | 12 A | 24 A | 31 A | 34 A | 36 A | 47 A | 42 A | i 42 A | A 42 A |  | 14. |
| $5 \quad 6-4$ | 4616 | 89 | E |  |  |  |  | 20 A | 34 A | 45 A | 55 A | 15 A | 26 A | 35 A | 35 A | A 38 | 41 A | 43 A | A 18 | A 44 |  | 15 A |
| \% t-11 | 5134 | 107 | F |  |  |  |  |  | 21 A | 35 A | 42 A | 148 A | 52 A | 20 A | 30 A | 37 A | 38 A | 39 A | A 139 A | , 38 A |  | 13 A |
| $7 \quad t-18$ | 5444 | 176 | F |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23 A | 31 A | 39 A | 42 A | 48 A | 51 n | 83 A | 35 A | 2. A | A 62 | A 40 A | A 40 A | 13 A |
| \% t-25 | 6093 | 176 | G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 ^ | 23 A | 27 A | 34 A | 4\% A | A $4 . \mathrm{A}$ | 59 A | 60 A | A 27 A | A 27 A | A 27 A | 14 A |
| 9 7-3 | 5891 | 118 | G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 A | 22 A | 30 A | 38 A | A 46 A | 51 A | 53 A | A İS A | A 24 | A 25 A | I3 A |
| 10 7-9 | 6295 | 119 | G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18 A | 30 A | 36 A | A 51 A | 60 A | 61 A | A $21 . A$ | 26 | A 26 A | 15 A |
| 11 7-16 | 5385 | 122 | G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22 A | 32 A | A 43 A | 51 A | 53 A | A Si. A | A 15 A | A 23 A | 14.4 |
| 12 7-:3 | 5191 | 121 | G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24 A | A 39 A | 47 A | 49 A | $\mathrm{A}, 5 \mathrm{~A}$ | 17 A | 124 | 13 A |
| Ottawa 10 ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $15-7$ | 384 | 21 | A | 15 A | 32 A | 42 A | 55 D | 77 E | 97 F | 21 A | 31 A | 35 A | 35 A | 37 A | 32 A | 35 A | 19 A | 22 A | A 23 A | A 24 A |  | 18 A |
| 2. 5-14 | 654 | 25 | A |  | 24 A | 35 A | 44 D | 70 E | 92 F | 21 A | 30 A | 33 A | 34 A | 34 A | 31 A | 32 A | 19 A | 22 A | A 24 A | A $2{ }_{4}^{\prime} \mathrm{A}$ |  | 16 A |
| 3 5-2.2 | 2042 | 42 | B |  |  | 17 A | 29 A | 38 A | 54 D | 69 F | 19 A | 27 A | 31 A | 33 A | 34 A | 39 A | 41 A | 42 A | Al 4 A | 12/ A |  | $14 . \mathrm{A}$ |
| 4 5-28 | 2809 | 53 | c |  |  |  | 20 A | 31 A | 40 A | 55 A | 64 A | 13 A | 23 A | 31 A | 33 A | 37 A | 38 A | 39 A | A 40 A | A 43 |  | 13 A |
| $5 \quad 6-4$ | 3473 | 70 | D |  |  |  |  | 21 A |  | 43 A | 54 A |  | 25 A |  | 32 A | 35 A | 35A |  |  | A 36 A |  | 17 A |
| $6 \quad 6-11$ | 4535 | 89 | E |  |  |  |  |  | 21 A | 34 A | 41 A | 46 A | 50 A | 21 A | 29 A | A 34 A | 35 n | . 36 is | i 36 a | A 36 A |  | 13 A |
| $7 \quad 6-1.8$ | 4872 | 108 | F |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21 A | 29 A | 34 A | 38 A | 42 A | 45 A | 22 A | 30 A | 32 A | A 33 A | A 33 h | L 33 A | 13 A |
| $\begin{array}{ll}5 & 6-25\end{array}$ | 5137 | 109 | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 A | 22 A | 27 A | 33 A | 38 A | A 48 A | 51 A | 53 A | 417 A | 124 | A 24 i | 12 A |
| $9 \quad 7-3$ | 6100 | 119 | G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 A | 20 A | 28 A | 37 A | 1 42 A | 47 A | 49 A | A 17 A | A 23 A | A 23 A | 12 A |
| $10 \quad 7-9$ | 6361 | 175 | G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18 A |  | 35 A | 144 | 52 A | 54 A | A 17 A | A 23 A | A 23 i | 13 A |
| 117 | 5949 | 114 | G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A 42 A | 48 A | 52 A | A 59 A | A 15 | 122 | 13 A |
| 12 7 7-23 | 5661 | 121 | G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 A | A 35 A | 41 A | 47 A | A 52 A | A 16 | A 23 A | 14 A |

1. Dry Matter Yield - The two varieties have similar yield curves but the Canada brome did vary some. Saratoga yielded more throughout the season and was higher at the last harvest. This was unlike the other grass species which were similar in final yield. Both curves started to flatten on the same date, June 4, but not at the same stage of growth.

In 1961, the curves of the two varieties were identical in shape but Saratoga again was slightly higher in yield. Unlike 1962, the two varieties gave similar yields at the same stage of growth.
2. Height - Saratoga was about 10 cms . taller than Canada brome until heading, after which it was 20 cms. taller, with little agreement at similar stages.

In 1961, the height curves were similar in shape, Saratoga was again taller and this difference also was greater during the later cuts.
3. Percent Dry Matter - Both varieties were similar until the boot stage of development after which Saratoga was $2-4 \%$ higher in dry matter; however, they were similar at the last cut.

In 1961, the same trends occurred as in 1962.
4. Percent Crude Protein - In general, Saratoga was lower than Canada brome in protein throughout the season, coming together only at the flowering stage.

In 1961, the two varieties performed as in 1962.
5. Percent Digestible Dry Matter - In 1962 the two varieties in general were similar with some overlapping from week to week. Saratoga started out higher but after heading both were similar on a given date and stage.

In 1961, the varieties performed very similar as in 1962.
In both years bromegrass was higher in digestibility than the other species tested.
6. Leaf - Saratoga was higher in percent leaf at most dates of cut and at most stages. This variety was considerably higher in weight of leaves from the heading stage.

In 1961, there was a general similarity in the percent and yield of leaf at the same dates and stages.

In both years, the percentage and yield of leaf was lower with bromegrass than with the other grass species.

## TEST 157 - HAY GROVTH CURVES - 1962

First Crop Data (Yield lbs./acre)

| Cut <br> No. | Date Cut | Stage Cut | Height cms. | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { D.M. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yield } \\ \text { D.M. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Weekly } \\ \text { Increase } \\ \text { D.M. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Leaf } \end{gathered}$ | Yield Leaf | Weekly Increase Leaf | Yield <br> Stem | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Crude } \\ \text { Protein } \end{gathered}$ | Yield Crude Protein | Digestible Dry Matter | Yield Digestible Dry Matter |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SARATOGA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 5-7 | Veg. | 29 | 19.6 | 1081 | ---- | ---- | --- | ---* | ---- | 29.1 | 314 | 77.3 | 817 |
| 2 | 5-14 | Veg. | 35 | 19.0 | 1523 | 442 | ---- | -- | ---- | ---- | 23.3 | 354 | 77.7 | 1230 |
| 3 | 5-22 | Boot | 59 | 20.1 | 2957 | 1434 | 64.0 | 1892 | -- | 1065 | 17.9 | 530 | 72.9 | 2276 |
| 4 | 5-28 | Boot | 71 | 22.3 | 3872 | 915 | 52.3 | 2025 | 133 | 1847 | 14.4 | 559 | 70.8 | 2689 |
| 5 | 6-4 | Head | 100 | 25.8 | 5433 | 1561 | 38.1 | 2070 | 45 | 3363 | 12.5 | 682 | 74.2 | 3808 |
| 6 | 6-11 | Head | 117 | 28.2 | 5661 | 228 | 34.4 | 1947 | -123 | 3714 | 10.6 | 601 | 71.5 | 3985 |
| 7 | 6-18 | Head | 134 | 33.0 | 6404 | 743 | 30.3 | 1940 | - 7 | 4464 | 9.6 | 618 | 66.2 | 4161 |
| 8 | 6-25 | Flower | 134 | 36.7 | 7266 | 862 | 25.0 | 1817 | -123 | 5449 | 7.9 | 575 | 63.6 | 4656 |
| 9 | $7-3$ | Seed | 129 | 40.6 | 7330 | 64 | 25.2 | 1847 | 30 | 5483 | 7.8 | 531 | 64.6 | 4354 |
| 10 | 7-9 | Seed | 132 | 41.8 | 7525 | 195 | 24.6 | 1851 | 4 | 5674 | 6.4 | 484 | 66.7 | 4782 |
| 11 | 7-16 | Seed | 133 | 45.1 | 7456 | - 69 | 23.5 | 1752 | - 99 | 5704 | 6.0 | 447 | 67.7 | 4845 |
| 12 | 7-23 | Seed | 139 | 44.9 | 7563 | 107 | 22.7 | 1717 | - 35 | 5846 | 5.6 | 426 | 66.5 | 5374 |
| CANADA BROME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 5-7 | Veg. | 22 | 20.4 | 650 | --- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | 31.1 | 202 | 70.9 | 516 |
| 2 | 5-14 | Veg. | 26 | 20.9 | 911 | 261 | --.- | --.- | ---- | -..- | 26.0 | 241 | 72.0 | 785 |
| 3 | 5-22 | Joint | 45 | 20.2 | 2437 | 1526 | 71.1 | 1733 | ---- | 704 | 21.4 | 543 | 68.6 | 1615 |
| 4 | 5-28 | Boot | 53 | 21.7 | 2894 | 457 | 60.7 | 1757 | 24 | 1137 | 17.7 | 511 | 75.1 | 2181 |
| 5 | 6-4 | Head | 85 | 22.9 | 4997 | 2103 | 42.8 | 2139 | 382 | 2858 | 14.7 | 733 | 72.8 | 3478 |
| 6 | 6-11 | Head | 100 | 23.8 | 4568 | -429 | 34.2 | 1562 | -577 | 3006 | 12.2 | 556 | 71.2 | 3117 |
| 7 | 6-18 | Head | 114 | 28.9 | 5779 | 1211 | 27.4 | 1583 | 21 | 4196 | 11.1 | 644 | 65.3 | 3771 |
| 8 | 6-25 | Flower | 114 | 33.4 | 5776 | - 3 | 22.2 | 1282 | 301 | 4494 | 8.9 | 513 | 65.2 | 3728 |
| 9 | 7-3 | Flower | 117 | 36.8 | 6471 | 695 | 20.9 | 1352 | 70 | 5119 | 7.5 | 508 | 65.5 | 4311 |
| 10 | 7-9 | Seed | 116 | 37.9 | 6974 | 503 | 18.6 | 1297 | - 55 | 5677 | 7.6 | 529 | 64.3 | 4515 |
| 11 | 7-16 | Seed | 117 | 42.3 | 6699 | 275 | 19.6 | 1313 | 16 | 5386 | 7.0 | 463 | 66.2 | 4419 |
| 12 | 7-23 | Seed | 115 | 43.9 | 6348 | 351 | 19.6 | 1244 | - 69 | 5104 | 6.5 | 415 | 66.8 | 4206 |






TEST 157 - GROWIH CURVES - 1962
Aftermath Yields (Lbs./A)


TEST 157 - HAY GROWTH CURVES - 1962
Heights and Stages - Bromegrass


HAY GROWTH CURVES - 1961, 1962
Per Cent Digestible Dry Matter

| First Growth |  | Alfalfa |  | Timothy |  | Orchard |  | Brome |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cut No. | Date | Vernal | DuPuits | C11max | Essex | Frode | Ott. 100 | Saratoga | Canada |
| 1961-TEST 151 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 5-8 | 48.8 | 54.3 | 50.7 | 46.9 | 46.6 | 37.1 | 61.2 | 60.1 |
| 2 | 5-15 | 69.9 | 71.5 | 66.5 | 67.5 | 63.7 | 60.0 | 74.9 | 75.6 |
| 3 | 5-23 | 79.1 | 75.1 | 73.4 | 68.6 | 69.8 | 68.6 | 78.4 | 74.0 |
| 4 | 5-29 | 78.3 | 74.4 | 74.3 | 71.8 | 67.6 | 71.5 | 79.7 | 73.2 |
| 5 | 6.5 | 75.9 | 71.2 | 67.6 | 66.6 | 63.8 | 64.6 | 69.6 | 72.5 |
| 6 | 6-12 | 69.6 | 69.5 | 64.6 | 64.0 | 55.4 | 64.5 | 65.5 | 69.5 |
| 7 | 6-19 | 68.6 | 66.4 | 62.8 | 62.4 | 55.4 | 60.5 | 63.5 | 63.9 |
| 8 | 6-26 | 63.5 | 63.4 | ---- | 60.9 | 53.1 | 59.2 | 60.1 | 63.7 |
| 9 | 7-3 | 63.3 | --.. | 54.4 | 54.4 | 45.7 | 53.3 | 60.9 | 60.2 |
| 10 | 7-10 | 65.1 | 63.9 | 51.7 | 54.1 | 54.5 | 55.5 | 60.9 | 60.3 |
| 11 | 7-17 | 57.5 | 58.3 | 49.0 | 52.4 | 48.9 | 48.1 | 58.9 | 57.2 |
| 12 | 7-24 | 57.5 | 54.5 | 44.9 | 46.2 | 45.1 | 43.8 | 58.2 | 57.7 |
| 1962-TEST 157 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 5-7 | 74.8 | 74.3 | 71.9 | 74.3 | 76.2 | 76.5 | 77.3 | 70.9 |
| 2 | 5-14 | 75.3 | 80.2 | 70.4 | 73.6 | 77.6 | 77.7 | 77.7 | 72.0 |
| 3 | 5-22 | 75.0 | 73.9 | 67.0 | 70.3 | 72.2 | 73.6 | 72.9 | 68.6 |
| 4 | 5-28 | 76.4 | 73.0 | 65.6 | 70.9 | 72.1 | 74.9 | 70.8 | 75.1 |
| 5 | 6-4 | 71.2 | 69.7 | 66.7 | 66.2 | 67.6 | 72.2 | 74.2 | 72.8 |
| 6 | 6-11 | 65.8 | 65.2 | 61.8 | 64.4 | 60.5 | 65.3 | 71.5 | 71.2 |
| 7 | 6-18 | 63.2 | 63.6 | 58.1 | 64.5 | 57.4 | 62.4 | 66.2 | 65.3 |
| 8 | 6-25 | 6.20 | 60.0 | 52.5 | 58.4 | 48.4 | 54.8 | 63.6 | 65.2 |
| 9 | 7-3 | 57.8 | 60.5 | 50.0 | 56.1 | 48.9 | 49.7 | 64.6 | 65.5 |
| 10 | 7-9 | 60.6 | 60.0 | 48.3 | 54.0 | 46.5 | 49.1 | 66.7 | 64.3 |
| 11 | 7-16 | 59.9 | 59.3 | 49.5 | 55.3 | 46.4 | 50.0 | 67.7 | 66.2 |
| 12 | 7-23 | 57.4 | 55.5 | 47.6 | 52.5 | 39.0 | 47.5 | 66.5 | 66.8 |

TEST 157 - HAY GROWTH CURVES - 1962
Per Cent Crude Protein

| First Growth |  | Alfalfa |  | Timothy |  | Orchard |  | Brome |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cut No. | Date | Vernal | Dupuits | Climax | Essex | Frode | Ott. 100 | Saratoga | Canada |
| 1 | 5-7 | 32.3 | 34.1 | 28.7 | 30.7 | 29.5 | 32.2 | 29.1 | 31.1 |
| 2 | 5-14 | 29.9 | 31.5 | 23.2 | 23.9 | 22.9 | 27.6 | 23.3 | 26.0 |
| 3 | 5-22 | 23.9 | 24.2 | 17.9 | 18.7 | 16.9 | 21.3 | 17.9 | 21.4 |
| 4 | 5-28 | 22.9 | 21.8 | 15.9 | 15.6 | 13.9 | 17.4 | 14.4 | 17.7 |
| 5 | 6-4 | 21.8 | 20.0 | 13.4 | 14.6 | 11.9 | 14.0 | 12.5 | 14.7 |
| 6 | 6-11 | 20.3 | 18.5 | 11.4 | 12.9 | 10.0 | 12.6 | 10.6 | 12.2 |
| 7 | 6-18 | 19.2 | 17.4 | 10.2 | 10.8 | 9.0 | 11.0 | 9.6 | 11.1 |
| 8 | 6-25 | 18.2 | 17.4 | 9.3 | 10.1 | 7.7 | 9.5 | 7.9 | 8.9 |
| 9 | 7-3 | 16.3 | 17.0 | 7.8 | 8.5 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 7.8 | 7.5 |
| 10 | 7-9 | 16.8 | 15.8 | 7.0 | 7.7 | 7.3 | 7.8 | 6.4 | 7.6 |
| 11 | 7-16 | 14.8 | 14.1 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 7.0 | 6.0 | 7.0 |
| 12 | 7-23 | 14.4 | 13.9 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 6.1 | 6.9 | 5.6 | 6.5 |

Early Cut - June 1, 1962

| Asscciation | Ibs. D <br> June I | /Acre, <br> July 5 | falfa <br> Aug 22 | ass <br> Total | $\text { June } 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Alfald } \\ & \text { July } 5 \end{aligned}$ | Aug 22 | $\text { June } \begin{gathered} \neq 1 \end{gathered}$ | Grass July 5 | Aug. 22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} \text { LuPuits } & + \text { Iincoln } \\ & + \text { Climax } \\ & + \text { Frode } \end{aligned}$ | 4236 | 2230 | 2631 | 9097 | 88.8 | 98.3 | 98.4 | 11.2 | 1.7 | 1.6 |
|  | 4162 | 2248 | 2803 | 9213 | 96.3 | 99.6 | 98.0 | 3.7 | . 4 | 2.0 |
|  | 4092 | 2814 | 2814 | 9197 | 82.4 | 91.1 | 86.3 | 17.6 | 8.9 | 13.7 |
| Mean | 4163 | 2749 | 2749 | 9168 | 89.2 | 96.3 | 94.2 | 10.8 | 3.7 | 5.8 |
| $\begin{aligned} \text { Vernal } & + \text { Iincoln } \\ & + \text { Climax } \\ & + \text { Frode } \end{aligned}$ | 4413 | 1790 | 2280 | 8483 | 71.9 | 90.1 | 88.2 | 28.2 | 9.9 | 11.8 |
|  | 4000 | 1813 | 2423 | 8236 | 85.3 | 98.9 | 98.6 | 14.7 | 1.1 | 1.4 |
|  | 3804 | 1755 | 2552 | 8171 | 75.3 | 80.3 | 73.4 | 24.7 | 29.7 | 24.6 |
| Mean | 4072 | 1786 | 24.18 | 8276 | 77.5 | 89.8 | 86.7 | 22.5 | 10.2 | 12.6 |


| Association | Lbs. D.M. Per Acre - Alfalfa |  |  |  | Ubs. D.M. Per Acre- Grass |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | June 1 | July 5 | Aug 22 | Total | June 1 | July 5 | Aug 22 | Total |
| DuPuits + Iincoln | 3761 | 2192 | 2589 | 8542 | 475 | 38 | 42 | 555 |
| + Climax | 4008 | 2239 | 2747 | 8994 | 154 | 9 | 56 | 219 |
| + Frode | 3372 | 2564 | 2590 | 8526 | 720 | 250 | 159 | 1129 |
| Mean | 3713 | 2332 | 2642 | 8687 | 450 | 99 | 86 | 634 |
| Vernal + Lincoln | 3173 | 1613 | 2012 | 6798 | 1240 | 177 | 268 | 1685 |
| + Climax | 3412 | 1793 | 2389 | 7594 | 588 | 20 | 34 | 642 |
| + Frode | 2864 | 1614 | 2096 | 6574 | 940 | 172 | 322 | 1434 |
| Mean | 3150 | 1673 | 2166 | 6989 | 923 | 123 | 208 | 1254 |


| Association | MEDIUM CUT - JUNE 13, 1962 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ibs. D.M. /Acre - Alfalfa + Grass |  |  |  | \% Alfalfa |  |  | \% Grass |  |  |
|  | June 13 | July 24 | Aug 22 | Total | June 13 | July 24 | Aug 22 | June 13 | July 24 | Aug 22 |
| DuPuits + İincoln | 4866 | 2033 | 2294 | 9193 | 86.6 | 98.4 | 97.1 | 13.4 | 1.6 | 2.9 |
| + Climax | 4916 | 2098 | 2262 | 9276 | 98.3 | 99.0 | 97.8 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 2.2 |
| + Frode | 5321 | 1840 | 2223 | 9384 | 86.9 | 89.2 | 85.5 | 13.1 | 1.8 | 14.5 |
| Mean | 5035 | 1990 | 2260 | 9285 | 90.6 | 95.5 | 93.5 | 9.4 | 1.5 | 6.5 |
| Vernal + Iincoln | 5532 | 1616 | 1912 | 9060 | 67.8 | 85.8 | 87.9 | 32.2 | 14.2 | 12.1 |
| + Climax | 4530 | 1591 | 2053 | 8174 | 93.5 | 98.8 | 95.7 | 6.5 | 1.2 | 4.3 |
| + Frode | 5521 | 1545 | 1805 | 8871 | 78.8 | 78.2 | 79.3 | 21.2 | 21.8 | 20.7 |
| Mean | 5194 | 1584 | 1923 | 8701 | 80.0 | 87.6 | 87.6 | 20.0 | 12.4 | 12.4 |


| Association | Ibs. D.M. Per Acre - Alfalfa |  |  |  | Lbs. D.M. Per Acre - Grass |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Juñe 13 | July 22 | Aug 22 | Total | June | July | Aug | Total |
| DuPuits + İincoln | 4214 | 2000 | 2227 | 8447 | 652 | 33 | 67 | 752 |
| + Climax | 4832 | 2077 | 2212 | 9121 | 84 | 21 | 50 | 155 |
| + Frode | 4624 | 1641 | 1901 | 8166 | 697 | 199 | 322 | 1218 |
| Mean | 4557 | 1906 | 2113 | 8576 | 478 | 84 | 146 | 708 |
| Vernal + Lincoln | 3751 | 1387 | 1681 | 6819 | 1781 | 229 | 231 | 2241 |
| + Glimax | 4236 | 1572 | 1965 | 7773 | 294 | 19 | 88 | 401 |
| + Frode | 4351 | 1208 | 1431 | 6990 | 1170 | 337 | 374 | 1881 |
| Mean | 4113 | 1389 | 1692 | 7194 | 1082 | 195 | 231 | 1508 ${ }^{\text { }}$ |

$$
\text { LATE CUT - JULY 5, } 1962
$$

| Association | Ibs. D.M./Acre, Alfalfa + Grass |  |  |  |  | \% Alfalfa |  |  | \% Crass |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | July 5 | Aug. 1 | Sept. 6 | Total | July 5 | Aug. 1 | Sept. 6 | July 5 | Aug. 1 | Sept. 6 |
| DuPuits + Iincoln | 5596 | 1782 | 2351 | 9729 | 88.8 | 98.0 | 94.8 | 37.2 | 2.0 | 5.2 |
| + Climax | 4997 | 1483 | 2276 | 8756 | 96.5 | 100.0 | 97.3 | 3.5 | 0 | 2.7 |
| + Frode | 5391 | 1670 | 2371 | 9432 | 90.2 | 95.7 | 92.5 | 9.8 | 4.3 | 7.5 |
| Mean | 5328 | 1645 | 2333 | 9306 | 91.8 | 97.9 | 94.9 | 8.2 | 2.1 | 5.1 |
| Vernal + Lincoln | 5749 | 1443 | 2083 | 9275 | 70.6 | 89.1 | 78.8 | 29.4 | 10.9 | 21.2 |
| + Climax | 5228 | 1535 | 2083 | 8846 | 90.2 | 98.2 | 96.9 | 9.8 | 1.8 | 3.1 |
| + Frode | 5453 | 1285 | 1898 | 8636 | 75.3 | 85.9 | 78.5 | 24.7 | 14.1 | 21.5 |
| Mean | 5477 | 1421 | 2021 | 8919 | 78.7 | 91.1 | 84.7 | 21.3 | 8.9 | 15.3 |


| Association | Ibs. D.M. Per Acre - Alfalfa |  |  |  | Ibs. D.M. Per Acre - Grass |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | JuIy 5 | Aug. 1 | Sept. 6 | Total | July 5 | Aug. | Sept. | Total |
| DuPuits + İncoln | 4969 | 1746 | 2229 | 894.4 | 627 | 36 | 122 | 785 |
| + Climax | 4822 | 1483 | 2215 | 8520 | 175 | 0 | 61 | 236 |
| + Frode | 4863 | 1598 | 2193 | 8654 | 528 | 72 | 178 | 778 |
| Mean | 4885 | 1609 | 2212 | 8706 | 443 | 36 | 120 | 599 |
| Vernal + Iincoln | 4059 | 1286 | 1641 | 6986 | 1690 | 157 | 442 | 2289 |
| + Climax | 4716 | 1507 | 2018 | 8241 | 512 | 28 | 65 | 605 |
| + Frode | 4106 | 1104 | 1490 | 6700 | 1371 | 181 | 408 | 1960 |
| Mean | 4294 | 1299 | 1716 | 7309 | 1791 | 122 | 305 | 1618 |

Title Aftermath distribution of alfalfa and trefoil varieties.
Purpose To study the relationship among the dry matter aftermath production and the aftermath distribution from Vernal, DuPuits alfalfas and Viking, Empire, and Morshansk trefoils.

Exp. No. 4783
Iocation O.A.C. B7 (north end)
Date Seeded May 15, 1961
Design Split plot with four replications
Treatments 1. Species alfalfa - DuPuits 10 lb ./acre Vernal 10 lb acre
trefoil - Empire 8 lbs./acre Viking 8 lbs./acre Morshansk 8 lbs./acre
2. Gutting Schedules

1st. Harvest (hay)
Hay removed from all varieties at medium to late bud. 2nd, 3rd, 4th Harvest

Aftermath growth curves were determined by cutting at 61 , medium bud stage, and 1/10th bloom stages of development. Curves were only determined on aftermath from preceeding bud and $1 / 10 t h$ bloom harvests.

Key to harvest schedule
Ist $I=$ Bud
2nd \& Succeeding
$1=6^{\prime \prime}$
$2=$ Bud
$3=1 /$ IOth Bloom.
3. Heights of plants in centimeters were taken weekly. Stages of development were estimated weekly on the following basis.

A - Vegetative
B - Early Bud
C - Buds Emerged
D - Late Bud

E - Early Flower
F - Full Flower
G - Late Flower
H - Early Seed

## Results

(1962 Harvest)
Tables showing the dry matter yield, production per day, pounds of legume and grass (weeds) and per cent dry matter are shown for each variety. In addition graphs showing aftermath yield and height curves as well as tables for height are included.

The dry spring and summer of 1962 resulted in yields that were low. In particular the dry spell during the latter days of June and the first three weeks of July had a very marked delaying effect upon the growth of all varieties during the second aftermath recovery period. This was particularly true in the case where plots were previously harvested at the bud stage. As a result little difference in recovery time was
apparent as a result of cutting the first aftermath at bud or l/loth bloom.
The first aftermath recovery was not effectual to the same degree as the second aftermath growth and the curves appeared to be "normal growth curves".

In all cases the dry matter production curves, production per day data, and stage indicated that when the plants reach a stage between vegetative and early bud the growth slows down.

Although the very dry mid summer period influenced the second aftermath distribution of the varieties the differences in aftermath harvest time among the varieties in all the aftermath harvests was a reflection of the date of harvest of the hay crop.

Effect of Date of Hay Harvest on the Distribution and Production Of Alfalfa and Trefoil Varieties Gut at Bud Stage

Variety Date Hay Fiage Field First Aftermath Second Aftermath Third Aftermath Season

| Viking |  | 23 | C | 2324 | June | 22 | B | 1377 | July |  | B | 360 | Aug 31 | B | 1735 | 5796 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dupuits ++ |  | 25 | AB | 3646 |  | 27 | BC | 2129 |  | 27 | BC | 673 | 31 | B | 1303 | 7751 |
| Morshansk |  | 28 | $A B$ | 2333 |  | 29 | BC | 1445 | Aug. | 27 | BC | 1687 | - | - | - | 5465 |
| Vernal |  | 30 | A+ | 4293 | July | 6 | BC | 2265 |  | 14 | C | 1705 | Oct 10 | A | 295 | 8558 |
| Empire | June | 8 | C | 3194 |  | 19 | B | 940 | Aug. | 31 | B | 1315 | - | - | - | 5449 |
|  | May | $23^{\circ}$ | A | 1947 |  | 29 | C | 1967 | Aug. | 31 | B | 2906 | -- | - | - | 6814 |

+ Stage recorded on May 22 ( 8 days prior to cutting).
- One replication of Empire was cut prior to bud stage in the first hay crop.
+ An additional harvest on November 1 was made of DuPuits of 446 Ib . Total. yield for season 8192 lb .

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Treatment } \\ & \text { Cut } \\ & 12345 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Date of Cut | Date of Recording Hgt. \& Stage | Stage of Plant Develop. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Height } \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { Cms. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Yield in Lbs. D.M./Acre |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { D.M. } \end{gathered}$ | Total Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Prodin } \\ & \text { Per Day } \end{aligned}$ | Legume | Grass | Weed |  |  |
| 1 | May 25 | May 22 | AB | 58.00 | 3646 |  | 3646 | 0 | 0 | 20.7 |  |
| 11 | June 12 | June 12 | A | 27.98 | 564 | 31.3 | 564 | 0 | 0 | 20.2 | 4210 |
| 12 | June 27 | June 25 | B | 49.56 | 2129 | 64.5 | 2129 | 0 | 0 | 22.4 |  |
| 13 | July 6 | July 4 | D | 56.25 | 2613 | 62.2 | 2613 | 0 | 0 | 35.5 |  |
| 121 | July 19 | July 16 | A | 16.92 | 317 | 14.1 | 317 | 0 | 0 | 27.3 | 6086 |
| 122 | July 27 | July 24 | BC | 22.50 | 673 | 22.4 | 673 | 0 | 0 | 30.1 |  |
| 123 | Aug. 8 | Aug. 8 | D | 39.50 | 1630 | 38.8 | 1630 | 0 | 0 | 24.8 |  |
| 131 | July 26 | July 24 | A | 17.33 | 332 | 16.6 | 332 | 0 | 0 | 23.1 | 6591 |
| 132 | Aug. 2 | July 30 | B | 28.38 | 1060 | 39.3 | 1060 | 0 | 0 | 21.2 | 7319 |
| 133 | Aug. 27 | Aug. 27 | E | 49.75 | 2148 | 41.3 | 2148 | 0 | 0 | 41.2 | 8407 |
| 1221 | Aug. $1{ }_{4}$ | Aug. 13 | A | 22.00 | 602 | 33.4 | 602 | 0 | 0 | 19.8 | 7050 |
| 1222 | Aug. 31 | Aug. 27 | B | 34.13 | 1303 | 37.2 | 1303 | 0 | 0 | 34.0 | 7751 |
| 1223 | Oct. 10 | Oct. 10 | c | 34.50 | 899 | 12.0 | 899 | 0 | 0 | 31.1 | 7347 |
| 1231 | Aug. 27 | Aug. 27 | A | 17.88 | 459 | 24.2 | 459 | 0 | 0 | 30.5 | 7864 |
| 1232 | Oct. 10 | Oct. 10 | B | 23.00 | 733 | 17.6 | 733 | 0 | 0 | 28.4 | 8138 |
| $12 \times 22$ | Nov. 1 | Oct. 22 | A | 21.75 | 446 | 7.2 | 446 | 0 | 0 | 20.2 | 8192 |

EXP. 4783/62
HEIGHTS IN CENTTMETERS - DUPUITS

Treatment No.
Date
May 22
June 5 June 12 June 12
June 18
June 25
July 4
July 9
July 16
July 24
July 30
fiug. 8
c.ug. 13

Aug. 22
Aug. 27
Sept. 3
Sept. 10
Sept. 17
Sept. 24
ost. 2
Oct. 10
Oct. 15
0ct. 22
 $\begin{array}{llllllllll}58.00 & 58.00 & 58.00 & 58.00 & 58.00 & 58.00 & 58.00 & 58.00 & 58.00 & 58.00\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}10.63 & 10.63 & 10.63 & 10.63 & 10.63 & 10.63 & 10.63 & 10.63 & 10.63 & 10.63\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllll}21.98 & 21.98 & 21.98 & 21.98 & 21.98 & 21.98 & 21.98 & 21.98 & 21.98 & 21.98\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllll}35.03 & 35.03 & 35.03 & 35.03 & 35.03 & 35.03 & 35.03 & 35.03 & 35.03\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllll}49.56 & 49.56 & 49.56 & 49.56 & 49.56 & 49.56 & 49.56 & 49.56 & 49.56\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllll}5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 56.25 & 56.25 & 56.25\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllll}10.71 & 10.71 & 10.71 & 10.71 & 10.71 & 10.71 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllll}16.92 & 16.92 & 16.92 & 16.92 & 16.92 & 16.92 & 8.17 & 8.17 & 8.17\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllll}22.50 & 22.50 & 22.50 & 22.50 & 22.50 & 17.33 & 17.33 & 17.33\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllll}5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 27.38 & 27.38 & 28.38 & 28.38\end{array}$ $18.00 \quad 18.00 \quad 18.00 \quad 39.50 \quad 39.50 \quad$ 1.2.5n $\begin{array}{lllll}22.00 & 22.00 & 22.00 & 5.00 & 5.00\end{array} 45.50$ $32.50 \quad 32.50 \quad 12.88 \quad 12.88 \quad 49.75$ $\begin{array}{lllll}34.13 & 34.13 & 17.88 & 17.88 & 49.75\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}5.25 & 33.50 & 22.50\end{array}$
$33.75 \quad 22.75$
$34.00 \quad 23.25$
$34.25 \quad 23.50$
$34.50 \quad 23.00$
21.25
21.75


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Treatment } \\ & \text { Cut } \\ & 12345 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Date } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Cut } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Date ofRecordingHgt. \& Stage | Stage of Plant Develop. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Height } \\ \text { in } \\ \text { Cms. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Yield in Lbs. D.M./Acre |  |  |  | Weed | DM. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tot. Yield } \\ & \text { for } \\ & \text { Year } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | Prodin <br> Per Day | Legume | Grass |  |  |  |
| 1 | May 30 | May 22 | A | 52.60 | 4293 |  | 4293 | 0 | 0 | 23.1 |  |
| 11 | June 18 | June 18 | A | 22.12 | 580 | 30.5 | 580 | 0 | 0 | 19.7 | 4873 |
| 12 | July 6 | July 4 | BC | 44.78 | 2265 | 61.2 | 2265 | 0 | 0 | 32.2 |  |
| 13 | July 17 | July 16 | C | 52.34 | 2842 | 59.2 | 2842 | 0 | 0 | 33.7 |  |
| 121 | Aug. 1 | July 30 | A | 19.50 | 618 | 23.8 | 618 | 0 | 0 | 22.2 | 7176 |
| 122 | Aug. 14 | Aug. 13 | C | 37.05 | 1705 | 43.7 | 1705 | 0 | 0 | 23.4 |  |
| 123 | Aug. 31 | Aug. 27 | D | 41.88 | 1944 | 34.7 | 1944 | 0 | 0 | 40.1 |  |
| 131 | Aug. 8 | Aug. 8 | A | 28.42 | 817 | 37.1 | 817 | 0 | 0 | 18.7 | 7952 |
| 132 | Aug. 21 | Aug. 13 | C | 36.13 | 1965 | 56.1 | 1965 | 0 | 0 | 25.5 | 9100 |
| 133 | Âug. 31 | Aug. 27 | CD | 44.75 | 2185 | 48.6 | 2185 | 0 | 0 | 36.7 | 9320 |
| 1221 | Oct. 10 | Oct. 10 | A | 17.58 | 395 | 6.9 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 25.5 | 8658 |
| 1222 | Oct. 10 | Oct. 10 | A | 11.58 | 295 | 5.2 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 26.9 | 8558 |
| 1223 | Oct. 10 | Oct. 10 | A | 11.58 | 214 | 3.8 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 30.9 | 8477 |
| 1231 | Oct. 10 | Oct. 10 | A | 10.00 | 156 | 3.9 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 24.8 | 8658 |
| 1232 | Oct. 10 | Oct. 10 | A | 10.00 | 133 | 3.3 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 24.6 | 8653 |

Date 2 II- 2 121- 2122121222 Treatment No 212232123121232 2 131-2132- 2 133-
$\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\text { May } 22 & 52.60 & 52.60 & 52.60 & 52.60 & 52.60 & 52.60 & 52.60 & 52.60 & 52.60 & 52.60\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { June } 5 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { June } & 12 & 10.68 & 10.68 & 10.68 & 10.68 & 10.68 & 10.68 & 10.68 & 10.68 & 10.68\end{array} \quad 10.68$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\text { June } 18 & 22.12 & 22.12 & 22.12 & 22.12 & 22.12 & 22.12 & 22.12 & 22.12 & 22.12 & 22.12\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { June } 25 & 35.81 & 35.81 & 35.81 & 35.81 & 35.81 & 35.81 & 35.81 & 35.81 & 35.81\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\text { July } 4 & 44.78 & 44.78 & 44.78 & 44.78 & 44.78 & 44.78 & 44.78 & 44.78 & 44.78\end{array}$

| July 9 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 47.50 | 47.50 | 47.50 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| July 16 | 6.33 | 6.33 | 6.33 | 6.33 | 6.33 | 6.33 | 52.34 | 52.34 | 52.34 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| July 24 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| JuIy 30 | 19.50 | 19.50 | 19.50 | 19.50 | 19.50 | 19.50 | 8.67 | 8.67 | 8.67 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Aug. 8
Aug. 13
Aug. 22
Aug. 27
Sept. 3
Sept. 10
Sept. 17
Sept. 24
Oct. 2
Oct. 10

| 33.40 | 33.40 | 33.40 | 33.40 | 33.40 | 28.42 | 28.42 | 28.42 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



| 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 41.75 | 41.75 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | 43.75

$9.00 \quad 9.00 \quad 4.00 \quad 41.88 \quad 41.88 \quad 45$
$10.92 \quad 10.92 \quad 10.92 \quad 5.00 \quad 5.00$
$11.42 \quad 11.42 \quad 11.42 \quad 5.00 \quad 5.00$
$\begin{array}{lllll}12.33 & 12.33 & 12.33 & 6.63 & 6.63\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}12.50 & 12.50 & 12.50 & 6.75 & 6.75\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}12.50 & 12.50 & 12.50 & 7.75 & 7.75\end{array}$
$11.58 \quad 11.58 \quad 11.58 \quad 10.00 \quad 10.00$

| EXP. 4783 |  | AFIERMATH GROWTH CURVES OF VIKING TREFOIL, 1961 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | O.A.C. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Treatment | Date of Cut | Date of Recording Hgt. \& Stage | Stage of Plant Height in Develop. Cms. |  | Yield in Lbs. of D.M./acre |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { D.M. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { Yield } \\ & \text { For Year } \end{aligned}$ |
| Cut |  |  |  |  |  | Prod'n |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12345 |  |  |  |  | Total | Per Day | Legume | Grass | Weed |  |  |
| 1 | May 23 | May 22 | C | 28.60 | 2324 |  | 2132 | 22 |  | 17.7 |  |
| 11 | June 18 | June 18 | $A B$ | 20.50 | 702 | 27.0 | 678 | 30 |  | 15.3 | 3026 |
| 12 | June 22 | June 18 | B | 20.50 | 1377 | 45.9 | 1364 | 13 |  | 15.6 |  |
| 13 | June 29 | June 25 | BC | 28.75 | 1976 | 53.4 | 1857 | 61 |  | 18.9 |  |
| 121 | July 17 | July 16 | $A B$ | 13.25 | 197 | 7.9 | 194 | 2 |  | 24.8 | 3898 |
| 122 | July 19 | July 16 | B | 13.25 | 360 | 13.3 | 347 | 10 |  | 28.7 |  |
| 123 | July 26 | July 24 | D | 15.50 | 681 | 20.0 | 656 | 15 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 131 | July 31 | July 30 | CD | 17.33 | 407 | 12.7 | 400 | 5 |  | 22.9 | 4707 |
| 132 | July 31 | July 30 | $C D$ | 17.33 | 927 | 29.0 | 919 | 6 |  | 22.2 | 5227 |
| 133 | Aug. I | July 30 | CD | 17.33 | 532 | 16.1 | 521 | 8 |  | 21.3 | 4832 |
| 1221 | Aug. 16 | Aug. 13 | $A B$ | 19.92 | 1360 | 48.6 | 1299 | 40 |  | 24.8 | 5421 |
| 1222 | Aug. 31 | Aug. 27 | B | 27.25 | 1735 | 40.3 | 1599 | 136 |  | 30.1 | 5796 |
| 1223 | Sept 12 | Sept 10 | BC | 28.00 | 1884 | 34.3 | 1786 | 75 |  | 27.7 | 5945 |
| 1231 | Aug. 21 | Aug. 13 | $A B$ | 13.38 | 489 | 18.8 | 470 | 16 |  | 20.5 | 4871 |
| 1232 | Aug. 30 | Aug. 27 | AB | 22.00 | 1011 | 28.9 | 974 | 37 |  | 30.9 | 5393 |




| EXP. 4783 | AFTERMATH GROWTH CURVES OF MORSHANSK TREFOIL TREFOIL, 1961 1962 Data. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | O.A.C. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Treatment } \\ & \text { Cut } \\ & 12345 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Date } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Cut } \end{aligned}$ | Date of Recording <br> Height \& Stage | Stage of Plant Develop. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Height } \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { Cms. } \end{aligned}$ | Yield in Ibs. D.M./hcre |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { D.M. } \\ \text { D. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total <br> Yield <br> For <br> Year |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | $\operatorname{Prod}^{1} \mathrm{~N}$ Per Day. | Legume | Grass | Weed |  |  |
| 1 | May 28 | May 22 | AB | 27.00 | 2333 |  | 2242 | 91 |  | 18.3 |  |
| 11 | June 22 | June 18 | AB | 13.33 | 64.4 | 25.8 | 625 | 19 |  | 15.7 | 2977 |
| 12 | June 29 | June 25 | C | 24.00 | 1445 | 45.2 | 14.4 | 38 |  | 18.0 |  |
| 13 | July 4 | July 4 | DE | 34.25 | 2032 | 54.9 | 2005 | 18 |  | 24.1 |  |
| 121 | Aug. 8 | Aug. 8 | B | 19.84 | 639 | 16.0 | 621 | 16 |  | 20.4 | 4417 |
| 122 | Aug. 27 | Aug. 27 | BC | 28.20 | 1687 | 28.6 | 1630 | 57 |  | 31.4 | 5465 |
| 123 | Sept. 13 | Sept. 10 | C | 28.25 | 1396 | 18.4 | 1380 | 16 |  | 33.6 | 5174 |
| 131 | Aug. 2 | July 30 | AB | 11.75 | 253 | 8.7 | 248 | 6 |  | 21.3 | 4618 |
| 132 | Aug. 31 | Aug. 27 | B | 32.25 | 1836 | 31.7 | 1836 | 0 |  | 32.4 | 6201 |
| . 133 | Sept. 13 | Sept. 10 | B | 31.00 | 1702 | 24.0 | 1663 | 40 |  | 28.5 | 6067 |
| 1221 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1222 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1223 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1231 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1232 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Tut. No. May 22 June 5 June 12 June 18 June 25 July 4 July 9 July 16 July 24 July 30 Aug 8 Aug 13 Aug 22 Aug 27 Sept 3 Sept 10

| 5 | 11- | 27.00 | 5.00 | 7.18 | 13.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 121- | 27.00 | 5.00 | 7.18 | 13.33 | 24.00 | 5.00 | 5.50 | 7.25 | 8.63 | 11.33 | 19.84 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 1221 | 27.00 | 5.00 | 7.18 | 13.33 | 24.00 | 5.00 | 5.50 | 7.25 | 8.63 | 11.33 | 19.84 | 23.70 | 28.15 | 28.20 |  |  |
| 5 | 1222 | 27.00 | 5.00 | 7.18 | 13.33 | 24.00 | 5.00 | 5.50 | 7.25 | 8.63 | 11.33 | 19.84 | 23.70 | 28.15 | 28.20 |  |  |
| 5 | 1223 | 27.00 | 5.00 | 7.18 | 13.33 | 24.00 | 5.00 | 5.50 | 7.25 | 8.63 | 11.33 | 19.84 | 23.70 | 28.15 | 28.20 |  |  |
| 5 | 1231 | 27.00 | 5.00 | 7.18 | 13.33 | 24.00 | 5.00 | 5.50 | 7.25 | 8.63 | 17.33 | 19.84 | 23.70 | 28.15 | 28.20 | 28.88 | 28.25 |
| 5 | 1232 | 27.00 | 5.00 | 7.18 | 13.33 | 24.00 | 5.00 | 5.50 | 7.25 | 8.63 | 17.33 | 19.84 | 23.70 | 28.15 | 28.20 | 28.88 | 28.25 |
| 5 | 131- | 27.00 | 5.00 | 7.18 | 13.33 | 24.00 | 34.25 | 5.00 | 6.25 | 8.25 | 17.75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 13 ? | 27.00 | 5.00 | 7.18 | 13.33 | 24.00 | 34.25 | 5.00 | 6.25 | 8.25 | 11.75 | 22.25 | 27.13 | 32.38 | 32.25 |  |  |
| 5 | 133- | 27.00 | 5.00 | 7.18 | 13.33 | 24.00 | 34.25 | 5.00 | 6.25 | 8.25 | 11.75 | 22.25 | 27.13 | 32.38 | 32.25 | 32.50 | 31.00 |

AFTERMATH GROWTH CURVES (4783) MORSHANSK TREFOIL

EXP. 4783
AFTERMATH GROWTH CURVES OF EMPIRE TREFOIL, 196.1
O.A.C. (Reps 1,3,4)

1962 Data

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Treatment } \\ & \text { Cut } \\ & 12345 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Date of Cut | Date ofRecordingHeight \&Stage | $\begin{gathered} \text { Stage } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Plant } \\ \text { Develop. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Height } \\ \text { in } \\ \text { Cms. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Yield in Ibs. D.Mo/Acre |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ D_{0} M_{0} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total <br> Yield For Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Prod } \mathrm{In}^{\prime} \\ & \text { Per Day } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Legume | Grass | Weed |  |  |
| 1 | June 8 | June 5 | c | 38.73 | 3194 |  | 2791 | 234 |  | 23.6 |  |
| 11 | July 17 | July 16 | $A B$ | 15.80 | 684 | 17.5 | 627 | 14 |  | 33.1 | 3878 |
| 12 | July 19 | July 16 | B | 15.80 | 940 | 22.9 | 839 | 29 |  | 35.7 |  |
| 13 | Aug. 7 | July 30 | $C D$ | 20.67 | 1740 | 29.0 | 1609 | 65 |  | 23.3 | 4934 |
| 121 | Aug. 14 | Aug. 13 | A | 14,28 | 470 | 18.1 | 432 | 15 |  | 17.1 | 4604 |
| 122 | Aug. 31 | Aug. 27 | B | 21.73 | 1315 | 30.6 | 1254 | 42 |  | 33.8 | 54.49 |
| 123 | Sept. 12 | Sept. 10 | A | 22.50 | 1372 | 24.9 | 1256 | 60 |  | 29.6 | 5506 |
| 131 | Oct. 10 | Oct. 10 | A | 9.33 | 223 | 3.5 | 187 | 45 |  | 25.0 | 5157 |
| 132 | oct. 10 | Oct. 10 | A | 9.33 | 873 | 13.6 | 60 | 39 |  | 25.8 | 5807 |
| 133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1221 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1222 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1223 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1231 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1232 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Date $\quad 411$ - 4 121- 41221412224122341231412324131 - 4 132- 4 133-
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { May } 22 & 25.10 & 25.10 & 25.10 & 25.10 & 25.10 & 25.10 & 25.10 & 25.10 & 25.10 & 25.10\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { June } 5 & 38.73 & 38.73 & 38.73 & 38.73 & 38.73 & 38.73 & 38.73 & 38.73 & 38.73 & 38.73\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { June } 12 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { June } 18 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { June } 25 & 8.44 & 8.44 & 8.44 & 8.44 & 8.44 & 8.44 & 8.44 & 8.44 & 8.44 & 8.44\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { July } 4 & 11.47 & 11.47 & 11.47 & 11.47 & 11.47 & 11.47 & 11.47 & 11.47 & 11.47 & 11.47\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { JuIy } 9 & 14.57 & 14.57 & 14.57 & 14.57 & 14.57 & 14.57 & 1_{4.57} .57 & 14.57 & 14.57 & 14.57\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { July } 16 & 15.80 & 15.80 & 15.80 & 15.80 & 15.80 & 15.80 & 15.80 & 15.80 & 15.80 & 15.80\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { July } 24 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 5.00 & 14.78 & 14.78 & 14.78\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { July } 30 & 6.95 & 5.95 & 6.95 & 6.95 & 6.95 & 6.95 & 14.33 & 14.33 & 14.33\end{array}$ Aug. 8

Aug. 13
ag. 22
Aug. 27
Sept. 3
Sept. 10
Sept. 17
Sept. 24
oct. 2
Oct. 10
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}10.61 & 10.61 & 10.61 & 10.61 & 10.61 & 10.61 & 5.67 & 5.67 & 20.67\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllll}14.28 & 14.28 & 14.28 & 14.28 & 14.28 & 14.28 & 6.00 & 6.00 & 23.33\end{array}$ $21.00 \quad 21.00 \quad 21.00 \quad 21.00 \quad 21.00 \quad 7.34 \quad 7.34 \quad 5.00$ $\begin{array}{llllllll}21.73 & 21.73 & 21.73 & 21.73 & 21.73 & 8.67 & 8.67 & 5.00\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}22.17 & 22.17 & 9.00 & 9.00 & 5.00\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}22.50 & 22.50 & 8.84 & 8.84 & 5.00\end{array}$
$9.17 \quad 9.17 \quad 5.33$
$9.34 \quad 9.34 \quad 5.33$
$9.50 \quad 9.50 \quad 5.33$
$9.33 \quad 9.33 \quad 5.33$

Progress Report
Using the In Vitro Technique
For Quality Evaluation of Crops

The materials, equipment, solutions, and procedure used in this technique are outlined in the 1961 Forage Management Progress Report of this department.

The In Vitro technique used in quality evaluation is based upon that developed at the Hurley Grassland Station and reported in Proc. Sth Inter: Grass Cong. 1960 Report. The digestibility of a sample is gauged on the decrease in dry metter rather than cellulose. Thus, chemical determinations of cellulose content on the sample prior to addition of the micro-organisms and on the residue after digestion is eliminated. However, very precise weighing of the samples is required before and after digestion using this dry matter technique.

In this laboratory, the total digestion of the sample is estimated. Digestion alone is only one factor involved in quality evaluation of crops. However, error terms involved in determining the more desirable criterion of value; the nutritive value index (relative intake $x$ digestion) by an In Vitro technique are high.

Table 1: Calibration of Artificial Rumen With Standard Samples
Per Cent Digestible Dry matter

| Period of <br> Digestion | G 6II <br> (O.A.G. Alfalfa) | Purdue | Macdonald <br> Brome | Macdonald <br> Alfalfa |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 44.4 | 32.8 | 20.3 |  |
| 24 | 57.0 | 47.3 | 43.9 | 36.5 |
| 36 | 59.9 | 47.2 | 53.2 | 47.0 |
| 48 | 63.9 | 52.3 | 50.5 | 51.5 |
| $48+48$ | 73.4 | 55.7 | 61.0 | 61.1 |

Analysis of Variance Table
Mean Squares

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Variants | df. | 24 | $48+48$ |
| Runs | 2 | $13.60 * *$ | $15.50 * *$ |
| Substrate | 2 | $50.06 * *$ | $47.08 * *$ |
| R x S | 4 | 2.52 | 3.12 |
| Error | 8 | 1.39 | 0.89 |
|  |  | 1.10 | 0.94 |

Justification for acceptance of the criterion of total digestion is in the fact that the one factor restricting the use of forage as a complete livestock feed is energy. In general, forages will contain adequate protein and also sufficient minerals if the crop has been grown under an adequate and well balanced fertility program for animal nutrition.

The use of total digestion (as indicated in this case by digestible dry matter) in order to "sort out" the effect of management practices, differences among species and varieties, etc., on the energy value of crops has a very meaningful objective. When relating these data to livestock performance, the same problems and difficulties are encountered as when other energy values are used. In particular the resulting data are useful in computing rations for livestock or when animals are on a restrictive feeding program. In general, however, these data can be utilized within limits tc indicate the total quality of feed. For where botanical composition remains constant (such as in stands of pure alfalfa or grass or in mixtures where the proportion of the components remain the same), intake is related to digestibility where the digestibility values are medium to high.

Thus, two lines of research are suggested by the above. 1) The determination of the effect of agronomic practices, species and varieties on the energy content of forage and 2) the investigation into the use of In Vitro techniques for estimating total quality of crops.

The former line of research is well underway in this laboratory. The laboratory has been equipped and staffed for the evaluation of approximately 10,000 samples per year. It is essential in this field to make certain that every run estimates the In Vivo digestion. This is accomplished by using "standard samples" in every run. Standard samples such as Macdonald alfalfa and bromegrass have known In Vivo digestion ratings and are used in every run along with an O.A.C. standard alfalfa (G6l-1). The relationship between results obtained with the In Vitro technique and the In Vivo data is shown in the accompanying table.

Table 2: Relationship Between In Vitro and In Vivo Digestion

$$
\frac{\text { O.A.C., Guelph }}{\mathscr{\%} \text { D.D.M. }}
$$

| Sample | In Vitro + | In Vivo |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Purdue Alfalfa | 55.7 | $55.1^{\circ}$ |
| Macdonald Alfalfa | 61.1 | 60.0 |
| Ottawa Brome 4602-B | 70.5 | 71.8 |
| Ottawa Brome 449-7 | 62.9 | 58.7 |
| Ottawa Alfalfa. 482-3B | 74.1 | 73.1 |
| Ottawa Alfalfa 482-2B | 57.8 | 58.8 |

Although no correlations can be made between these two sets of data (limited In Vivo data) there appears to be a close relationship between In Vitro and In Vivo digestibility using this technique under our laboratory conditions. The O.A.C. alfalfa (G6I-I) has become our basic standard sample for calibration of each run, and also for research into technology of techniques and components. No In Vivo digestibility data are available for this sample. However, limited data are available concerning its animal acceptance. Intake trials using forage produced at Brampton were conducted in 1961 on sixteen samples (including G6I-1) of hay. The yield, stage, date, digestible dry matter and the In Vivo data are shown in the accompanying table (table 3). Digestion and protein values are also given for three Animal Husbandry hays that were used in a dairy cattle intake trial in 1961.

Table 3:
Sheep Hays Brampton, 1961

| No. | Date of Cut | Stage | Ib. Yield | Per Cent |  | \% Crude Protein | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Ash. } \end{gathered}$ | In Vivo |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | D.D.M. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Water } \\ & \text { Sol. } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Intake ${ }^{\circ}$ gms!. 75 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { wgt.gain } \\ & \text { per day } \end{aligned}$ |
| Vernal Alfalfa |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G611 | 5-16 | Vegetative | 2912 | 75.3 | 36.3 | 20.5 | 12.44 | 80.6 | +0.48 |
| G612 | 5-30 | Early Bud | 4313 | 69.4 | 30.5 | 17.3 | 10.78 | 65.6 | +0.39 |
| G613 | 6-14 | 1st Flower | 4851 | 62.2 | 27.7 | 17.4 | 7.90 | 67.0 | +0.26 |
| G614 | 6-27 | E. Seed | 4826 | 62.0 | 19.3 | 15.3 | 7.84 | 54.3 | +0.24 |
| Saratoga Brome |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G619 | 5-16 | Boot | 1887 | 79.9 | 31.7 | 14.6 | 9.02 | 85.9 | +0.45 |
| 66170 | 5-30 | Head | 3597 | 69.8 | 19.1 | 10.9 | 7.71 | 67.7 | +0.23 |
| G6111 | $6-14$ | Late Flower | 4959 | 68.6 | 18.7 | 7.7 | 6.32 | 44.0 | +0.00 |
| G6112 | 6-27 | E. Seed | 5025 | 58.8 |  | 5.7 | 5.80 | 49.0 | +0.03 |
| Climax Timothy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G615 | 5-16 | Joint | 2510 | 78.7 | 25.4 | 16.2 | 9.56 | 77.3 | +0.45 |
| C616 | 5-30 | Boot | 4096 | 72.5 | 20.4 | 11.9 | 9.12 | 64.1 | $+0.31$ |
| G617 | $6-14$ | Head | 5632 | 59.0 | 19.3 | 11.2 | 7.62 | 47.1 | +0.00 |
| G618 | 6-27 | Flower | 5985 | 54.2 | 18.3 | 8.0 | 6.08 | 33.6 | -0.07 |
| Frode Orchard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G6113 | 5-16 | Boot | 1502 | 75.3 | 33.0 | 12.7 | 10.95 | 80.1 | +0.56 |
| G6114 | 5-30 | Flower | 2435 | 70.1 | 25.3 | 9.4 | 17.42 | 68.9 |  |
| G6115 | 6-14 | L. Flower | 3539 | 62.6 | 20.9 | 8.3 | 8.60 | 58.8 | +0.30 |
| G6116 | 6-27 | Seed | 3658 | 58.7 | 19.1 | 7.5 | 9.57 | 55.4 | +0.14 |

Animal Husbandry Hays 1961 (Dairy Cows)

| AHBSI | $6-6$ | 70.2 | 18.5 | $41.1^{+}+.11$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AHBS2 | $6-27$ | 68.0 | 17.0 | 32.9 |  |
| AHBS3 | $7-18$ | 59.8 | 12.3 | 21.9 | -.68 |

[^1]In a former report mention was made of the fact that the use of Pepsin was not necessary for the estimation of digestibility in grasses but was necessary for legumes.

Table 4: Use of Pepsin in the Digestibility of Forages
Per Cent Digestible Dry Matter

| Sample | Period of <br> Digestion | Average Digestion |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 48 | Four Funs ${ }^{+}$ | Three Funs ${ }^{\circ}$ |
|  | $48+48$ | 66.1 | 60.9 |
| G619 | 48 | 73.5 | 73.1 |
|  | $48+48$ | 76.0 | 73.1 |
| MacBrome | 48 | 79.3 | 79.9 |
|  | $48+48$ | 63.1 | - |

+ runs 23; 31, 32, and 35 period - up to June 10, 1962.
- runs 50, 62, 70 period - after October 3, 1962.

Period I. Ration for sheep chopped $\frac{3}{4}$ " to 1 ". - $75 \%$ alfalfa hay Brampton harvested 1961.

- $25 \%$ grass Brampton harvested 1961. D. D.M. 75. 3\%.

2. Ration for sheep chopped $\frac{3}{4}$ to 1". - $80 \%$ alfalfa hay O.A.C. Animal Husbandry Dept., 1961. $20 \%$ straw (small proportion of grass). D.D.M. 70. $2 \%$.

Recent indications are that the ration used for feeding the fistulated sheep may have a bearing on the use of pepsin. Where sheep were fed a ration of approximately $75 \%$ alfalfa and $25 \%$ grass, the pepsin was not necessary for estimating digestibility of grasses. Where alfalfa was fed accompanied by little or no grass,the pepsin digestion period was required for estimating digestion of both species.

Using any In Vitro technique a variability exists between two runs using the same samples. In order to overcome this, it has been the practice of this laboratory to use two runs of the same material and average the digestibilities. However, in many cases a run $x$ treatment interaction occurs. It was essential to determine the type of interaction that occurred. Thus three runs were made of a management study to determine the type of interaction.

Table 5:
Interaction Between Runs $x$ Treatments

| Cut | Run Number |  |  | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 50.5 e | 46.7 cd | 52.4 d | 49.9 |
| 2 | 67.1 a | 64.3 a | 70.0 こ | 67.1 |
| 3 | 73.4 a | 68.5 a | 75.0 a | 72.3 |
| 4 | 74.3 a | 68.5 a | 74.2 a | 72.3 |
| 5 | 67.6 ab | 62.9 ab | 70.0 ab | 66.8 |
| 6 | 64.6 b | 52.3 bc | 66.0 bc | 61.0 |
| 7 | 62.8 bc | 48.8 c | 64.3 cd | 58.6 |
| 8 | 56.4 cd | 39.3 de | 56.0 d | 50.6 |
| 9 | 54.4 d | 34.0 | 52.9 d | 47.1 |
| 10 | 51.8 de | 37.0 | 51.6 d | 46.8 |
| 11 | 48.1 e | 33.0 | 47.7 d | 43.0 |
| 12 | 43.7 e | 32.3 e | 47.4 d | 41.1 |
| Standard | 59.6 | 62.9 | 67.7 | 63.4 |
| Time From Feed | 14.3 hrs . | 5.0 hrs. | 16.0 hrs . |  |
| pH of R.L. | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.3 |  |

Analysis of Variance Table

Variant
Runs
Replications
Runs $x$ Reps.
Cutting Dates
Cuts x Runs
Error B
d.f. 2

3
6
11
22
99
M.S. 1985-33** 21. $59 * *$ 0.84

1553-53前
41-96*
12-84

A run $x$ treatment interaction was apparent. However, by the use of Duncan's Multiple Range test within each mun and a comparison of these across the runs is evident that the interaction was due to a change in magnitude (Run 52) and not in ranking of the individual treatments. These data plus others indicate that the technique is ranking the treatment in the correct order in every run, but that two runs are necessary to obtain a valid estimate of digestibility.

It is also important to know the number of replications of the field trial as well as the number of tubes per sample that should be used to estimate the digestibility. Analyses were made of material that had been processed through the In Vitro technique.

Table 6:
Analysis of Variance Table
Saratoga Mean Squares Canadian Brome

| Reps. 3 | 23.34 | 13.07 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cuts 11 | 450.20 | 345.81 | $6 \mathrm{~s}^{2}+260^{2}+4 \mathrm{Ct}^{2}$ |
| Reps. x Cuts 33 | 14.84 | 14.69 | $\mathrm{ls}^{2}+2 \mathrm{l}^{2}$ |
| Sample Error 48 | 2.71 | 3.48 |  |
| Predicted Standard Error |  |  |  |
| for 2 samples 4 reps. | 1.86 | 1.84 |  |
| 1 sample 4 reps. | 2.20 | 2.27 |  |
| 1 sample 6 reps. | 1.46 | 2.52 |  |

The prediction values indicated that the use of one tube for each of four field replications would result in a very high standard error. Standard errors of the various combinations of number of tubes and replications indicated that one tube from each of six replications would result in the lowest error. However, at the present two samples of 4 replications are being used ass the error term is only slightly larger than where 1 sample is used with 6 replications and less work is involved in using this number.

Samples from many agronomic studies such as first and aftermath growth curves experiments, mixture diversification trials, strain and species comparisons are being processed in the laboratory. One of the underlying projects of all these studies is to determine that the value of the leaf stem proportions in terms of digestibility. In one study conducted at Kemptville with two varieties of trefoil, leaf and stem were separated and digestion trials were conducted. (Table 7)

Although these are preliminary studies, the data indicate that Empire stems tend to be lower in digestibility than Viking stems but that the leaves of Empire are higher in digestikiluty then the Viking stems. In addition, the digestibility of the stems gradually decrease with increasing maturity of the crop. Whereas, the leaves remain fairly constant in digestibility until seed stage is reached. This is particularly the case with Empire.

The second phase of the program concerned with quality of crops is that of attempting to obtain a method by which the overall feeding quality can be estimated with the proviso that it will eliminate much of the variability among runs. This suggests that the technique must be chemical rather than biological.

The concept of determining NVI by an In Vitro technique is based upon information that indicate a lag in early digestion period occurs with some samples and that this lag in digestion is related to intake. The lag in digestion suggests that components within the crops in question may vary and that if the above thesis is true, they differ markably in digestion; thus, "loading the gut" and reducing intake. Thus, chemical determinations of components of different species varieties and their maturity are essential.

A program was undertaken in order to achieve the above objectives. involves investigation into components of forage and their digestibility. Work is proceeding in the fractionation of the components into four broad groups:

| Table 7: |  | TREFOIL DEVELOPMENT STUDY |  |  |  | KEMPIVIITE, 1961 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gutting Date | Stage of Development | Plant Height (inches) | Yield in <br> Ibs. DM/A. | $\text { D. } \begin{aligned} & \mathscr{O} \\ & D_{.} \\ & \text {M. } \end{aligned}$ | Leaves | $\text { D. } \stackrel{\neq}{D_{0}} \mathrm{M}_{0}$ | $\%$ Stems | $\text { D. } \stackrel{\neq}{D_{0}} M_{\bullet}$ |
| Viking |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| May 31 | Vegetative | 11.4 | 1245 | 74.1 | 74.9 | 73.7 | 25.1 | 74.5 |
| June 8 | Ist Flower | 19.1 | 2186 | 67.2 | 59.1 | 66.4 | 40.9 | 68.0 |
| June 16 | Full Blossom | 20.0 | 2987 | 66.9 | 47.5 | 70.8 | 52.5 | 63.1 |
| June 23 | Late Bud | 24.4 | 3488 | 62.6 | 44.7 | 67.9 | 55.3 | 57.2 |
| June 29 | Pods \& F\% | 28.8 | 3162 | 65.6 | 39.3 | 70.7 | 60.7 | 60.5 |
| July 7 | Late Blossom | 31.3 | 4002 | 61.4 | 33.5 | 65.3 | 66.5 | 57.5 |
| July 14 | Seed | 35.2 | 4197 | 56.4 | 29.6 | 60.7 | 70.4 | 52.2 |
| Empire |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| June 9 | Vegetative | 13.5 | 1045 | 73.9 | 68.0 | 81.5 | 32.0 | 66.4 |
| June 16 | L. Bud | 19.2 | 2034 | 70.1 | 51.1 | 78.4 | 48.9 | 61.8 |
| June 23 | E. Bloom | 22.5 | 2836 | 69.5 | 50.5 | 75.0 | 49.5 | 53.9 |
| June 29 | Flower | 30.3 | 2973 | 68.0 | 43.7 | 81.5 | 56.3 | 54.5 |
| July 7 | E. Pod | 33.7 | 3499 | 61.6 | 40.8 | 76.1 | 59.2 | 47.1 |
| July 14 | M. Pod | 37.2 | 3359 | 61.9 | 31.5 | 73.2 | 68.5 | 50.5 |
| July 21 | Seeds | 38.8 | 3027 | 57.3 | 23.1 | 65.8 | 76.9 | 48.9 |

1) water soluble material, 2) material made soluble by cellulase, 3) pepsin, and 4) residue. These studies are not completed but the fractionation ias been going on using early and late cut alfalfa and grass. Techniques have been developed to look at some of the components within each grouping.

Table 8: Effect of Buffer and Distilled Water on Per Cent Solubility of. Alfalfa and Bromegrass


- Distilled water pH 5.9
+ Buffer - Mon + di basic sodium phosphate pH 5.7.

Alfalfa cut either at an early or late stage contains a higher proportion of water soluble material than grasses. The buffer (Mono basic sodium jhosphate) at a pH of 5.7 results in comparable results to those of distilled water.

Two sources of cellulase entymes are available: an indnstrial and a purified type. Neither of these are refined to a degree that they will remove only ceilulose.

Sabje 9:
Effect of Industrial vs. Purified Cellulase

|  | Buffer |  | Industrial ${ }^{\circ}$ |  | $\text { Purified }{ }^{+}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time (hrs.) | 24 | 48 | 24 | 48 | 24 | 48 |
| Alfalfa (G6II) | 36.4 | 36.0 | 38.2 | 40.5 | 47.9 | 52.2 |

- conc. industrial 500 units or 125 mgms/tube.
+ conc. purified $100 \mathrm{mgms} /$ tube.

These two cellulase enzymes were evaluated and the data showed that the so-called purified cellulase resulted in higher solubility, of the components. Studies on the quantity of enzymes were also made. The amounts shown in Table 9 ngeared to be the maximum values obtainable.

Determination of six carbon sugars were made on the extracts after rea'ments with buffer and buffer plus cellulase have been completed using the anthrone technique.

Table 10: Effect of Time on Disappearance of Soluble Sugars

| Buffer | 10.8 | 27.9 | 27.8 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Buffer + Ce11. | 15.6 | 47.3 | 10.1 | 51.0 |

It was found that the per cent sugar decreased with increasing times of digestion with early cut alfalfa, but not so with early cut bromegrass. In addition, the cellulase was instrmental in releasing additional sugars. Thus the need was for a substance to stop the further breakdown of these sugars if the quantities were to be measured and identifications made. Toluane, an anticeptic was used.

Table 11:
Effect of Toluene on the Soluble. Carbohydrates

|  | Periods of Digestion (Hrs.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\vdots$ | 6 | 12 | 24 | 36 | 48 | 96 |
| Buffer + Toluene | $9.6+$ | 9.3 | 10.0 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 8.9 |
| Buffer + O Toluene | 9.8 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Cellulase + Toluene | 12.6 | 15.0 | 15.7 | 16.1 | 18.8 | 17.1 |
| " $\quad$ + Toluene 312.0 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.8 |  |

+ \% of dry weight (6 carbon sugars.)

It was found by using Toluene that these sugars could be prevented from breaking down and thus be measured by the anthrone technique. Use of Toluene with buffer or buffer plus cellulase media does not influence total digestion of the samples. However, where Toluene is used on Rumen liquor the digestibility is somewhat different. (Table 12)

Table 12: Effect of Toluene and Actidione on the Digestibility of Forages

| Co2 | Rumen İquor |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Toluene | Actidione | Co2 | Buffer <br> Toluene | Aotidione |  |
| 50.6 | 53.0 | 48.3 | 41.5 | 43.9 | 42.0 |
| 57.3 | 40.0 | 53.5 | 35.0 | 33.8 | 35.1 |

In addition to Toluene, actidione (an antibiotic) was used to fulfill the same purpose. However, no sugar analyses have been completed as yet, when actidione was used.

Rumen Liquor digestion values and those of the solu bility of components using buffer cellulase and pepsin were obtained in a number of trials involving early and late cut alfalfa and bromegrass.

| Forage Samples | R.I. + Pepsin | Buffer | Cellulese | Buffer Cellu <br> + Pepsin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alfalfa G611 | 72.7 | 43.2 | 54.5 | 70.5 |
| G614 | 58.4 | 26.1 | 37.6 | 47.4 |
| Brome G619 | 81.5 | 33.9 | 51.0 | 64.1 |
| G6112 | 59.5 | 25.8 | 28.9 | 37.9 |

Data from one of those trials are shown in Table 13. The technique of using buffer plus cellulase plus pepsin approximated the digestibinity of rumen liquor only in early cut alfalfa. In late cut alfalfa and early and late cut bromegrass the values were considerably lower than the rumen liquor digestion.

This suggested that the residue remaining after the removal of water soluable, digestible cellulose and protein material contained chemical components which are present to a greaterextent in early cut brome than in alfalfa and that the proportion of the components increase with age of the plant.

In order to determine the components of the residue five and ten per cent KOH and $5 \% \mathrm{~K} 2 \mathrm{CO}$ solutions were used to remove the non polyuronic hemicelluloses and polyuronic hemicelluloses respectively.

Table 14: Influence of Potassium Salts on Removel of Hemicolluloses

|  | Cellulase <br> Alone | Cellulase <br> $5 \% \mathrm{KOH}$ | Cellulase <br> 10\% KOH | 48 Hours <br> Gellulase <br> $5 \% \mathrm{~K}_{2} \mathrm{Co}_{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alfalfa G611 (early) | 56.3 | 74.3 | 74.0 | 63.6 |
| G614 (late) | 38.1 | 59.7 | 58.2 | 46.9 |
| Brome G619 (early) | 52.6 | 79.2 | 79.7 | 60.9 |
| G6112 (late) | 34.5 | 61.0 | 62.0 | 41.6 |

It would appear that the major component in the residue as indicated by the material removed by the KOH is of the non polyuronic type (glactans, pentasans, etc.) The proportion of polyuronic cellulases appears to be somewhat smaller. The use of $10 \% \mathrm{KOH}$ solutions did not remove any more material than the $5 \%$. It is also interesting to note that the use of cellulase followed by 8 hours of $5 \% \mathrm{KOH}$ resulted in soluability values that are very similar to the total digestion as obtained from rumen liquor. (Refer to the previous table.)

Using the standard samples this technique was compared to the Rumen Iiquor technique. Data are as yet not completely processed; however, indications are that this may be a technique that could be used to replace the rumen liquor. Additional work is required to perfect the method.

| Table 15: | Com | $f \mathrm{P}$ | uor |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample |  | Rumen liguor |  |  | Cellulase +58 KOH |  |  | Ave. |
|  | 85 | 87 | 89 | Ave. | 85 | 8. | 89 |  |
| Mac. Alfalfa | 57.9 | 60.7 | 60.6 | 59.8 | 56.4 | 60.0 | 61.8 | 59.4 |
| Mac Brome | 58.4 | 60.9 | 59.6 | 59.6 | 58.4 | 58.6 | 59.2 | 58.7 |
| Purdue Alfalfa | 55.2 | 58.2 | 56.9 | 56.8 | 62.4 | 60.1 | 57.6 | 60.1 |
| O.A.C. alfalfa | 75.5 | 77.4 | 76.5 | 76.5 | 71.3 | 71.0 | 70.0 | 70.8 |

I. Effect of Seeding Rates on Westerwolth Ryegrass - 1962 (Test 228)

Most of the European data pertaining to the use of Westerwolth ryegrass has indicated the use of high seeding rates from 25 to 45 pounds per acre. In previous work at Guelph with Westerwolth ryegrass 15 pounds per acre has been the seeding rate used. The test was conducted to determine if any advantage might be achieved from the use of higher seeding rates.

This test was seeded by hand in a broadcast planting on range $D-16$ on April 30, 1962. Plot size was 5 ft . $\mathrm{x} 16 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{Et}$. and the design used was a splitplot with the main plots including a hay management and a pasturemanagement. Under the hay management the material was clipped after the grass showed considerable heading over the plot. The pasture plots were harvasted when 10 to 12 inches of growth was present or prior to heading of the grass. Seeding rates of 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30 pounds per acre made up the sub-plots. The tetraploid C.B. Westerwolth variety was used in the test.

Prior to seeding 75 pounds of nitrogen was applied to the test site and during the life of the trial 50 pounds of nitrogen was applied to the whole test after the hay cuts were made. Although moisture was definitely limited on the trial it was not possible to irrigate the test. Therefore, the results should be a good indication of the potential of Westerwolth ryegrass in a dry season when no supplementary water is applied.

The yields achieved in 1962 from Westerwolth ryegrass are close to the minimum acceptable level for an annual grass crop. In comparison to alfalfa or an alfalfa-grass mixture the yield is relatively low. The hay management outyielded the pasture management by almost one ton of dry matter. No differential response to seeding rates occurred under the two management systems.

Yields were the same for all seeding rates used in the experiment except in the first cut and season total. The lowest seed rate ( 10 pounds per acre) was lower yielding than the other rates used. There was no advantage seeding more than 15 pounds per acre. The ten pound seeding rate was satisfactory for later cuts under the hay management.

Stand counts made May 29 definitely show a lower number of plants per square foot for the 10 and 15 pound rate. An explanation of the greater yield obtained from the 15 pound rate over the 10 pound rate even though stand counts indicate the same number of plants per square foot cannot be offered.

EFFECT OF SEEDING RATES ON YIELD OF UESTERTOLTH RYEGRASS (TETRAPLOID C.B.) - 1962 (TEST 228)

Yield in lbs./acre of dry matter

| Seeding Rates | Cut 1 | Cut 2 | Cut 3 | Cut 4 | Cut 5 | Cut 6 | Seasonal <br> Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

PASTURE MANAGEMENT
Jun. 20 Ju1. 12 Aug. 8 Sept. 5 Oct. 2 Nov. 5

| 10 lbs/acre | 692 | 854 | 1360 | 452 | 314 | 577 | 4250 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 | 726 | 920 | 1483 | 560 | 406 | 571 | 4666 |
| 20 | 632 | 866 | 1389 | 555 | 467 | 588 | 4498 |
| 25 | 962 | 950 | 1382 | 529 | 431 | 584 | 4837 |
| 30 | 996 | 898 | 1391 | 507 | 462 | 524 | 4828 |
| Mean | 802 | 898 | 1401 | 521 | 415 | 579 | 4616 |

HAY MANAGEMENT
Ju1. 12 Aug. 22 Nov. 5

| $10 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{acre}$ | 2067 | 2459 | 1551 |  |  |  | 6076 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 2084 | 2491 | 1639 |  |  |  | 6215 |
| 20 | 2200 | 2518 | 1612 |  |  |  | 6330 |
| 25 | 2113 | 2549 | 1627 |  |  |  | 6290 |
| 30 | 2276 | 2480 | 1620 |  |  |  | 6377 |
| Mean | 2148 | 2500 | 1610 |  |  |  | 6256 |
| Pasture + Hay Mean | 1475 | 1699 | 1506 |  |  |  | 5437 |
| Management . 05 | 443 | 166 | N.S. | ---- | ---- | ---- | 867 |
| . 01 | 813 | 304 | N.S. |  |  | ---- | 1591 |
| Rates . 05 | 141 | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | 242 |
| . 01 | 191 | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | 328 |
| Rates x Man. . 05 | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | ---- | -..- | ---- | N.S. |
| . 01 | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | ---- | ---- | ---- | N.S. |
| C.v. (\%) | 9.2 | 9.7 | 4.5 | 14.3 | 19.5 | 8.9 | 4.3 |

EFFECT OF SEEDING RATES ON STAND OF WESTERWOLTH RYEGRASS - 1962 (TEST 228)
Rates $\quad$ Stand count - plants/sg.ft. - May 29

| 10 | 9.2 |
| :---: | ---: |
| 15 | 9.2 |
| 20 | 12.2 |
| 25 | 16.2 |
| 30 | 21.3 |
| L.S.D. @. .05 |  |
| @.01 | 2.1 |
| C.V. (\%) | 2.9 |
|  |  |

II. Effect of Management and Cutting Height on Yield of Westerwolth and Italian Ryegrass - 1962 (Test 229)

This test was conducted to determine the effect, if any, of cutting height under the two management systems, pasture and hay, on Westerwolth and Italian ryegrass. Information obtained from the test would be useful in specifying suitable managements for maximum recovery growth.

The methods and fertilization used in test 228 were repeated in test 229. The cutting heights used were $1^{\prime \prime}, 2^{\prime \prime}$ and $4^{\prime \prime}$ above ground level. Tetraploid CB Westerwolth and common Italian ryegrass (probably Washington common) were the varieties used in the test. With the hay management each cut was made when most of the material was headed out. With the pasture management each cut was made prior to heading. At the last cut, November 6 , all plots were cut at the one inch height.

The anly important interaction observed in the test was between species and management in the first cut and total season yield. In the first cut, the Westerwolth variety yielded less relative to the Italian variety with the hay management than with the pasture management. In the season yield, Westerwolth yielded more than Italian under pasture management while the relative yields of the varieties were reversed under the hay management. This indicates that Westerwolth is slightly superior to Italian ryegrass as a pasture species.

In regard to cutting height the one inch height was superior to the other heights in cut 1 while in the final cut the four-inch height was superior. Both of these conditions would be expected on the basis of the methods used. In the other cuts the one inch cutting height appeared slightly higher-yielding than the other cutting heights. Over the season the one inch cutting height yielded the most. There was some indication that the one inch height was causing some harm to the stand or recovery growth after the fourth cut under pasture managenent.

The yields of these varieties were again approximately one ton greater under hay management than under pasture management.

The plant height data indicate that growth was slightly faster at the one inch cutting height than at the other heights under the pasture management. Under the hay management growth seemed to progress at about the same rate for all cutting heights.

Additional observations were made on rate of recovery growth, location and type of recovery growth but they have not been sumarized at this time.

Dry matter yields in pounds per acre

| Height of Cut | Variety | Cut 1 | Cut 2 | Cut 3 | Cut 4 | Cut 5 | Cut 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Seasonal } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PASTURE MANAGEMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Jun. 20 | Jul. 12 | Aug. 8 | Sept. 5 | Oct. 2 | Nov. 6 |  |
| 1" | Westerwolth | 1177 | 1425 | 1649 | 652 | 455 | 326 | 5684 |
|  | Italian | 1379 | 1263 | 1387 | 548 | 482 | 201 | 5260 |
| 2" | Westerwolth | 883 | 1064 | 1497 | 558 | 470 | 567 | 5039 |
|  | Italian | 887 | 1090 | 1187 | 598 | 462 | 663 | 4888 |
| 4" | Westerwolth | 555 | 1048 | 1389 | 598 | 635 | 993 | 5218 |
|  | Italian | 557 | 1017 | 1121 | 494 | 710 | 1066 | 4963 |
|  | Means 1" | 1278 | 1344 | 1518 | 600 | 468 | 263 | 5472 |
|  | 2" | 885 | 1077 | 1342 | 578 | 466 | 615 | 4964 |
|  | 4" | 555 | 1032 | 1255 | 545 | 672 | 1029 | 5091 |
|  | Westerwolth | 872 | 1179 | 1512 | 603 | 520 | 629 | 5314 |
|  | Italian | 941 | 1123 | 1232 | 547 | 551 | 643 | 5037 |
|  | Pasture Mean | 906 | 1151 | 1372 | 575 | 536 | 636 | 5176 |


effect of management and cutting hiefgis on plant height of westerwolth and ITALIAN RYEGRASS - 1962 (TEST 229)

Plant Height (in inches)

| Cutting Heights | July 12 | July 20 | July 26 | Aug. 8 | Aug. 15 | Aug. 22 | Aug. 29 | Sept. 4 | Oct. 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pasture management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 " Westerwolth | 17.0 | 5.1 | 7.4 | 20.5 | 6.2 | 8.4 | 11.3 | 13.7 | 9.5 |
| Italian | 15.0 | 3.3 | 4.6 | 15.5 | 5.1 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 10.1 | 8.0 |
| 2" Westerwolth | 20.5 | 7.1 | 8.6 | 22.4 | 7.2 | 10.0 | 13.2 | 14.6 | 11.6 |
| Italian | 17.7 | 4.6 | 5.6 | 16.1 | 6.0 | 7.7 | 9.4 | 11.3 | 9.4 |
| $4^{\prime \prime}$ Westerwolth | 21.0 | 8.1 | 10.2 | 23.6 | 9.4 | 13.4 | 15.8 | 18.5 | 14.3 |
| Italian | 17.5 | 6.1 | 6.7 | 17.1 | 8.2 | 10.3 | 12.5 | 15.1 | 12.2 |
| Means 1" | 16.0 | 4.2 | 6.0 | 18.0 | 5.7 | 7.5 | 9.0 | 11.9 | 8.8 |
| 2" | 19.1 | 5.9 | 7.1 | 19.2 | 6.6 | 8.8 | 11.3 | 12.9 | 10.5 |
| Westerwolth | 19.5 | 6.8 | 8.7 | 22.1 | 7.6 | 10.6 | 13.5 | 15.6 | 11.8 |
| Italian | 16.7 | 4.7 | 5.6 | 16.2 | 6.4 | 8.2 | 9.6 | 12.2 | 9.9 |
| Pasture Mean | 18.1 | 5.7 | 7.2 | 19.2 | 7.0 | 9.4 | 11.5 | 13.9 | 10.9 |
|  |  | hay management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 " Westerwolth | 29.2 | 5.8 | 8.2 | 19.7 | 27.0 | 30.1 | 5.1 | 6.7 | 12.1 |
| Italian | 29.7 | 4.1 | 5.9 | 14.9 | 20.3 | 24.5 | 4.6 | 5.7 | 8.7 |
| 2" Westerwolth | 29.0 | 7.5 | 9.1 | 22.2 | 26.7 | 30.9 | 6.4 | 7.2 | 13.0 |
| Italian | 31.5 | 6.3 | 6.4 | 15.8 | 20.1 | 26.0 | 5.6 | 6.5 | 10.9 |
| 4" Nesterwolth | 29.5 | 8.5 | 11.1 | 22.5 | 27.8 | 31.9 | 8.0 | 8.7 | 15.0 |
| Italian | 29.2 | 6.7 | 7.7 | 18.7 | 22.2 | 28.0 | 7.4 | 8.2 | 13.1 |
| Means 1" | 29.5 | 5.0 | 7.1 | 17.3 | 23.7 | 27.3 | 4.8 | 6.2 | 10.4 |
| 2 " | 30.2 | 6.9 | 7.8 | 19.0 | 23.4 | 28.5 | 6.0 | 6.9 | 12.0 |
| 4" | 29.4 | 7.6 | 9.4 | 20.6 | 25.0 | 30.0 | 6.9 | 8.5 | 14.1 |
| Nesterwolth | 29.2 | 7.3 | 14.2 | 21.5 | 24.0 | 31.0 | 6.5 | 7.6 | 13.4 |
| Italian | 30.2 | 5.8 | 10.0 | 16.5 | 27.2 | 26.2 | 5.9 | 6.8 | 10.9 |
| Hay Mean | 29.7 | 6.5 | 8.1 | 20.6 | 20.9 | 28.6 | 6.2 | 7.2 | 12.2 |
| Mean Pasture + Hay | 24.0 | 6.1 | 7.6 | 19.1 | 15.5 | 19.0 | 8.8 | 10.5 | 11.5 |

III. Yield of Seed of Three Annual Grasses - 1962 (Test 230)

This small test which included Westerwolth (Tetraploid C.B.) and Italian (common) ryegrass and rescuegrass (Georgia Selection) was used to determine the potential seed yield of the three grasses.

The test was seeded by hand in broadcast plantings on range D-16 on April 30, 1962. Four replicates were seeded of a randomized complete block design. Plot size was $5^{\prime} \times 16 \frac{1}{2}$ ' of which $3^{\prime \prime} \times 12$ was harvested for seed yield. No supplemental water was applied and the test suffered some from drought.

The rescuegrass stand was very poor and was considered to be only about $\frac{1}{4}$ of a good stand. The stand of Westerwolth was about half that of Italian ryegrass; however, it appeared to be a satisfactory stand. The seed yield data presented can only be considered as a rough index of potential importance. The surprising feature is the high yield of rescuegrass seed which was obtained from such a poor stand. In the case of the ryegrass varieties, the yields would have to be two to three times as large before seed production would be profitable.

YIELD OF SEED OF THREE ANNUAL GRASSES - 1962 (TEST 230)

Yield (lbs./acre)
Westerwolth
Italian ryegrass
Rescuegrass
L.S.D. © . 05
@ . 01
C.v. (\%)

Stand (May 30)
10.5
22.5
5.5
IV. Growth Curve Study on Italian Ryegrass - 1962 (Test 231)

This test was set up to determine the yield response curve of Italian and Weaterwolth ryegrass. However, the Westerwolth ryegrass did not establish well due to poor seeding. It is essential when seeding Westerwolth ryegrass to use a seeddrill with an agitator because of the small awns on the Westerwolth. Some information was obtained from the Westerwolth ryegrass but is not as good as that for the Italian ryegrass. The results for the two types of ryegrass are reported separately. Results for the Italian ryegrass are a mean of six replicates while only three replicates are meaned for the Westerwolth ryegrass.

A split plot design was used for the Italian ryegrass wherein the aftermath was harvested as pasture in one case while in the other was harvested as hay. In the case of Westerwolth ryegrass the aftermath was harvested at a pasture stage of growth. The pasture management consisted of harvesting just prior to heading while the hay management was harvested after most of the plants were headed.

The test was planted April 30, and the first harvest was made June 13, or six weeks after seeding. The remaining seven initial harvests were made at weekly intervals. The aftermath harvests were made according to their stage of growth and, in most cases, this meant weekly harvests. A final harvest was made on all plots on November 5.

Growth was affected by poor moisture conditions. This is indicated by the percent dry matter data presented for the initial harvest. No supplemental irrigation was applied to the test. Prior to planting 75 pounds of nitrogen per acre was applied to the test area ( $\mathrm{D}-16$ ) and an additional 50 pounds of nitrogen per acre was applied on all plots prior to and including the fourth initial cut. Thereafter each plot cut initially was supplied with nitrogen at the above rate.

Both species were headed at the time of the fourth cut and this would appear to be the best time to cut for quality material. However, maximum yield was not obtained until the sixth cut. The Westerwolth appeared of better quality at this later cut than the Italian ryegrass. This material will be analyzed for percent digestibility in the in vitro laboratory.

Additional information was obtained on location and type of recovery growth, rate of recovery growth, development of the two species, etc. These data have not been surmarized at this time and are not available for inclusion in the report.

## GROWTH CURVE STUDY ON ITALIAN RYEGRASS - 1962 (TEST 231)

Yield in pounds of dry matter per acre


AFTERMATH HAY MANAGEMENT


Heights of grass in inches

Growth
Stages Jun. 15 Jun. 25 Jun. 29 Jul. 4 Jul. 11 Jul. 18 Jul. 25 Aug. 1 Aug. 8 Aug. 15 Aug. 22 Aug. 29 Sept. 4 Sep. 19

## pasture

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 9.8 | $12.5 *$ | 13.2 | 17.2 | 22.1 | 7.1 | 8.0 | 12.3 | 16.9 | 7.1 | 8.3 | 8.8 | 11.1 | 7.3 |
| 2 | 10.6 | $8.4 *$ | 9.1 | 11.2 | 14.1 | 18.1 | 6.2 | 9.3 | 13.9 | 6.7 | 8.4 | 9.9 | 12.4 | 7.1 |
| 3 | 10.9 | 19.3 | 4.1 | 7.7 | 8.3 | 10.1 | 13.4 | 7.2 | 11.0 | 14.4 | 6.5 | 7.6 | 8.5 | 12.9 |
| 4 | 10.7 | 18.9 | 22.6 | 28.6 | 5.5 | 7.4 | 8.3 | 12.1 | 7.2 | 9.7 | 12.6 | 5.2 | 5.9 | 11.6 |
| 5 | 10.2 | 19.0 | 22.9 | 28.4 | 30.7 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 11.6 | 16.8 | 7.1 | 8.1 | 9.7 | 12.0 | 16.4 |
| 6 | 10.6 | 19.6 | 23.6 | 29.4 | 31.1 | 31.1 | 7.5 | 10.1 | 13.6 | 17.6 | 6.7 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 10.9 |
| 7 | 10.1 | 19.0 | 23.2 | 29.2 | 31.7 | 32.1 | 32.2 | 8.2 | 11.0 | 13.7 | 18.2 | 5.8 | 6.6 | 9.3 |
| 8 | 10.3 | 18.8 | 23.0 | 29.2 | 30.3 | 30.2 | 30.3 | 31.0 | 8.7 | 11.7 | 14.2 | 6.0 | 6.8 | 9.0 |
| Mean | 10.4 | 16.9 | 17.7 | 22.6 | 21.7 | 18.0 | 14.3 | 12.7 | 12.4 | 11.0 | 10.4 | 7.5 | 8.9 | 10.5 |

HAY

| 1 | 9.6 | 12.3* | 13.9 | 17.0 | 22.3 | 24.9 | 7.1 | 9.6 | 13.3 | 18.3 | 23.3 | 5.6 | 6.1 | 8.9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 11.0 | 8.5* | 9.5 | 11.9 | 14.1 | 20.8 | 23.5 | 7.5 | 10.8 | 13.4 | 17.5 | 22.4 | 5.1 | 8.5 |
| 3 | 10.7 | 19.4 | 4.5 | 7.8 | 8.3 | 9.2 | 12.9 | 17.9 | 8.6 | 9.7 | 12.2 | 17.6 | 18.8 | 8.9 |
| 4 | 10.9 | 19.1 | 24.6 | 29.2 | 5.7 | 7.9 | 8.7 | 13.2 | 19.6 | 6.6 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 11.5 | 14.5 |
| 5 | 11.1 | 18.6 | 23.4 | 29.1 | 30.3 | 7.7 | 11.8 | 11.5 | 16.6 | 21.7 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 10.1 |
| 6 | 10.9 | 19.4 | 24.1 | 28.8 | 30.5 | 30.3 | 6.9 | 9.7 | 13.9 | 18.3 | 21.7 | 5.4 | 6.3 | 8.5 |
| 7 | 10.3 | 19.4 | 23.0 | 28.2 | 29.7 | 30.2 | 30.8 | 8.4 | 10.6 | 13.6 | 17.7 | 21.0 | 5.4 | 10.3 |
| 8 | 10.9 | 19.6 | 22.9 | 28.8 | 31.2 | 26.9 | 31.7 | 31.2 | 9.4 | 12.5 | 15.8 | 19.2 | 22.0 | 9.0 |
| Mean | 10.7 | 17.0 | 18.2 | 22.6 | 21.5 | 19.7 | 16.7 | 13.6 | 12.8 | 14.3 | 15.4 | 13.4 | 10.3 | 9.8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hay + } \\ & \text { Pasture } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean | 10.5 | 17.0 | 18.0 | 22.6 | 21.6 | 18.9 | 15.5 | 13.2 | 12.6 | 12.6 | 12.9 | 10.4 | 9.6 | 10.2 |

[^2]Yields in pounds of dry matter per acre


* Anthesis occurred

GROWIH CURVE STUDY ON WESTERWOLTH RYEGRASS - 1962 (TEST 231)
Height of grass in inches

| Growth Stages | Jun. 25 | Jun. 29 | Jul. 4 | Jul. 11 | Jul. 18 | Jul. 25 | Aug. 1 | Aug. 8 | Aug. 15 | L.ug. 22 | Aug. 29 | Sept. 4 | Se. 319 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 16.1 | 15.0 | 19.7 | 26.0 | 9.2 | 12.1 | 19.1 | 25.3 | 7.8 | 10.7 | 14.1 | 6.1 | 1).7 |
| 2 | 11.1 | 11.7 | 14.3 | 18.3 | 25.0 | 7.8 | 13.9 | 22.1 | 6.8 | 10.2 | 13.7 | 16.1 | 7.1 |
| 3 |  | 4.0 | 10.0 | 11.7 | 17.8 | 23.7 | 10.0 | 13.9 | $19: 3$ | 6.8 | 9.4 | 10.6 | 17.5 |
| 4 |  |  |  | 7.7 | 12.4 | 16.0 | 23.8 | 10.9 | 13.1 | 17.6 | 6.6 | 9.3 | 12.0 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  | 8.2 | 11.4 | 17.6 | 25.7 | 8.3 | 11.5 | 13.7 | 6.3 | 11.5 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 8.5 | 14.1 | 24.2 | 7.5 | 10.2 | 13.0 | 16.7 | 8.9 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.8 | 14.8 | 21.0 | 7.2 | 9.9 | 11.0 | 20.0 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.8 | 14.9 | 20.3 | 6.0 | 7.9 | 11.5 |
| Mean | 13.6 | 10.2 | 14.7 | 15.9 | 14.5 | 13.3 | 15.5 | 18.3 | 12.3 | 11.8 | 10.8 | 10.5 | 12.4 |

Growth StageItallan Ryegrass
Westerwolth Ryegrass115.414.1212.612.3

$$
12.0
$$

$$
4
$$

$$
19.5
$$

$$
14.5
$$

5
30.225.8

6

36.5

29.5
7*
26.2
22.9
8*
26.0
21.4

* Lower moisture due partially to recovery growth and rainfall which occurred at that time.
alternate row seeding of dupuits alfalfa and westerwolit ryegrass


## alternat row

| Treatment | \% D.M. at Harvest |  |  | Yield of Mixture lbs. D.M./acre |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cut 1 | Cut 2 | Average | Cut 1 | Cut 2 | Total |
| 0 Nitrogen | 29.6 | 24.2 | 26.8 | 4007 | 2550 | 6557 |
| 25 N* | 26.9 | 25.8 | 26.4 | 3245 | 2885 | 6130 |
| $50 \mathrm{~N}^{+}$ | 25.4 | 24.4 | 24.8 | 3.46 | 2997 | 6143 |
| Harvesting date | July 10 | Aug. 24 |  | July 10 | Aug. 24 |  |
| * 2 applications - total 50 lbs. N |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + 2 applications | total 100 | bs. N |  |  |  |  |


| YIELD OF ALFALFA COMPONENT |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Treatment | $\underline{\text { 1st Cut }}$ | $\underline{2 n d}$ Cut | Total |  |
| 0 | 1670 | 1433 | 3103 |  |
| 25 | 1513 | 1389 | 2902 |  |
| 50 | 1355 | 1672 | 3027 |  |

Note: 3re cut taken on October 12 - Observation cut only. Yield average for each treatment slightly over 1300 lbs.

Planted: April 27
Fertility: High
Seeding Rate: Alfalfa-8 lbs./acre; Westerwolth - 15 lbs./acre

OAT LODGING AND FORAGE ESTABLTSHMENT
1961 - Test 153 1962-Test 161

## Objectives

To study the effect of time and degree of lodging of an oat companion crop upon the establishment and development of Vernal alfalfa and lincoln bromegrass.

Design Split-plot with 6 replications
Main plots - companion crop treatments
Sub plots - forage species
Seeded plot size - 8 ft. x 13 ft .
Lodged plot size - $5 \mathrm{ft} . \times 10 \mathrm{ft}$.

## Procedure

1. Garry oats seeded at $2 \frac{1}{2}$ bushels per acre under high fertility
2. Underseeded with pure stands of Vernal - 10 lbs . and Iincoln - 12 lbs .
3. Oats lodged after allowing to grow through fence wire stretched over a frame ( 'lxl $^{1}$ ), the latter held 10 inches off the soil.
4. Treatments, a combination of lodging at heading and at the dough stage to $60^{\circ}$ and $90^{\circ}$.

Data collected on:

1. Oat density - number of stems per foot of row.
2. Length of straw and yield of straw.
3. Oat yield and quality.
4. Iight intensity readings at seedling level when lodged and at oat harvest.
5. Stand counts before lodging, oat harvest, late fall.
6. Height, weight, no tillers, at lodging time, oat harvest, and late fall (10 seedling sample per plot).
7. First crop hay or plant yield at hay stage.

## Observations

Test 153 in 1961 was seriously damaged by birds just as the oats were emerging and consequently, the data in the 1961 report is not too reliable. The test was carried through to screen the techniques suggested in the outline.
2. Test 161 in 1962, the oats did not germinate as well as expected and the crop was rather thin. The land, however, was very fertile, as the straw yields indicate and a heavy growthy oat crop was obtained. On July 12 , between the first and second lodging date, a severe storm lodged all the oats. The oats were so twistod that those growing through the wire frames in the unlodged plots could not be put upright by raising the frame. In the severe lodging treatment only on July 27, the oats were put flatter.
3. No analysis of data completed in 1962.

```
TEST 161 - OAT LODGING (1962)
```

Seeded: April 30, 1962 Location E-16

Oats Harvested: Aug. 17, 1962

| Lodging Treatment | Oat Straw $\frac{\text { Oat Yield and Quality }}{}$ |  |  |  | Establishment |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Per cent Hull | Plants/Square Foot |  |  | \% Iight |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yield } \\ & \text { Lbs./A } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yield } \\ & \text { Lbs./A } \end{aligned}$ | Weight Lbs/Bus. | Seed Wgt Gns. |  | Vernai | IVincoln | Vernal | Iincoln | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Interception } \\ & \text { Aug } 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| Early, moderate | 2260 | 5149 | 31.5 | 26.5 | 31.0 | 20.9 | 11.0 | 23.6 | 12.9 | 76 |
| Early, severe | 2036 | 5149 | 31.5 | 25.2 | 31.0 | 21.9 | 11.3 | 19.9 | 10.7 | 78 |
| * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Late, moderate | 1880 | 5112 | 30.0 | 25.0 | 31.4 | 19.2 | 9.2 | 19.4 | 10.5 | 82 |
| Late, severe | 2036 | 5280 | 31.2 | 24.4 | 32.6 | 23.9 | 11.9 | 17.1 | 10.4 | 81 |
| No lodging | 1924 | 4919 | 30.7 | 22.8 | 32.0 | 18.0 | 10.1 | 15.3 | 13.7 | 72 |
| No Companion |  |  |  |  |  | 24.3 | 14.1 | 25.0 | 17.1 |  |

* Early - 7/5/62: Late - 7/27/62 - Lodged

TEST 161 - OAT LODGING (1962)

Lodging Treatment
Early, Early, Iate, Iate No No Moderate Severe Moderate Severe Lodging: Companion
$\frac{\text { July } 10,1962}{\text { Inncoln Brome }}$
Height
Stools
Dry Weight
Vernal Alfalfa
Height
Stools
Dry Weight
JuIy 27, 1962
Incoln Brome

| Height |  | 37.4 | 35.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Stools | 1.2 | 1.1 |  |
| Dry Weight | 1.3 | 1.0 |  |
| Vernal Alfalfa |  |  |  |
| Height |  | 30.7 | 37.9 |
| Stools | 1.7 | 1.4 |  |
| Dry Weight | 1.4 | 1.9 |  |

August 17, 1962
Gincoln Brome
Height
Stools
Dry Weight
Vernal Alfalfa
Height
Stools
Dry Weight
October 18, 1962

| Incoln Erome |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Height | 18.8 |
| Stools | 10.3 |
| Dry Weight | 8.8 |
| Vernal Alfalfa |  |
| Height | 17.1 |
| Stools | 3.2 |
| Dry Weight | 5.5 |

31.8
2.9
1.8
29.5
1.9
2.0

18.8
10.3
8.8
17.1
3.2
5.5
34.6
2.9
1.9
36.4
2.9
1.9
35.1
2.9
2.2
35.7
2.5
1.5
32.8
2.5
34.1
1.8
1.7

| 38.0 | 57.0 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 1.1 | 4.5 |
| 1.3 | 27.1 |
| 41.4 | 52.0 |
| 1.7 | 1.9 |
| 2.2 | 21.7 |


| 32.6 | 50.6 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 1.1 | 2.0 |
| 2.0 | 14.8 |

Seeded:
May 4, 1962
Main Stems Per
Foot of Row

IEST 163 - BARIEY VARIETY AND ESTABLISHMENT - 1962 Underseeded with Vernal and Iincoln

10 Plant Samples
VARTETY
York Herta Parkland Mix. Grain Garry No Companion
19.1
21.4
20.9
18.7
19.2

汧stablishment Spring
$\frac{\text { Tincoln }}{\text { Vernal }}$
Fall

Iincoln
Vernal
15
24
11
11
14
27
11
27
22
18
27
40

June 20, 1962
Tincoln Brome
Height

Stools
Vernal Alfalfa
Height
Stools
July 17, 1962

| Lincoln Brome |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Height | 23.7 | 20.7 | 22.3 | 21.8 | 21.2 | 54.3 |
| Stools | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 3.7 |
| Vernal Alfalfa |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Height | 8.5 | 9.3 | 8.4 | 9.9 | 1.4 .3 | 33.4 |
| Stools | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.6 |

August 15, 1962
Iincoln Brome
Height
Stools
21.5
18.3
18.7
24.8
2.1
27.0
57.9

Vernal Alfalfa
Height
11.1
9.7
11.3
1.7
10.8
13.6
33.9

Stools
1.4
1.5
1.4
1.7
2.3

* Spring -plants per square foot; Fall - rated 1-10; I-no plants; 5 - medium; 10 - excellent.

In previous studies, barley was found to severely reduce the establishment of bromegrass and also severely reduce the vigor of alfalfa. This small replicated test was seeded to observe any differences among three barley varieties and mixed grain.

1. The test established well but lodged severely in mid July.
2. Some data were collooted to learn if differences still occurred.
3. The lodging factor makes the test data unreliable.

TEST 165 RATE AND METHOD OF SEEDING RAPE - 1962

In 1962, as in other years, row seedings of rape were decidely superior in yield to the broadcast method at all rates of seeding used.

The Yield advantage of row seedings well compensates for the one cultivation which has been necessary to keep the crop clean.

Broadcast plantings are usually weedy, particularly at the lighter seeding rates.

Seeded
July 12

TEST - RATE AND METHOD OF SEEDING RAPE (1962)

Harvested November 5

| Method | Per cent | Green | Dry Matter | Height | Diameter | 25 Plant | Per |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| and | Dry | Yield | Yield | in | of Stems | Dry Wgt. | Cent |
| Rate | Matter | Tons/Acre | Tons/Acre | Cms. | in Cms. | in Gas. | Leaf |

Rows

| $\frac{1}{2} \#$ | 13.9 | 38.2 | 5.30 | 78 | 1.6 | 521 | 43.0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 \#$ | 12.8 | 42.3 | 5.19 | 77 | 1.5 | 502 | 45.5 |
| $1 \frac{1}{2} \#$ | 12.6 | 37.2 | 4.67 | 79 | 1.5 | 488 | 43.9 |
| $2 \#$ | 11.4 | 41.1 | 4.63 | 81 | 1.4 | 467 | 43.3 |
| Ave. | 12.7 | 39.7 | 4.95 | 79 | 1.5 | 495 | 43.9 |

roadcast

| $2 \#$ | 11.4 | 25.0 | 2.68 | 81 | 1.6 | 584 | 43.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $4 \#$ | 11.5 | 25.2 | 2.92 | 82 | 1.4 | 452 | $43:-$ |
| $6 \#$ | 11.2 | 26.1 | 2.89 | 78 | 1.2 | 351 | 44.2 |
| Ave. | 11.4 | 25.4 | 2.83 | 80 | 1.4 | 4.62 | 43.5 |

## RATE OF SEEDING RAPE (AVERAGE OF 1959, 1961, and 1962 CROPS)

| Method and Rate | Per Cent Dry Matter | Green Yield Tons/Acre | Dry Matter Yield Tons/Acre | Weight in Cms. | Diameter of stems in Cms. | 25 Plant Dry Wgt. in gms. | Per Cent Leaf |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\frac{1}{2} \#$ | 11.5 | 27.7 | 3.32 | 90 | 1.6 | 659 | 36.7 |
| I \# | 11.2 | 29.4 | 3.32 | 88 | 1.5 | 610 | 38.5 |
| 11 $\#$ | 11.2 | 26.9 | 3.07 | 91 | 1.5 | 549 | 36.5 |
| 2 \# | 10.9 | 28.5 | 3.13 | 91 | 1.4 | 472 | 35.6 |

Broadcast

| $2 \#$ | 11.7 | 18.1 | 1.95 | 92 | 1.4 | 511 | 34.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $4 \#$ | 11.4 | 18.2 | 2.10 | 89 | 1.3 | 371 | 33.9 |
| $6 \#$ | 11.8 | 18.1 | 2.11 | 86 | 1.1 | 294 | 34.1 |

* 1961 and 1962 Data only.


## Forage Crop Publications and Papers Presented

from May, 1962 to April 30, 1963

Crop Science Department, O.A.C.
(Publications and papers presented prior to May 1962 are listed in the 1961 Progress Report.)

Department of Crop Science, High dry matter silage or haylage. Dept. of . Crop Sci. mimeo 120/52.1 Y62, 4 pp. June, 1962.

Department of Crop Science. 1962 Crop Notes for extension, promotion and sales programs. Dept. of Crop Sci. mimeo, 30 pp . Sept. 1962. (With Kemptville Agricultural School and Western Ontario Agricultural School.)

Jones, G.E. Relative merits of growing cereal crops or forages for millk and/or beef production in the East Central Region. Can. Soc. Agron. Proc. 1962, pp. 43-46, 1962.

Jones, G.E. Use of herbicides in the establishment of forage seedlings. Forage Notes 8: No. 3, 16-19, Fall, 1962.

Ontario Forage Crops Committee. 1962 progress report on farm plantings of forage crops, Department of Crop Sci. mimeo, 15 pp. Oct. 1962. (Dept. of Crop Sci., with K.A.S., W.O.A.S., and Soils and Crops Branch of the O.D.A.)

Tossell, W.E. Ontario's field crop research program. Proc. Ont. Soil and Crop Improvement Assoc. 1963 convention, pp. 81-85, Jan. 1963.

Tossell, W.E. What the forage seed consumption area of Canada looks for in seed. Can. Seed Growers' Assoc. Proc. pp. 19-24, June 1962.

Young, W.S. Field crop recommendations for 1963. Proc. Ont. Soils and Crop Improvement Assoc. 1963 convention, pp. 76-81, Jan. 1963.


[^0]:    * 24 years ( 3 years at each of 8 locations).

[^1]:    + Consumption in pounds per day per cow.
    - Intake in grams per metobolic weight (sheep).

[^2]:    * Measured June 27

