

# **Shade tolerance of tropical forage legumes for use in agroforestry systems**

**Thesis submitted by  
Heath James Addison  
B.Agr.Sc(Hons), University of Tasmania (1998)  
June 2003**

**For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
in Tropical Plant Sciences  
School of Tropical Biology  
James Cook University**

## STATEMENT OF ASCESS

I, the undersigned, the author of this thesis, understand that James Cook University will make it available for use within the University Library and by microfilm or other means, allow access to users in other approved libraries

All users consulting this thesis will have to sign the following statement:

In consulting this thesis, I agree not to copy or closely paraphrase it in whole or in part without the written consent of the author; and to make proper public written acknowledgement for any assistance which I have obtained from it.

Beyond this, I do not wish to place any restriction on access to this thesis.

---

Signature

---

Date

## **Abstract**

The benefits of raising livestock in conjunction with tree plantations include the better use of land resources, an increased and diversified income, soil stabilisation and the potential for higher plantation yields through better weed control, nutrient cycling and nitrogen accretion. However, the significant acceptance of tree-pasture (silvopastoral) systems has been impeded by the belief that productive pasture cannot be maintained under tree canopies.

The aims of this project were to identify forage legume species suitable for use in silvopastoral systems in order to improve pasture quality under differing rainfall regimes in the tropics. A total of 35 species and cultivars of tropical pasture legumes were tested for shade tolerance beneath four levels of shade under shadehouse conditions, with a range of agronomic and ecophysiological parameters measured, including biomass production, root:shoot ratio, root nodulation, foliar nutrient content, time to flowering, seed production and light response curves.

Production of both above and below-ground biomass was strongly depressed by shading, although the extent of this varied between species. Many of the most promising species yielded well under both the control and the shaded treatments, indicating that they may be suitable for use in both younger, less shaded plantations and older, heavily shaded plantations. Concentrations of leaf N were affected by shading with increased N found under shade treatments compared to the control. There were no similar effects on leaf P concentrations. Root nodulation was strongly affected by shading and was greatly reduced or entirely absent under shaded treatments, suggesting that fixation of atmospheric nitrogen may be lower under shade than in the open. Shading prolonged the vegetative growth in many species, delaying flowering and greatly reducing seed production, although the size of individual seeds was maintained at the expense of seed numbers. An increase in the fraction of readily germinable seed and a decrease in the fraction of hard seed were found in several species when the seed was produced under shade. Light curves were not always correlated, with the production of dry matter with several species that appear shade-tolerant from dry matter production producing light response curves suggesting otherwise.

Field trials were conducted in both the wet and seasonally dry tropics to examine the growth of selected legume species under timber plantations that were already established for a number of years, and under a relatively young Nelder wheel plantation of African Mahogany (*Khaya senegalensis*). Field trials, particularly the Nelder wheel trial, demonstrated the dynamic nature of pasture growth, particularly in the seasonally dry tropics, and the need for continuous monitoring of such trials to form a more complete picture. *Arachis pintoii* was clearly the best performing species under a five-year-old mixed rainforest species/*Eucalyptus pellita* plantation in the wet tropics. In the seasonally dry tropics *Clitoria ternatea* and *Centrosema brasilianum* proved to be the best performing cultivars beneath both a conventional, 12-year-old African Mahogany stand and the Nelder wheel, with pasture production depressed by increasing tree densities. Pasture production was found to decrease exponentially with increasing tree density in the Nelder wheel plantation. Both *Clitoria ternatea* and *Centrosema brasilianum* were observed to climb trees during the trial, indicating the potential of vigorous climbing species to smother young or small trees. Soil moisture content was also found to decrease as tree density increased, suggesting that in the seasonally dry tropics light may not always be the limiting factor for growth.

Sixteen species were identified which are potentially useful, shade tolerant or shade adapted, pasture species for use beneath tree plantations in both the wet and the seasonally dry tropics. The most promising species suited to the wet tropics were *Arachis pintoii*, *Centrosema acutifolium*, *C. macrocarpum*, *C. pubescens*, *Calopogonium mucunoides*, *Desmodium intortum*, *D. ovalifolium*, *D. canum*, *D. heterophyllum*, *D. uncinatum* and *Pueraria phaseoloides*. The most promising species suited to the seasonally dry tropics were *Arachis stenosperma*, *Centrosema brasilianum*, *Clitoria ternatea*, *Macroptilium atropurpureum* and *M. lathyroides*.

Many of the species identified as being shade tolerant, or relatively productive under shade have a climbing habit which can cause concern due to the potential smothering of young or small trees. When climbing species are removed the remaining species suited to the wet tropics are *A. pintoii*, *D. canum*, *D. heterophyllum*, *D. intortum* and *D. ovalifolium*, and those to the seasonally dry tropics are *A. stenosperma* and *M. lathyroides*. However climbing species may still be of use beneath older plantations or

where a higher level of pasture management is acceptable to prevent the smothering of trees through a greater control of the intensity and frequency of grazing or cutting.

Additional research is required to examine the long-term persistence and performance of the species identified in this study as plantations age and shade levels increase. The compatibility of suitable legume species with shade tolerant grasses is an important aspect, which will affect the production and persistence of the legume species, that has seen relatively little research in the past.

## **Acknowledgements**

There are many people who have contributed in many ways to this thesis, some directly and many in less tangible ways. I will endeavour to name you all but if I forget anyone please forgive me!

Over and above all others I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Bob Congdon, for all his help and advice. From my first enquiries from Vancouver Island, to his and Cheryl's hospitality during my first few days and nights in Townsville, to the proof reading of the finished product, he has been a great help and gone over and above the call of duty during my time at JCU.

I would also like to thank those others who contributed to the project through their advice and help. Foremost among these is Cherie Stafford, from her help in the lab to battling march flies in the field, I could not have done without her help. I'm sorry but I couldn't get your name in golden ink as promised!

My thanks are also due to Dr. Joe Holtum for his assistance with that machine I love to hate, the Li-Cor 6400, and his assistance with the ecophysiological aspects of the project. I also thank Adjunct Professor Peter Brownell for his help and the many interesting talks, Mr. Chris Gardiner for his help with many aspects of the project from finding the elusive rats nest in the shade house to his help in the field and Professor Ross Coventry for his help with all things to do with soil.

For their advice on forestry in north Queensland thanks are due to Rod Collins and Gary Sexton, as is to Dr. Bruce Cook, Dr. Arthur Cameron, Dr. Harry Bishop and the Genetic Resources Centre for the supply of seed. I'm also indebted to Dr. Jeff Corfield for his advice on pasture sampling techniques and to Dr. David Ratkowsky for his statistical advice, particularly for not trying to handball me when confronted with the Nelder Wheel!

For allowing the use of his land and the many interesting discussions and debates (of which I don't think I came out on top in a single one), I thank the unforgettable Errol Wiles, one of the most interesting people I have ever met. For also allowing the use of their land I extend my thanks to the Burdekin Agricultural College.

For supporting the project financially, through the donation of African Mahogany seedlings and making their land available for use assisting the project I extend my thanks to the Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation (RIRDC), the Community Rainforest Reforestation Program (CRRP) and last but not least James Cook University.

For keeping life interesting at home for three years I wish to thank my housemates Joe, Corrine and Andre. From the 17 Florey St. circus, (united against the Wizard) to the 4 Pilea Crt. zoo (awash with testosterone), life at home was never so interesting. Rest assured guys I may have left Townsville but Mr. Furious is alive and well with plenty of F5's to come!

Although you will probably never read this I thank you, Rosie, for your all to brief company and our chats over the years.

Finally thanks are due to my family, Mum, Dad and Ely for all being a bit strange in their own way and for their support during my time in Townsville.

## Table of Contents

1 - Introduction .....	1
1.1 Pre-amble .....	1
1.2 Potential advantages and disadvantages of silvo-pastoral systems .....	1
1.3 Effects of trees on the below canopy environment.....	3
1.3.1 Light.....	3
1.3.2 Soil moisture .....	8
1.3.3 Nutrients.....	9
1.3.4 Pasture production beneath tree plantations .....	11
1.3.5 Pasture quality.....	12
1.3.6 Relative humidity.....	13
1.3.7 Temperature .....	13
1.4 Legume genotypes studied.....	14
1.5 Conclusions.....	48
 Chapter 2 – Effects of shade on the comparative performance of forage legumes grown under glasshouse conditions- agronomic properties .....	 50
2.1 Introduction.....	50
2.2 Materials and methods .....	52
2.2.1 Trial Establishment.....	52
2.2.2 Measurement of Agronomic Properties .....	57
2.3 Results.....	61
2.3.1 Above-ground Biomass .....	61
2.3.2 Root Biomass .....	80
2.3.3 Total Plant Biomass .....	89
2.3.4 Root Nodulation.....	99
2.3.5 Nitrogen content of leaf material .....	108
2.3.6 Phosphorus content of leaf material.....	118
2.3.7 Days to first flower .....	127
2.3.8 Production of seed .....	136
2.3.9 Seed size .....	139
2.3.10 Seed germination .....	143
2.3.11 Shoot:root ratio .....	158
2.4 Discussion.....	167
2.4.1 Species adapted to wet tropical areas .....	167
2.4.2 Species adapted to wet/dry tropical areas .....	176
2.4.3 Other parameters.....	184
2.5 Conclusions.....	189
 Chapter 3 - Light response curves and physiological measurements .....	 192
3.1 Introduction.....	192
3.2 Materials and methods .....	194
3.2.1 Plant production and growing conditions .....	194
3.2.2 Gas exchange measurements .....	195
3.3 Results.....	195
3.4 Discussion.....	214
3.5 Conclusions.....	217



Chapter 4 - Performance of selected legumes beneath established tree plantations.....	219
4.1 Introduction.....	219
4.2 Production, ground cover and persistence of six forage legume accessions beneath a 5-year-old <i>Eucalyptus pellita</i> and mixed rainforest species plantation.....	220
4.2.1 Materials and methods.....	220
4.2.2 Results.....	223
4.2.3 Discussion.....	229
4.2.4 Conclusions.....	230
4.3 Performance of seven species of tropical forage legume beneath a 12-year-old African mahogany ( <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> ) plantation.....	231
4.3.1 Materials and methods.....	231
4.3.2 Results.....	235
4.3.3 Discussion.....	248
4.3.4 Conclusions.....	250
4.4 Production and persistence of <i>Clitoria ternatea</i> , <i>Chamaecrista rotundifolia</i> and four accessions of <i>Arachis</i> under open conditions and beneath two densities of <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> .....	250
4.4.1 Materials and methods.....	250
4.4.2 Results.....	253
4.4.3 Discussion.....	263
4.4.4 Conclusions.....	265
4.5 General conclusions and summary.....	265
 Chapter 5 – Pasture production and legume performance beneath an African Mahogany ( <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> ) Nelder Wheel sown with four commercially available pasture legumes.....	267
5.1 Introduction.....	267
5.2 Materials and methods.....	268
5.2.1 Trial site.....	268
5.2.2 Trial establishment.....	268
5.2.3 Measurement of the light levels and soil moisture content.....	270
5.2.4 Pasture Sampling.....	270
5.3 Results.....	272
5.3.1 Shade levels.....	272
5.3.2 Soil moisture content.....	272
5.3.3 Pasture production and composition.....	273
5.4 Discussion.....	282
5.4.1 Shade levels.....	282
5.4.2 Soil moisture content.....	283
5.4.3 Total dry matter yield.....	284
5.4.4 Legume yield.....	285
5.4.5 Grass yield.....	287
5.4.5 Weed yield.....	287
5.5 Conclusions.....	290
 Chapter 6 – Research outcomes.....	292
6.1 Conclusions from shade-house trials.....	292
6.2 Conclusions from field trials.....	294
6.3 Further Research.....	299

References.....	300
-----------------	-----

## List of Illustrations and Diagrams

Figure 1.1 Photosynthetic photon flux densities (PPFD) levels in the open and beneath 2282 stems/ha of <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> .....	6
Figure 2.1 Maximum, minimum and mean air temperatures during trial period and long term average weather data.....	53
Figure 2.2 Regressions of overall production of above-ground biomass means, with standard errors, by 7 and 14 species of wet tropical and 14 species of wet/dry tropical forage legume grown beneath four shade levels.....	65
Figure 2.3 Plants from each shade treatment on the day of harvest.....	74 – 79
Figure 2.4 Regressions of overall production of root biomass means, with standard errors, by 7 and 14 species of wet tropical and 14 species of wet/dry tropical forage legume grown beneath four shade levels.....	80
Figure 2.5 Regressions of overall production of total biomass means, with standard errors, by 7 and 14 species of wet tropical and 14 species of wet/dry tropical forage legume grown beneath four shade levels.....	89
Figure 2.6 Regressions of root nodulation level means, with standard errors, by 7 and 14 species of wet tropical and 14 species of wet/dry tropical forage legume grown beneath four shade levels.....	99
Figure 2.7 Regressions of leaf nitrogen content, with standard errors, by 7 and 14 species of wet tropical and 14 species of wet/dry tropical forage legume grown beneath four shade levels.....	108
Figure 2.8 Regressions of leaf phosphorus content, with standard errors, by 7 and 14 species of wet tropical and 14 species of wet/dry tropical forage legume grown beneath four shade levels.....	180
Figure 2.9 Regressions of days to first flower, with standard errors, by 7 and 14 species of wet tropical and 14 species of wet/dry tropical forage legume grown beneath four shade levels.....	127

Figure 2.10 Regressions of seed production, with standard errors, of 14 species of wet/dry tropical forage legume grown beneath four shade levels, 119 days after planting.....	136
Figure 2.11. Regressions of seed production, with standard errors, of 14 species of wet/dry tropical forage legume grown beneath four shade levels.....	139
Figure 2.12 Changes over time in mean germination rates and standard errors of seed produced under control (0%shade), 63%, 76% and 84% shade.....	156
Figure 2.13 Regressions of log root:shoot ratios, with standard errors, by 7 and 14 species of wet tropical and 14 species of wet/dry tropical forage legume grown beneath four shade levels.....	158
Figure 3.1 Example of a light response curve and critical points.....	194
Figure 3.2 Light response curves (CO <sub>2</sub> assimilation vs. light intensity) and line of best fit of the initial linear section of the curve of 19 species of tropical forage legume adapted to the wet tropics.....	197 – 203
Figure 3.3 Light response curves (CO <sub>2</sub> assimilation vs. light intensity) and line of best fit of the initial linear section of the curve of 13 species of tropical forage legume adapted to the wet/dry tropics.....	204 – 208
Figure 3.4 Slope of the line of best fit relative yield of above ground biomass vs. maximum rate of photosynthesis.....	217
Figure 4.1 Maximum and minimum mean air temperatures at Babinda from Jan 2000 to October 2002.....	221
Figure 4.2 Monthly and long term mean of rainfall at Babinda from Jan 2000 to October 2002.....	222
Figure 4.3 Maximum and minimum mean air temperatures at Ayr in 2000.....	232
Figure 4.4 Monthly rainfall during 2000 and the long term monthly average.....	232
Figure 4.5 Diagram showing delineation of canopied and inter-canopy areas.....	234

Figure 4.6 Location of species relative to one another.....	252
Figure 5.1 Rainfall (mm) recorded at James Cook Universities Townsville campus from January 1999 to August 2002.....	270
Figure 5.2 Average total dry matter production of forage beneath eight densities of <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> on three dates.....	289

## List of Tables

<b>Table 1.1</b> General differences between leaves of plants adapted to high and low light intensities.....	7
<b>Table 2.1</b> Species of legumes tested for shade tolerance – species suited to the wet tropics tested in (a) January to May 2000, (b) tested in February to May 2001, and (c) the seasonal wet/dry tropics tested in June to October 2001. ....	54
<b>Table 2.2</b> Major nutrients in the fine earth fraction (<2mm) of the soil used in shade house pot trials.....	56
<b>Table 2.3.</b> Total number of seeds used for each species, under each shade treatment in the germination test.....	60
<b>Table 2.4</b> Statistical summary of three shade house trials examining effects of shade on a range of properties in 35 accessions of tropical forage legume.....	63
<b>Table 2.5</b> Summary of regression analysis of three shade house trials examining effects of shade on a range of properties in 35 accessions of tropical forage legume. ....	64
<b>Table 2.6</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of above-ground biomass (g per plant, oven dried at 70°C) production by (a) 7, (b) 14 and (c) 14 legume species grown under 4 shade levels.....	66
<b>Table 2.7</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of above-ground biomass (g per plant, oven dried at 70°C) produced by 7 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82%. ....	71
<b>Table 2.8</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of above-ground biomass (g per plant, oven dried at 70°C) produced by 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 84%. ....	72
<b>Table 2.9</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of above-ground biomass (g per plant, oven dried at 70°C) produced by 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade (n = 4), harvested 119 days after planting. Means in a column followed by the same lower case letter and means in a row followed by the same upper case letter do not differ significantly.....	73
<b>Table 2.10</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of root biomass (g per plant, oven dried at 70°C) production by (a) 7, (b) 14 and (c) 14 legume species grown under 4 shade levels,.....	82

<b>Table 2.11</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of root biomass (g per plant, oven dried at 70°C) produced by 7 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 84% shade. ....	86
<b>Table 2.12</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of root biomass (g per plant, oven dried at 70°C) produced by 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 84% shade. ....	87
<b>Table 2.13</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of root biomass (g per plant, oven dried at 70°C) produced by 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade. ....	88
<b>Table 2.14</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of total plant biomass (g per plant, oven dried at 70°C) production by (a) 7, (b) 14 and (c) 14 legume species grown under 4 shade levels. ....	91
<b>Table 2.15</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of total plant biomass produced by seven wet tropical forage legume species grown under four different shade levels. ....	96
<b>Table 2.16</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of total plant biomass production (g per plant, oven dried at 70°C) by 14 wet tropical forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 84% shade. ....	97
<b>Table 2.17</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of total plant biomass (g per plant, oven dried at 70°C) produced by 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade. ....	98
<b>Table 2.18</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of mean root nodulation score (0 = none, 5 = most) production by (a) 7, (b) 14 and (c) 14 legume species grown under 4 shade levels. ....	101
<b>Table 2.19</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of mean root nodulation score (0 = none, 5 = most) of seven wet tropical forage legume species grown under four different shade levels. ....	105
<b>Table 2.20</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of mean root nodulation score (0 = none, 5 = most) of 14 wet tropical forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 84% shade. ....	106
<b>Table 2.21</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of mean root nodulation score (0 = none, 5 = most) of 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade. ....	107

<b>Table 2.22</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of nitrogen concentration (%) of leaf material (a) 7, (b) 14 and (c) 14 legume species grown under 4 shade levels.....	110
<b>Table 2.23</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of leaf nitrogen concentration (%), on a 70°c oven dry basis of 7 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade.....	114
<b>Table 2.24</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of leaf nitrogen concentration (%), on a 70°c oven dry basis of 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 84% shade.....	116
<b>Table 2.25</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of leaf nitrogen concentration (%), on a 70°c oven dry basis of 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade.....	117
<b>Table 2.26</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of P concentrations (%) of leaf material (a) 7, (b) 14 and (c) 14 legume species grown under 4 shade levels.....	120
<b>Table 2.27</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of leaf phosphorus concentrations (%), on a 70°c oven dry basis of 7 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade.....	124
<b>Table 2.28</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of leaf phosphorus concentrations (%), on a 70°c oven dry basis of 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 84% shade.....	125
<b>Table 2.29</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of leaf phosphorus concentrations (%), on a 70°c oven dry basis, of 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade.....	126
<b>Table 2.30</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of days to first flower by (a) 7, (b) 14 and (c) 14 legume species grown under 4 shade levels.....	129
<b>Table 2.31</b> Means and standard errors of the time to first flower of 7 forage legume species (trial 1) grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade.....	133
<b>Table 2.32</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of the time to first flower of 14 forage legume species (trial 2) grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade.....	134
<b>Table 2.33</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of the time to first flower of 14 forage (wet/dry tropical) legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade.....	135
<b>Table 2.34</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of seed production of 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade.....	137



<b>Table 2.35</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of seed production (g per plant) produced by 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade ..	138
<b>Table 2.36</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of average seed weight of 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade. ....	140
<b>Table 2.37</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of average seed weight (g) produced by 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade ..	142
<b>Table 2.38</b> Statistical summary of germination trial of seeds produced by legumes under 4 levels of shade.....	143
<b>Table 2.39</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of time to 50% germination (days), % readily germinable seed, % hard seed and % non-viable seed of 8 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade.....	144
<b>Table 2.40</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of time to 50% germination (days), % readily germinable seed, % hard seed and % non-viable seed of 8 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade.....	146
<b>Table 2.41</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of percent readily germinable seed of 8 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade .....	152
<b>Table 2.42</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of percent hard seed of 8 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade.....	153
<b>Table 2.43</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of percent non-viable seed of 8 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade .....	154
<b>Table 2.44</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of estimated time to 50% germination (days) of seed produced by 8 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade .....	155
<b>Table 2.45</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of the log of shoot:root ratio of (a) 7, (b) 14 and (c) 14 legume species grown under 4 shade levels. ....	160
<b>Table 2.46</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of the log of shoot:root ratio of 7 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade .....	164
<b>Table 2.47</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of the log of shoot:root ratio of 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 84% shade .....	165
<b>Table 2.48</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of the log of shoot:root ratio of 14 forage legume species grown under 0 (control), 63, 76 and 82% shade .....	166
<b>Table 2.49</b> Production of above-ground dry matter by 35 species of legume, under four shade levels expressed as a percentage of that produced under full sun (control). ....	183

<b>Table 2.49</b> Production of above-ground dry matter by 35 species of legume, under four shade levels expressed as a percentage of that produced under full sun (control). .....	183
<b>Table 3.1</b> Equations of lines of best fit and R <sup>2</sup> values for linear parts of light response curves .....	210
<b>Table 3.2</b> Apparent quantum efficiencies, light compensation points, light saturation points and light saturation rates of photosynthesis .....	212
<b>Table 4.1</b> Major nutrients in the fine earth fraction (<2mm) of the soil Bingil series krasnozem. ....	221
<b>Table 4.2</b> Summary of statistical results .....	223
<b>Table 4.3</b> Mean, standard error and LSD groupings of percent ground cover of six tropical forage legumes planted beneath a 5-year-old (at trial establishment) <i>E. pellita</i> and mixed rainforest species timber plantation. ....	226
<b>Table 4.4</b> Mean, standard error and LSD groupings of dry matter production (t/ha) of six tropical forage legumes planted beneath a 5-year-old (at trial establishment) <i>E. pellita</i> and mixed rainforest species timber plantation .....	227
<b>Table 4.5</b> Mean, standard error and LSD groupings of mean plant weight (g) of six tropical forage legumes planted beneath a 5-year-old (at trial establishment) <i>E. pellita</i> and mixed rainforest species timber plantation. ....	228
<b>Table 4.6</b> Mean, standard error and LSD groupings of the number of plants per meter for six tropical forage legumes planted beneath a 5-year-old (at trial establishment) <i>E. pellita</i> and mixed rainforest species timber plantation .....	228
<b>Table 4.7</b> Major nutrients in the fine earth fraction (<2mm) of the topsoil (0 - 10 cm) of the trial site.....	231
<b>Table 4.8</b> Summary of statistical results for growth of 7 species of tropical forage legume beneath a 12-year-old African mahogany ( <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> ) plantation at Clare.....	236
<b>Table 4.9</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of percent ground cover under canopied, inter-canopied and clear (control) .....	236
<b>Table 4.10</b> Mean, standard error and LSD groupings of ground covered by seven species of tropical forage legume grown beneath a 12-year-old <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> plantation. ....	237
<b>Table 4.11</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of percent ground cover of seven species of tropical forage legume under canopied, inter-canopied and clear (control) areas .....	239

<b>Table 4.12</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of dry matter production (kg per ha) of seven species of tropical forage legume under canopied, inter-canopied and clear (control) areas .....	241
<b>Table 4.13</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings dry matter production (kg per ha) of seven species of tropical forage legume under canopied, inter-canopied and clear (control) areas .....	241
<b>Table 4.14</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of dry matter production (kg per ha) of seven species of tropical forage legume under canopied, inter-canopied and clear (control) areas. ....	242
<b>Table 4.15</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings of the mean number of plants per metre of seven species of tropical forage legume under canopied, inter-canopied and clear (control) areas .....	243
<b>Table 4.16</b> Mean, standard error and LSD groupings of the mean number of plants per metre of ground sown of tropical forage legumes grown beneath a 12-year-old <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> plantation .....	244
<b>Table 4.17</b> Means, standard errors and LSD groupings mean number of plants per metre of seven species of tropical forage legume under canopied, inter-canopied and clear (control) areas beneath a 12-year-old <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> plantation.....	247
<b>Table 4.18</b> Major nutrients in the fine earth fraction (<2mm) of the trial site soil. ....	253
<b>Table 4.19</b> Shade levels (percentage of full sun in the open) in the open and at 2 different locations in two densities of <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> on three harvesting dates. ....	253
<b>Table 4.20</b> Statistical summary of results .....	257
<b>Table 4.21</b> Dry matter production (grams) by six accessions of legume under open conditions and beneath two densities of <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> .....	258
<b>Table 4.22</b> Ground cover (%) by six accessions of legume under open conditions and beneath two densities of <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> .....	259
<b>Table 4.23</b> Ground cover of six accessions of legume under open conditions and beneath two densities of <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> .....	260
<b>Table 4.24</b> Number of plants of six accessions of legume under open conditions and beneath two densities of <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> .....	261
<b>Table 4.25</b> Number of plants of six accessions of legume under open conditions and beneath two densities of <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> . ....	262

<b>Table 5.1</b> Shade levels at the mid point between trees of eight densities of <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> , grown in Townsville in a Nelder wheel arrangement at ages of 24, 27 and 30 months.....	272
<b>Table 5.2</b> Moisture content ( % based upon weight, mean $\pm$ SE) of soil from 0-10, 20-30 and 40-50 cm beneath eight densities of <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> .....	278
<b>Table 5.3</b> Means and standard errors of total, legume, grass and weed dry matter yields (kg/ha) for the August 2001 sampling.....	279
<b>Table 5.4</b> Means and standard errors of total, legume, grass and weed dry matter yields (kg/ha) for the November 2001 sampling.....	280
<b>Table 5.5</b> Means and standard errors of total, legume, grass and weed dry matter yields (kg/ha) for the February 2002 sampling .....	281
<b>Table 5.6</b> R-squared values of the line of best fit on three sampling dates for actual yield vs. estimated yield of legume, grass and weed components of the pasture.....	282
<b>Table 5.7</b> R squared values of linear and exponential lines of best fit, applied to total dry matter production.....	285
<b>Table 6.1</b> Summary of assessment of each species tested across all trials.....	299

## **STATEMENT OF SOURCES**

### **DECLARATION**

**I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any university or other institution of tertiary education. Information derived from the published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given.**

---

**Singature**

---

**Date**

## **ELECTRONIC COPY**

I, the undersigned, the author of this work, declare that the electronic copy of this thesis provided to the James Cook University Library, is an accurate copy of the print thesis submitted, within the limits of the technology available.

---

Signature

---

Date