Inclusion of *Tarchonanthus camphoratus* in finishing diets for lambs

H.J. van der Merwe* and I. Nel

Department of Animal Science, University of the Orange Free State, P.O. Box 339, Bloemfontein 9300, Republic of South Africa

* Outeur aan wie korrespondensie gerig moet word.

Received 17 October 1990; accepted 6 February 1991

The effect of including 20, 30, 40 and 50% Tarchonanthus camphoratus as the sole roughage in a finishing diet for lambs was investigated. Stems (with leaves), not exceeding 12,5 mm in diameter and 600 mm in length respectively, were harvested in June 1987 and milled through a 25-mm mesh screen. Additionally, the chemical composition of ten-month-old coppice shoots was determined. The chemical composition of T. camphoratus and shoots (indicated in brackets) on a dry-matter basis (%) was as follows: crude protein 5,65 (16,32); ether extract 3,70 (5,01); ash 4,73 (9,59); cellulose 44,42 (29,03); hemicellulose 9,78 (7,39); lignin 1,59 (3,70); calcium 0,17 (0,67); phosphorus 0,11 (0,63); potassium 0,16 (0,79). A significant (P < 0,05) reduction in the apparent digestibility of acid detergent fibre occurred when more maize was included in the diet. The inclusion of 40 and 50% T. camphoratus in the diet resulted in a significantly (P < 0.05)lower apparent digestibility of dry matter and gross energy as well as metabolizable energy content. Accordingly, metabolizable energy intake, daily live mass-gain and efficiency of feed conversion to live mass of lambs on these diets were significantly (P < 0.05) lower. No significant (P > 0.05) differences in nitrogen retention as a percentage of nitrogen intake, carcass mass and grading occurred between the various treatments. The results suggest that a maximum of approximately 30% T. camphoratus could be included in a finishing diet for lambs.

Die insluiting van 20, 30, 40 en 50% Tarchonanthus camphoratus as enigste ruvoerbron in 'n afrondingsdieet vir lammers is ondersoek. Takke (en blare) met onderskeidelik 'n deursnee en lengte wat nie 12,5 mm en 600 mm oorskry het nie, is in Junie 1987 geoes en deur 'n 25 mm-sif gemaal. Eweneens is die chemiese samestelling van tien-maande-oud lote bepaal. Die chemiese samestelling van T. camphoratus en lote (aangedui tussen hakkies) op 'n vogvrye basis (%) was as volg: ruproteïen 5,65 (16,32); eterekstrak 3,70 (5,01); as 4,73 (9,59); sellulose 44,42 (29,03); hemisellulose 9,78 (7,39); lignien 1,59 (3,70); kalsium 0,17 (0,67); fosfor 0,11 (0,63); kalium 0,16 (0,79). Die skynbare verteerbaarheid van suuronoplosbare vesel het betekenisvol (P < 0.05) verlaag namate meer mielies in die proefdiëte ingesluit is. Verder het die insluiting van 40 en 50% T. camphoratus in die dieet met 'n betekenisvolle (P < 0,05) verlaging in die skynbare verteerbaarheid van droë materiaal en bruto energie asook metaboliseerbare energie-inhoud gepaard gegaan. Dienooreenkomstig was die metaboliseerbare energieinname, massatoename en die doeltreffendheid van voeromsetting na lewende massa van lammers op hierdie diëte beteker isvol (P < 0.05) swakker. Geen statisties-betekenisvolle (P > 0.05)verskille in stikstofretensie as 'n persentasie van stikstofinname, karkasmassa en gradering het tussen die onderskeie behandelings voorgekom nie. Die resultate dui aan dat nagenoeg 30% T. camphoratus in afrondingsdiëte vir lammers ingesluit kan word.

Keywords: *Tarchonanthus camphoratus*, digestibility, finishing diets, lambs.

The semi-arid regions of South Africa periodically experience severe droughts. In contrast to grasses, potential feed resources such as trees and shrubs are less vulnerable to droughts and can, therefore, play an important role in these drought-stricken areas. Furthermore, the utilization of woody plant species during normal years could increase the livestock carrying capacity of these areas.

Investigations into the feeding of leaves, ground twigs and branches of woody plants to ruminants have been mainly devoted to the feeding of such materials at a maintenance level (Bonsma, 1942; Kotze, 1965; Lüdemann, 1966; Donaldson *et al.*, 1968; Van Schalkwyk, 1975). Donaldson *et al.* (1968) pointed out that the feeding of livestock on a survival diet for long periods results in virtually no income. Consequently, it is important to investigate the feeding potential of these available feeding resources for production purposes.

Tarchonanthus camphoratus grows on the calcareous soil of the Ghaapse-plato (ca. 1 000 000 ha). No information could be found in the available literature about the inclusion of T. camphoratus in production diets for animals. Therefore, an initial study has been undertaken to investigate the feeding potential of T. camphoratus as a roughage source in finishing diets for lambs.

Twenty SA Mutton Merino ram lambs, with a mean initial body mass of ca. 30 kg, were randomly allocated to four groups. The lambs in each group received one of four experimental diets on an *ad libitum* basis. The composition of the experimental diets is shown in Table 1. The diets were composed to provide the crude protein requirements (*ca.* 13% on a dry-matter basis) of lambs (NRC, 1985). The *T. camphoratus* plants were cut at ground level during June 1987. Stems (and leaves), not exceeding 12,5 mm and 600 mm in diameter and length respectively, were milled through a 25-mm mesh screen. Furthermore, 15 mg/kg monensin sodium was included in the diets.

The lambs, implanted with Ralgro, were fed individually in digestion crates during the total feeding period. A growth as well as a digestion study was conducted. The collection period was carried out during the fifth week of the growth study. Lambs were weighed at the beginning and end of the feeding period after an overnight fasting period. Each group was slaughtered when the lambs had reached an average mass of 40 kg.

The chemical composition of feed, faeces, urine and coppice shoots (ten-month growth) was determined according to the methods of AOAC (1965). Gross energy was determined by means of bomb calorimetry. Acid detergent fibre (ADF), cellulose, hemicellulose and lignin were determined according to the methods of Van Soest (1963) and Van Soest & Wine (1967).

The data were analysed by means of a completely random design. An analysis of variance was performed and significant differences were identified by means of Tukey's t test (Steele & Torrie, 1960).

The chemical composition of *T. camphoratus* and shoots (indicated in brackets) on an air-dry basis (%) was as follows: crude protein 5,65 (16,32); ether extract 3,70 (5,01); ash 4,73 (9,59); cellulose 44,42 (29,03); hemicellulose 9,78 (7,39); lignin 1,59 (3,70); calcium 0,17 (0,67); phosphorus 0,11 (0,63); and potassium 0,16 (0,79). It is obvious that the

 Table 1
 Physical and chemical composition of experimental diets

Table 2 Digestion and balance data

	Diets *					
	1	2	3	4		
Item	(50%)	(40%)	(30%)	(20%)		
Physical composition						
(air-dry basis) (%)						
Maize meal	28,2	38,7	49,2	59,7		
Voermol ^b	10,0	10,0	10,0	10,0		
Protein concentrate ^c	10,3	9,8	9,3	8,8		
T. camphoratus	50,0	40,0	30,0	20,0		
Salt	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5		
Dicalcium phosphate	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0		
Chemical composition						
(dry-matter basis) (%)						
Dry matter	89,16	89,07	87,93	88,83		
Ash	7,49	7,07	7,21	7,64		
Crude protein	13,32	13,72	14,22	14,32		
Acid detergent fibre	31,07	26,25	21,22	16,00		
Ether extract	4,49	4,42	4,26	3,66		
Calcium	1,35	1,30	1,26	1,18		
Phosphorus	0,68	0,69	0,68	0,68		

Percentage T. camphoratus indicated in brackets.

^b Specifications of commercial voermol was minimum 5% urea, minimum 18% crude protein, maximum 10% fibre, maximum 0,8% calcium, minimum 0,6% phosphorus, maximum 16% moisture and minimum 0,8% fat.

^c Specifications of commercial protein concentrate was minimum 42% crude protein, maximum 12% moisture, minimum 1% fat, maximum 13% fibre, maximum 8% calcium and minimum 2,5% phosphorus.

particularly high cellulose content of T. camphoratus could detrimentally influence the digestibility thereof. The low lignin content of T. camphoratus was unexpected. In contrast to T. camphoratus stems, the cellulose content of the shoots was lower whereas the crude protein, ether extract, ash, calcium, phosphorus and potassium contents were higher. According to this, the shoots have a potentially greater nutritive value than stems. Donaldson *et al.* (1968) found that the subsequent coppice growth could easily be harvested and, hence, the problem of collecting large amounts of feed was also partially solved. At the same time, bush encroachment could be controlled. A great amount of research is, however, required before definite recommendations on the most efficient and successful methods of feeding this roughage can be made.

The chemical composition of the experimental diets is shown in Table 1. Inclusion of a smaller amount of T. camphoratus in the diet resulted in lower ADF and ether extract content. Although the calcium and phosphorus content of the diets exceed the requirements of the lambs, the optimum ratio occurred.

According to the results in Table 2, a significant reduction in the apparent digestibility of ADF occurred when more maize was included in the diet. In this respect several researchers, viz. Van Soest (1983), Gibson (1984), Miller &

	1	2	3	4	Signifi-
Item	(50%)	(40%)	(30%)	(20%)	cance
Dry-matter intake			-		
(kg/lamb/d)	1,02	0,95	1,26	1,11	NS ^b
	±0,21	±0,16	±0,06	±0,16	
Apparent digestibility					
Dry matter (%)	62,34	64,66	68,35	72,07	4>3>1,2°
	±1,81	±2,27	±1,15	±0,91	
Crude protein (%)	73,80	72,56	73,21	75,75	NS
	±1,16	±2,51	±1,82	±1,50	
Acid detergent					
fibre (%)	49,49	46,59	42,98	37,98	1,2>4°
	±2,70	±2,35	±4,37	±6,84	
Ether extract (%)	66,06	71,57	62,23	61,29	NS
	±1,86	±0,87	±3,49	±2,85	
Gross energy (%)	68,55	69,68	74,49	77,42	4>3>1,2°
	±1,46	±1,65	±0,91	±0,89	
Digestible crude					
protein (%)	9,40	10,57	10,98	11,12	NS
	±2,14	$\pm 0,52$	±0,26	±0,26	
Metabolizable					
energy (MJ/kg) ^d	10,82	10,73	12,07	12,53	4>3>1,2°
	$\pm 0,22$	±0,22	±0,13	±0,25	
N retention as % of					
nitrogen intake	52,09	53,76	53,40	52,12	NS
	±4,51	±2,44	±7,62	±6,54	

^a Percentage T. camphoratus indicated in brackets.

Ncn-significant.

° P < 0,05.

^d Digestible energy \times 0,82.

Munt:fering (1985) and Dixon (1986), found that concentrate in the diet resulted in a lower fibre and specifically cellulose digestibility. As previously mentioned, the cellulose content of *T. camphoratus* is particularly high. Reduction of fibre digestion may result from changes in substrate utilization by rumen micro-organisms, reduced numbers of cellulolytic organisms, changes in digesta passage, lowered pH and decreased availability of the iso-acids and ammonia for cellul:tic microbes (Hynd, 1984; Coppock, 1985; Shriver *et al.*, 1986).

Furthermore, the inclusion of 40 and 50% T. camphoratus in the diet resulted in a significantly lower (P < 0,05) apparent digestibility of dry matter and gross energy as well as metabolizable energy content (Table 2). Accordingly, metabolizable energy intake, daily live mass-gain and efficiency of feed conversion to the live mass of lambs on these diets were significantly (P < 0,05) lower. On the other hand, no significant (P > 0,05) differences in nitrogen retention as a percentage of nitrogen intake (Table 2), carcass mass and grading (Table 3) occurred between the various treatments. According to these results, a maximum of approximately 30% T. camphoratus stems could, from a biological point of view, be included in a finishing diet for lambs. This level applies only for the *T*. *camphoratus* plants as harvested in this study. Further research is needed to evaluate season and year effects as well as different harvesting methods.

Item (50%) (40%) (30%) (20%) canceDry-matter intake $(kg/lamb/d)$ $1,14$ $1,17$ $1,53$ $1,12$ NS^1 $\pm 0,22$ $\pm 0,28$ $\pm 0,10$ $\pm 0,28$ Metabolizable energyintake $(MJ/lamb/d)$ $11,05$ $10,22$ $15,20$ $13,86$ $4,32$ $\pm 2,26$ $\pm 1,70$ $\pm 0,73$ $\pm 2,04$ 32 Initial mass (kg) $29,25$ $30,74$ $29,75$ $30,46$ NS $\pm 2,74$ $\pm 2,00$ $\pm 2,66$ $\pm 2,54$ End mass (kg) $39,33$ $40,62$ $42,08$ $40,54$ NS $\pm 5,03$ $\pm 1,55$ $\pm 2,35$ $\pm 3,11$ Days 99 92 57 57 Mass gain $(kg/d/lamb)$ $0,10$ $0,11$ $0,22$ $0,18$ $4,3>1$ $\pm 0,03$ $\pm 0,03$ $\pm 0,02$ $\pm 0,04$ Kg feed/kg live		Diets [*]				
V 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Item	-		-		- Signifi- cance
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Dry-matter intake					
Metabolizable energy intake (MJ/lamb/d)11,0510,2215,2013,864,32 $\pm 2,26$ $\pm 1,70$ $\pm 0,73$ $\pm 2,04$ 33Initial mass (kg)29,25 $30,74$ 29,75 $30,46$ NS $\pm 2,74$ $\pm 2,00$ $\pm 2,06$ $\pm 2,54$ NSEnd mass (kg)39,33 $40,62$ $42,08$ $40,54$ NS $\pm 5,03$ $\pm 1,55$ $\pm 2,35$ $\pm 3,11$ NSDays99925757Mass gain $(kg/d/lamb)$ $0,10$ $0,11$ $0,22$ $0,18$ $4,3>1$ $\pm 0,03$ $\pm 0,03$ $\pm 0,02$ $\pm 0,04$ $20,04$ $20,04$ Kg feed/kg live mass-gain10,599,265,846,39 $1,2>4$ $\pm 2,33$ $\pm 1,85$ $\pm 0,49$ $\pm 0,89$ $20,42$ NS $\pm 1,75$ $\pm 0,96$ $\pm 2,44$ $\pm 1,96$ NSDressing (%)48,17 $50,76$ $46,53$ $50,45$ NS $\pm 1,87$ $\pm 2,70$ $\pm 4,31$ $\pm 4,06$ SGrading (out of 20 points)14,5 $14,0$ $17,0$ $16,6$ NS $\pm 1,73$ $\pm 3,08$ $\pm 1,41$ $\pm 2,51$ SFat thickness (mm)2,64,04,83,6NS	(kg/lamb/d)	1,14	1,17	1,53	1,12	NS ^b
intake (MJ/lamb/d) 11,05 10,22 15,20 13,86 4,33 $\pm 2,26 \pm 1,70 \pm 0,73 \pm 2,04$ 33 Initial mass (kg) 29,25 30,74 29,75 30,46 NS $\pm 2,74 \pm 2,00 \pm 2,06 \pm 2,54$ End mass (kg) 39,33 40,62 42,08 40,54 NS $\pm 5,03 \pm 1,55 \pm 2,35 \pm 3,11$ Days 99 92 57 57 Mass gain (kg/d/lamb) 0,10 0,11 0,22 0,18 4,3>1 $\pm 0,03 \pm 0,03 \pm 0,02 \pm 0,04$ Kg feed/kg live mass-gain 10,59 9,26 5,84 6,39 1,2>4 $\pm 2,33 \pm 1,85 \pm 0,49 \pm 0,89$ Carcass mass (kg) 18,88 20,60 19,58 20,42 NS $\pm 1,75 \pm 0,96 \pm 2,44 \pm 1,96$ Dressing (%) 48,17 50,76 46,53 50,45 NS $\pm 1,87 \pm 2,70 \pm 4,31 \pm 4,06$ Grading (out of 20 points) 14,5 14,0 17,0 16,6 NS $\pm 1,73 \pm 3,08 \pm 1,41 \pm 2,51$		±0,22	±0,28	±0,10	±0,28	
$\begin{array}{c} \pm 2,26 \ \pm 1,70 \ \pm 0,73 \ \pm 2,04 \ 32 \\ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 $	Metabolizable energy					
Initial mass (kg) $29,25$ $30,74$ $29,75$ $30,46$ NS $\pm 2,74$ $\pm 2,00$ $\pm 2,06$ $\pm 2,54$ NSEnd mass (kg) $39,33$ $40,62$ $42,08$ $40,54$ NS $\pm 5,03$ $\pm 1,55$ $\pm 2,35$ $\pm 3,11$ NSDays 99 92 57 57 Mass gain $(kg/d/lamb)$ $0,10$ $0,11$ $0,22$ $0,18$ $4,3>1$ $\pm 0,03$ $\pm 0,03$ $\pm 0,02$ $\pm 0,04$ $4,3>1$ $\pm 2,33$ $\pm 1,85$ $\pm 0,49$ $\pm 0,89$ Carcass mass (kg) $18,88$ $20,60$ $19,58$ $20,42$ NS $\pm 1,75$ $\pm 0,96$ $\pm 2,44$ $\pm 1,96$ NSDressing (%) $48,17$ $50,76$ $46,53$ $50,45$ NS $\pm 1,87$ $\pm 2,70$ $\pm 4,31$ $\pm 4,06$ Grading (out of 20 points) $14,5$ $14,0$ $17,0$ $16,6$ NS $\pm 1,73$ $\pm 3,08$ $\pm 1,41$ $\pm 2,51$ Fat thickness (mm) $2,6$ $4,0$ $4,8$ $3,6$ NS	intake (MJ/lamb/d)	11,05	10,22	15,20	13,86	4,3>2
$\begin{array}{c} \pm 2,74 \\ \pm 2,00 \\ \pm 2,06 \\ \pm 2,54 \\ \end{array}$ End mass (kg) $\begin{array}{c} 39,33 \\ \pm 5,03 \\ \pm 5,03 \\ \pm 1,55 \\ \pm 2,35 \\ \pm 3,11 \\ \end{array}$ Days $\begin{array}{c} 99 \\ 92 \\ 57 \\ 57 \\ \end{array}$ Mass gain (kg/d/lamb) $\begin{array}{c} 0,10 \\ \pm 0,03 \\ \pm 0,03 \\ \pm 0,03 \\ \pm 0,02 \\ \pm 0,04 \\ \end{array}$ Kg feed/kg live mass-gain $\begin{array}{c} 10,59 \\ \pm 2,33 \\ \pm 1,85 \\ \pm 0,49 \\ \pm 2,39 \\ \pm 1,75 \\ \pm 0,96 \\ \pm 2,44 \\ \pm 1,96 \\ \end{array}$ Carcass mass (kg) $\begin{array}{c} 18,88 \\ 20,60 \\ 19,58 \\ \pm 0,49 \\ \pm 2,44 \\ \pm 1,96 \\ \end{array}$ Dressing (%) $\begin{array}{c} 48,17 \\ \pm 1,75 \\ \pm 2,70 \\ \pm 4,31 \\ \pm 4,06 \\ \end{array}$ Grading (out of 20 points) $\begin{array}{c} 14,5 \\ \pm 1,73 \\ \pm 3,08 \\ \pm 1,41 \\ \pm 2,51 \\ \end{array}$ Kg head here here here here here here here her		±2,26	±1,70	±0,73	±2,04	3>1
End mass (kg) $39,33$ $40,62$ $42,08$ $40,54$ NS $\pm 5,03$ $\pm 1,55$ $\pm 2,35$ $\pm 3,11$ Days 99 92 57 57 Mass gain (kg/d/lamb) $0,10$ $0,11$ $0,22$ $0,18$ $4,3>1$ $\pm 0,03$ $\pm 0,03$ $\pm 0,02$ $\pm 0,04$ Kg feed/kg live mass-gain $10,59$ $9,26$ $5,84$ $6,39$ $1,2>4$ $\pm 2,33$ $\pm 1,85$ $\pm 0,49$ $\pm 0,89$ Carcass mass (kg) $18,88$ $20,60$ $19,58$ $20,42$ NS $\pm 1,75$ $\pm 0,96$ $\pm 2,44$ $\pm 1,96$ Dressing (%) $48,17$ $50,76$ $46,53$ $50,45$ NS $\pm 1,87$ $\pm 2,70$ $\pm 4,31$ $\pm 4,06$ Grading (out of 20 points) $14,5$ $14,0$ $17,0$ $16,6$ NS $\pm 1,73$ $\pm 3,08$ $\pm 1,41$ $\pm 2,51$ Fat thickness (mm) $2,6$ $4,0$ $4,8$ $3,6$ NS	Initial mass (kg)	29,25	30,74	29,75	30,46	NS
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		±2,74	±2,00	±2,06	±2,54	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	End mass (kg)	39,33	40,62	42,08	40,54	NS
Mass gain $(kg/d/lamb)$ $0,10$ $0,11$ $0,22$ $0,18$ $4,3>1$ $\pm 0,03$ $\pm 0,03$ $\pm 0,02$ $\pm 0,04$ $4,3>1$ Kg feed/kg live $\pm 2,33$ $\pm 1,85$ $\pm 0,49$ $\pm 0,89$ Carcass mass (kg) 18,88 20,60 19,58 20,42 NS $\pm 1,75$ $\pm 0,96$ $\pm 2,44$ $\pm 1,96$ Dressing (%) 48,17 50,76 46,53 50,45 NS $\pm 1,87$ $\pm 2,70$ $\pm 4,31$ $\pm 4,06$ Grading (out of 20 points) 14,5 14,0 17,0 16,6 NS $\pm 1,73$ $\pm 3,08$ $\pm 1,41$ $\pm 2,51$ Fat thickness (mm) 2,6 4,0 4,8 3,6 NS		±5,03	±1,55	±2,35	±3,11	
$\begin{array}{c} (kg/d/lamb) & 0,10 & 0,11 & 0,22 & 0,18 & 4,3>1 \\ \pm 0,03 & \pm 0,03 & \pm 0,02 & \pm 0,04 \\ \hline kg \ feed/kg \ live \\ mass-gain & 10,59 & 9,26 & 5,84 & 6,39 & 1,2>4 \\ \pm 2,33 & \pm 1,85 & \pm 0,49 & \pm 0,89 \\ \hline Carcass \ mass \ (kg) & 18,88 & 20,60 & 19,58 & 20,42 & NS \\ \pm 1,75 & \pm 0,96 & \pm 2,44 & \pm 1,96 \\ \hline Dressing \ (\%) & 48,17 & 50,76 & 46,53 & 50,45 & NS \\ \pm 1,87 & \pm 2,70 & \pm 4,31 & \pm 4,06 \\ \hline Grading \ (out \ of \\ 20 \ points) & 14,5 & 14,0 & 17,0 & 16,6 & NS \\ \pm 1,73 & \pm 3,08 & \pm 1,41 & \pm 2,51 \\ \hline Fat \ thickness \ (mm) & 2,6 & 4,0 & 4,8 & 3,6 & NS \\ \end{array}$	Days	99	92	57	57	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Mass gain					
Kg feed/kg live mass-gain10,599,265,846,391,2>4 $\pm 2,33$ $\pm 1,85$ $\pm 0,49$ $\pm 0,89$ Carcass mass (kg)18,8820,6019,5820,42NS $\pm 1,75$ $\pm 0,96$ $\pm 2,44$ $\pm 1,96$ Dressing (%)48,1750,7646,5350,45NS $\pm 1,87$ $\pm 2,70$ $\pm 4,31$ $\pm 4,06$ Grading (out of 20 points)14,514,017,016,6NS $\pm 1,73$ $\pm 3,08$ $\pm 1,41$ $\pm 2,51$ Fat thickness (mm)2,64,04,83,6NS	(kg/d/lamb)	0,10	0,11	0,22	0,18	4,3>1,2
mass-gain10,599,265,846,391,2>4 $\pm 2,33$ $\pm 1,85$ $\pm 0,49$ $\pm 0,89$ 1Carcass mass (kg)18,8820,6019,5820,42NS $\pm 1,75$ $\pm 0,96$ $\pm 2,44$ $\pm 1,96$ Dressing (%)48,1750,7646,5350,45NS $\pm 1,87$ $\pm 2,70$ $\pm 4,31$ $\pm 4,06$ Grading (out of20 points)14,514,017,016,6NS $\pm 1,73$ $\pm 3,08$ $\pm 1,41$ $\pm 2,51$ Fat thickness (mm)2,64,04,83,6NS		±0,03	±0,03	±0,02	±0,04	
$\begin{array}{c} \pm 2,33 \\ \pm 1,85 \\ \pm 0,49 \\ \pm 0,89 \\ \end{array}$ Carcass mass (kg) 18,88 20,60 19,58 20,42 NS $\begin{array}{c} \pm 1,75 \\ \pm 0,96 \\ \pm 2,44 \\ \pm 1,96 \\ \end{array}$ Dressing (%) 48,17 50,76 46,53 50,45 NS $\begin{array}{c} \pm 1,87 \\ \pm 2,70 \\ \pm 4,31 \\ \pm 4,06 \\ \end{array}$ Grading (out of 20 points) 14,5 14,0 17,0 16,6 NS $\begin{array}{c} \pm 1,73 \\ \pm 3,08 \\ \pm 1,41 \\ \pm 2,51 \\ \end{array}$ Fat thickness (mm) 2,6 4,0 4,8 3,6 NS	Kg feed/kg live					
Carcass mass (kg)18,8820,6019,5820,42NS $\pm 1,75$ $\pm 0,96$ $\pm 2,44$ $\pm 1,96$ Dressing (%) $48,17$ $50,76$ $46,53$ $50,45$ NS $\pm 1,87$ $\pm 2,70$ $\pm 4,31$ $\pm 4,06$ Grading (out of20 points) $14,5$ $14,0$ $17,0$ $16,6$ NS $\pm 1,73$ $\pm 3,08$ $\pm 1,41$ $\pm 2,51$ Fat thickness (mm) $2,6$ $4,0$ $4,8$ $3,6$ NS	mass-gain	10,59	9,26	5,84	6,39	1,2>4,3
$\begin{array}{c} \pm 1.75 \\ \pm 0.96 \\ \pm 2.44 \\ \pm 1.96 \\ \end{array}$ Dressing (%) $\begin{array}{c} 48,17 \\ \pm 1.87 \\ \pm 2.70 \\ \pm 4.31 \\ \pm 4.06 \\ \end{array}$ Grading (out of 20 points) $\begin{array}{c} 14,5 \\ \pm 1.73 \\ \pm 3.08 \\ \pm 1.41 \\ \pm 2.51 \\ \end{array}$ Fat thickness (mm) $\begin{array}{c} 2,6 \\ 4,0 \\ 4,8 \\ 3,6 \\ \end{array}$ NS		±2,33	±1,85	±0,49	±0,89	
Dressing (%) $48,17$ $50,76$ $46,53$ $50,45$ NS $\pm 1,87$ $\pm 2,70$ $\pm 4,31$ $\pm 4,06$ Grading (out of20 points)14,514,017,016,6NS $\pm 1,73$ $\pm 3,08$ $\pm 1,41$ $\pm 2,51$ Fat thickness (mm)2,64,04,83,6NS	Carcass mass (kg)	18,88	20,60	19,58	20,42	NS
$\begin{array}{c} \pm 1,87 \pm 2,70 \pm 4,31 \pm 4,06 \\ \\ \text{Grading (out of} \\ 20 \text{ points)} & 14,5 14,0 17,0 16,6 \text{NS} \\ \pm 1,73 \pm 3,08 \pm 1,41 \pm 2,51 \\ \\ \text{Fat thickness (mm)} & 2,6 4,0 4,8 3,6 \text{NS} \end{array}$		±1,75	±0,96	±2,44	±1,96	
Grading (out of20 points)14,514,017,016,6NS $\pm 1,73$ $\pm 3,08$ $\pm 1,41$ $\pm 2,51$ Fat thickness (mm)2,64,04,83,6NS	Dressing (%)	48,17	50,76	46,53	50,45	NS
20 points) 14,5 14,0 17,0 16,6 NS $\pm 1,73 \pm 3,08 \pm 1,41 \pm 2,51$ Fat thickness (mm) 2,6 4,0 4,8 3,6 NS	• • •	±1,87	±2,70	±4,31	±4,06	
$\pm 1,73 \pm 3,08 \pm 1,41 \pm 2,51$ Fat thickness (mm) 2,6 4,0 4,8 3,6 NS	Grading (out of					
Fat thickness (mm) 2,6 4,0 4,8 3,6 NS	20 points)	14,5	14,0	17,0	16,6	NS
		±1,73	±3,08	±1,41	±2,51	
± 1.5 ± 1.4 ± 1.2 ± 1.9	Fat thickness (mm)	2,6	4,0	4,8	3,6	NS
		±1,5	±1,4	±1,2	±1,9	

Table 3 Intake, gain and carcass data

^a Percentage T. camphoratus indicated in brackets.

^b Non-significant; $^{\circ} P < 0.05$.

References

- AOAC, 1965. Official methods of analysis (10th edn.). Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Washington, DC.
- BONSMA, J.C., 1942. Nuttige bosveldse bome en struike. Boerd. S. Afr. 17, 226.
- COPPOCK, C.E., 1985. Energy nutrition and metabolism of the lactating dairy cow. J. Dairy Sci. 68, 3403.
- DIXON, R.M., 1986. Effects of dietary concentrates on rumen digestion of fibrous feedstuffs. Anim. Fd. Sci. Technol. 14, 193.
- DONALDSON, C.H., NIEMANN, P.J. & SWART, J.A., 1968. The utilization and feeding value of milled woody plant species. Proc. Grassld. Soc. Sth. Afr. 3, 75.
- GIBSON, J.P., 1984. The effects of frequency of feeding on milk production of dairy cattle: An analysis of published results. *Anim. Prod.* 38, 181.
- HYND, P.I., 1984. Effects of starch fermentation products on roughage digestion. J. agric. Sci., Camb. 103, 469.
- KOTZE, T.J., 1965. Black-tom proves it's worth. Fmg. S. Afr. 41, 13.

- LÜDEMANN, F., 1966. Utilisation of trees and inferior roughages during droughts. *The Meat Industry*, July-September, 23.
- MILLER, B.G. & MUNTIFERING, R.B., 1985. Effect of forage : concentrate on kinetics of forage fibre digestion in vivo. J. Dairy Sci. 68, 40.
- NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, 1985. Nurient requirements of sheep. National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC.
- SHRIVER, B.J., HOOVER, W.H., SARGENT, J.B., CRAWFORD, R.C. & THAYNE, W.V., 1986. Fermentation of high concentrate diet as affected by ruminal pH and digesta flow. J. Dairy Sci. 69, 413.
- STEELE, G.D. & TORRIE, J.H., 1960. Principles and procedures of statistics. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- VAN SCHALKWYK, L.P., 1975. Die benutting van voermengsels met wisselende hoeveelhede Mopaniebos-voer vir die droogtevoer van beeste. M.Sc.(Agric.)-verhandeling, Universiteit van die Oranje-Vrystaat.
- VAN SOEST, P.J., 1963. Use of detergents in the analysis of fibrous feeds. II. A rapid method for the determination of fibre and lignin. J. Assoc. Off. anal. Chem. 46, 829.
- VAN SOEST, P.J., 1983. Nutrition ecology of the ruminant (2nd edn.). Corvallis, Oregon. O&E Books Inc.
- VAN SOEST, P.J. & WINE, R.H., 1967. Use of detergents in the analysis of fibrous feeds. IV. Determination of plant cell wall constituents. J. Assoc. Off. anal. Chem. 50, 50.