STUDY OF IMPROVED IRRIGATION MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUE ON SUGAR CANE AT SHAH KOT AND NIAZ BIEG SUB-PROJECT

*Mohammad Asif, **M. Rasheed, ***Abdul Khaliq, M. A. Bandasha and ****M. R. Babar

*Command Water Management Project Punjab, Lahore

** Agricultural Extension Department, Punjab

Dept. of Agronomy, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad.

****On Farm Water Management Programme, Punjab.

Effect of a new planting technique i.e. planting sugarcanc 90 cm apart double row strips, on cane yield, intercropping and sowing of irrigation water was studied. Experiment was conducted at Shahkot and Lahore sites. Turnip, garlic and cauliflower were intercropped. After the harvest of intercrops 49 furrows of 88 cm width each were made. There was 20-28% saving in irrigation water and 14-60% increase in cane yield as compared with traditional method of planting sugarcane in 60 cm apart single rows. Intercropping of garlic in 90 cm apart double row strip gave the highest net income of Rs. 57854 ha".

INTRODUCTION

Sugareane (Sacchnrium officinarum) is one of major cash crops after cotton and rice in Pakistan. But our yields are much lower than worlds averages. Shortage of irrigation water is one of the major constraints for sugarcane production in the country. It is estimated about 1.25-1.50 acre inches of water passes through the cane plant to produce one tonne of millable cane (Hurnbert, 1968).

Irrigation system in Pakistan operates to supply less than 70% crop water demand Food, (Ministry of Agriculture Cooperatives, 1984). Only few tracts have the privilege of sweet ground water, where tubewells compensate the irrigation. Traditional irrigation methods (Flooding) results in poor water application efficiencies combined with inequity of water supply further aggravate the situation. Efficient utilization of available supplies is the only important way to bridge the gap of water deficiency. One way is to modify the existing conventional methods of planting crops in such a systematic way that it not only permit intercropping of short duration

crops but saves a considerable amount of water.

Therefore demonstration of water saving techniques (planting sugarcane in 90 cm strips) in comparison with traditional method of planting sugarcane 60 cm apart single row strip was tried at the selected farms at tails of Shahkot and Niaz Bieg distributries.

METHODOLOGY

The study was carried out in farmer's field during 1990-91. Sugarcane was planted in 90 cm apart double row strips in comparison with traditional 60 cm apart single row strip. Sugareane variety BF 162 was sown. Two budded double sets were placed in each furrow end to cnd. Fertilizer at the rate of 69, 46, 46 kg NPK was incorporated in furrows of double row strips and same quantity of NPK per acre was broadcasted in traditional 60 cm apart method. All other cultural practices were kept uniform and normal. Garlic, cauliflower and turnip were intercropped in 90 cm apart double row strips. After harvesting the intercrop, 48

wide furrow/acre, 88 cm of width were constructed in between *the* strips. Data on crop yield, intercrop yield and water saving was *collected* to determine *the water* application efficiency, net economic return and feasibility of intercropping on small farmer's field at *tail* areas.

Table 1:

rural Development (1990) and chaudhry and Qureshi (199 I): ReSults in Table HI further indicated that yields of sugarcane was improved from 14 to 60% in 90 cm apart double row planting as compared to 60 cm apart single row. These results are in accordance with the findings of Hag (J₁985)

Name of Farm	Village	Treatments	Yield inter-	Inter-Crop	Yield in tons/ha	
			crop Kg/acre		Y feld in tons/na	No. of
Mohammad Latif	100.IRB.	Single row, planting S.cane alone Paired	Cane 28000	-	69.16 0.00	ion
Rai Aurangzeb		row, intercropped with Garlic	32000	24	79.04 2.37	11
	104/R.B.	Single row, planting S. cane alone Paired row,	16000 25600	-	39.52	10
Asghr Ali	107/R B	without intercr£EEipl; Single row, planting S. cane alone paired row,	16000	-	63.23	10
Sabir Hussain	100/R.B.	intercroppped with turn!E-	16000	2000	39.52	9
Rana. Ashraf	102/R.B.	cane alone Paired row, intercrfEfed cauliflower Single row, planting S.	18000 33200	4500	44.46 - 82 Rs. 4500	12
Akbar Ali	Lahore Bingina	cane alone paired intercr~ed tun~ Single row, planting S.	26000	5000	4.46 - 4.22 Rs 5000	11
	Bilgilla	eane alone paired row, intercr<:E£ed cauliflower	69600	2000	50,42 _ 7J.9IRs.2500	15

The data (Table I) revealed that the sugarcane yield in 90 cm double row planting increased at almost all locations except IO~R, Shahkot. Table II shows the number of irrigations, time taken by individual irrigation and total seasonal time of irrigation applied to flat and furrows in 90 cm double row planting. The estimated water saving in 90 cm double row furrows is presented in Table III ranging from 20% to 28% of time needed under flat (60 cm apart single row) irrigations. The results corroborate with those of Associates in

and Nazir et al. (J 988). Randhawa et al. (J 993) also reported that sugarcane planted in 90 cm double row strips gave significantly higher cane yield. The perusal of Table I further indicates that in addition to intercropping, 90 cm apart double row strips gave highest yield of sugarcane about 1720 maunds at Lahore and 830 maunds at Shahkot tails area facing acute shortage of irrigation water.

The economic analysis (Table IV) indicated *that* sugarcane planted in 90 cm apart double row strips gave sUbstantially higher net income than traditional single row 60 cm apart. The economic analysis further revealed *that* sugarcane intercropped with garlic gave the

Table II Comparison of Irrigation Water applied under Flat and Paired Row

Irrigation Numbers		Site Numbers												
		I		2		3		4		5		6		
		115	115	119	120	119	120	105	104	106	107	90	90	
	2	90	90	90	90	100	105	90	92	98	100	80	81	
		80	80	84	45	102	104	85	87	90	91	85	80	
Earthing up		80	81	82	60	100	81	90	75	85	70	75	59	
intercrop 5		85	75	90	50	107	75	70	45	89	50	80	50	
(;	90	50	80	60			70	71	90	45	82	60	
-		80	40	85	45	95	69	75	40	80	50	75	45	
		88	49	80	49	100	50	70	48	75	46	80	50	
		75	45	90	50	95	48	75	40	80	50	75	45	
1)	85	50	89	49			80	50	80	60	78	46	
1		90	45					80	41	90	45	80	50	
1:	2		}				A	78	40			NA	NA	
1.	3											82	50	
1												80	42	
1.	5									20.00		80	45	
Total Time: (Min)		958	no	889	617	652	818	968	739	969	712	1127	792	
Mins/Irrigations /Acre	8	7.09	65.45	88.9	61,.7	90.89	7244	30.67	61, 58	88.09	64.72	75.13	52.8	

FLAT: Tradition 60 cm apart single row Paired row: 90 cm apart double row (Furrows)

Table III Comparison of Irrigation Technique and yield as affected by Irrigation technique

Irrigation Treatments	SI		52		53		54		S5		56	
	Flat	Furrow	Flat	FUITOW								
Time Applied (Min/Irr./Acre)	87	65	88	65	102	81.5	80	59	88	64	80	57
Saving (% over Flat)	0.0	25.2	0.0	26.1	0.0	20.5	0.0	26.0	0.0	27.2	0.0	28.0
Yield												
Yield/Acre	700	800	400	640	400	400	450	830	450	650	132 0	1740
Yield increase (percentage of Flat)	0.0	14.28	0.00	60.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	84.40	0.0	44.40	0.0	31.80

Flat: 60 cm apart single row strip

Furrow: 90 cq1 apart double row strips

Name of	Treatme	Yield in	tons/ha	Income in	n Rs.∕ha	Gross	Cost Rs/ha					
Farm	nts	Sugar	inter-	S. cane	intercrop		S. cane	intercrop	Total cost	Net Income		
		cane	(roD	293930		29393.0	96940)	-	9694.05	19698.9)		
M. Latif	Single row planting Paired row	69.16 79.04	2.37	33)!)200	37920.00	71920.00	%94Q)	3963.00	136)705	578)49)		
<u> </u>	Single	39)2		1679600	_	1679600	16940)		1(,94.0)	91(19)		
Rai Aurang zeb	row planting Paired row	6323	-	26872.7)	¥	26872.7)	7694.0)	-	-	1917870		
	planting	3952		16796.00	_	16796.00	6940.0	-	6940.00	985600		
Asghar AIi	Single row planting Paired row	3952	1.{JR	16796.00	9405.00	2620100	694000	2000.00	694000	1726100		
	planning	44,46		188950	-	18895.50	890100	-	890100	999451		
Sabi r Hussain	Single row planting Paired row planting	82.00	4)00.0	34850.00	4500.00	39350.00	890100	209500	10996.00	283)400		
				40005.50		18895,50	9895.00		989500	900050		
Runa Ashraf	Single row planting Paired row planting	64.22	5000.0	18895.50 2729350)000.00	3229350	989500	240000	12295.00	19998.50		
 	Single	130,42		55428.50	-	55428.50	1099500	11 -	10995.00	4443.1.)0		
Akhar Ali	row planting Paired row planting	17191	25000	73(617)7	250000	10995.00	210000	2100.00	1309500	6246675		

highest net return (Rs. 57854) per hectare at tail area followed by sugarcane intercropped with caulitlower (Rs. 28354). The highest net return of Rs. 62466 at Niaz Bieg indicates the highest potential of crop can be harvested by planting crop in 90 cm apart paired row strips if water resources are not limited. It may therefore be concluded from the results presented above.

1) That planting sugarcane at 90 cm apart double row strips is most

suitable for small farmers having limited soil and water resources.

 It permits systematic planting and handling of intercrop and thus gave higher net income per unit.

REFERENCES

Associates in Rural Development. 1990.

Fourteenth. Fifteenth and Sixteenth
Quarterly Progress Reports,

- ISM/Command Water Management Project.
- Chaudhry, M.R. and A.S. Qureshi. 199 I.
 Irrigation Techniques to improve
 Application Efficiency and Crop Yield,
 Journal of Drainage and Reclamation.
 Vol. 3, No. I January-June, 1991,
 DRIP, Tandojam.
- Humbert, R.P. 1968. The growing of sugarcane. Elsevier Publishing Co. Inc. Amsterdam, New York.
- Haq. LU. 1985. Studies on the feasibility and productive efficiency of the newly designed multi-row strips planting geometry facilitating intercropping in sugarcane. M.Sc. (Agri. Thesis) Deptt.. Agron. Univ. Agri., Faisalabad.
- Ministry of Food, Agriculture Cooperation. 1984. Pakistan on Farm Water

- Management Project Report, Govt.. of Pakistan, Islamabad.
- Malik, K.B., 1990. Irrigation requirements for cane crop. Paper read in the 25th Proceedings, Pakistan Society of Sugar Technologist, Rawalpindi, 21-23 July, 1990.
- Nazir, M.S., LA. Faqcer, G. Ali, R. Ahmad and T. Mahmood. 1988. Studies on planting and intercropping in autumn sugarcane. Gomal Univ. J. Res. 8(1-2): 57-64.
- Randhawa, M.A., S.A. Khan, K.M. Chaudhry, M.S. Nazir and M.Y. Khan. 1993. Effect of planting technique on the yield and quality of autumn sugarcane at different plant populations. Pak.. J. Agri. Sci., 30(I): 26-29.