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#### Abstract

A repository block of ornamental crabapples containing 87 cultivars was left unsprayed and evaluated for resistance to the colding moth, Laspeyresia pomonella (L.). Although there were considerable differences in susceptibility, none of the cultivars was resistant to codling moth attack. A number of trees escaped injury from the first generation, but all showed entries from the second generation in August.


## INTRODUCTION

Crabapples have long been known as hosts of the codling moth, Laspeyresia pomonella (L.) (Buckhurst 1921; Quist and Ward 1976).

Recent developments in codling moth control by the sterility method and the possibility of eradication (Proverbs 1971) makes reinfestation from hosts such as crabapples an important factor since they are commonly used on streets and in gardens as ornamentals. A crabapple cultivar resistant to codling moth would be desirable as an ornamental in apple producing areas and would greatly reduce an important source of infestation. Cutwright and Morrison (1935) have discussed varietal susceptibility of apples to codling moth and de Sarasola (1976) reported an apple cultivar, resistant to codling moth, which was developed from crabapple.

The Research Station, Summerland, maintains a crabapple repository containing 87 cultivars and this paper reports on their susceptibility to attack by the codling moth.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The crabapple cultivar orchard is a 2.4 m x 2.4 m planting with 87 cultivars randomly distributed. One side adjoins a block of young apple trees and the other three sides face open fields. The orchard receives an annual routine coding moth spray, but no sprays were applied in 1979. Two sex pheromone traps were installed in the orchard to monitor codling moth populations, and moths were recorded and re moved from the traps weekly. During the season, a total of 62 first generation males and 85 second generation males were captured. This level was considered high enough to ensure an infestation.

It was recognized from the outset that there would be differences in susceptibility to codling moth attack by the different cultivars due to a number of factors. These included time and density of fruit set, fruit size, relative firmness

[^0]of fruit, fruit color, and thickness of epidermis. Since we were looking for complete resistance to codling moth, any cultivar that showed infested fruit from either first or second generation codling moth was rated as susceptible. It was not possible to secure data on relative susceptibility of the cultivars because each cultivar was represented by only one tree, consequently there were no replicates. As the crabapple fruits were either purple or green, the role of these two colors in susceptibility was also evaluated.

The trees were carefully examined for codling moth entries at 2 periods during the season, the first, after 10 July for first generation entries and the second, after 20 August for second generation entries. The number of fruit per tree were quite variable, therefore we searched for entries for 30 minutes on each tree, from the ground and from a ladder. The number of entries were recorded for each cultivar and a sample of infested fruit was collected from each tree and dissected to ensure that codling moth larvae were present in the infested crabapples.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The crabapple cultivars and the number of codling moth entries are summarized in Table 1. None of the 87 cultivars showed resistance to codling moth although there was considerable variation in the number of entries. A few of the cultivars failed to set fruit and two trees (M. Scheideckeri and Red Jade) showed no larval entries, but had been damaged by cultivating equipment and the tree limbs were prostate on the ground. Several cultivars had no first brood entries and most of these had either very small fruit or very hard fruit. None of the cultivars escaped injury from the second generation.

Color did not play a role in susceptibility, as entries in red-purple cultivars were not significantly different at the 5 percent level from green varieties (one-tail T test $\mathrm{P}<0.05$ ).

Since none of 87 crabapple cultivars was resistant to codling moth, the chance of finding
a resistant cultivar seems remote. Some of the crabapples that had relatively few entries
might be more vulnerable had they not been in proximity to apparently preferred cultivars.

TABLE 1. Susceptibility of crabapples to attack by the codling moth.

| Variety | Fruit color | Fruit set | Codling moth entries |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | generation $1^{\text {a }}$ | generation $2^{\text {b }}$ |
| M. Hillieri | green | heavy | 0 | 6 |
| Mary Currelly | purple | medium | 5 | 6 |
| Dolgo | green | heavy | 3 | 7 |
| Almey | purple | medium | 6 | 9 |
| M. Sargentii | green | medium | 1 | 13 |
| Makamik | purple | medium | 1 | 12 |
| Sissipuk | purple | medium | 0 | 7 |
| M. purpurea Lemoinei | purple | medium | 1 | 2 |
| Ferril's Crimson | purple | medium | 2 | 3 |
| Wisley | purple | medium | 3 | 2 |
| Geneva | purple | 1ight | 0 | 2 |
| Van Eseltine | no fruit | - | - | - |
| Amisk | purple | medium | 1 | 8 |
| Sundog | purple | medium | 1 | 24 |
| Tomiko | no fruit | - | - | - |
| $\underline{M}$. purpurea Aldenhamensis | purple | light | 2 | 4 |
| Prairie Rose | green | light | 0 | 2 |
| Cowichan | purple | heavy | 2 | 26 |
| M. Scheideckeri ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | green | medium | 0 | 0 |
| Dorothea | green | medium | 2 | 9 |
| Hopa | purple | 1ight | 1 | 8 |
| M. floribunda rosea | purple | medium | 2 | 16 |
| M. spectabilis 33-15 | green | heavy | 0 |  |
| Garnet 33-28 | green | light | 0 | 8 |
| M. fusca 33-30 | purple | medium | , | 6 |
| M. transitoria 33-17 | green | medium | 7 | 42 |
| $\frac{M}{M}$. purpurea | purple | medium | 3 | 71 |
| M. spectabilis plena | green | light | 1 | 11 |
| M. robusta persicifolia | green | medium | 8 | 74 |
| $\frac{M}{M}$. $\frac{\text { brevipes }}{\text { robusta }}$ | green | medium | 3 | 63 |
| M. robusta fastigiata | green | medium | 0 |  |
| Profusion | purple | heavy | 0 | 11 |
| Kingsmere | purple | medium | 2 |  |
| Oekonomierat Echtermeyer | green | heavy | 2 | 19 |
| Cheals Crimson | green | heavy | 7 | 31 |
| Purple Wave | purple | medium | 0 | 3 |
| Irene | green | medium | 9 | 45 |
| M. Columbia | green | heavy | 3 | 47 |
| M. baccata mandshurica | purple | heavy | 1 | 2 |
| M. spectabilis 33-33 | green | heavy | 0 | 11 |
| M. spectabilis Riversii | green | heavy | 9 | 105 |
| M. denticulata | green | medium | 8 | 103 |
| M. Soulardii | green | medium | 5 | 119 |
| M. micromalus | no fruit | - | - | - |
| Wabiskaw | purple | medium | 3 | 25 |
| M. pumila paradisiaca <br> foleus aureus | green | heavy | 0 | 5 |
| Prince George's | green | heavy | 3 | 76 |
| Linda | green | heavy | 0 | 37 |
| Jay Darling | purple | 1ight | 0 | 5 |
| M. ioensis | green | light | 2 | 8 |


| Variety | Fruit color | Fruit set | Codling moth entries |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | generation $1^{\text {a }}$ | generation $2^{\text {b }}$ |
| Yellow Siberian | green | medium | 11 | 77 |
| Oporto | purple | heavy | 1 | 26 |
| M. sylvestris plena | green | medium | 0 | 35 |
| M. sylvestris | green | medium | 14 | 169 |
| M. prunifolia macrocarpa | green | medium | 15 | 187 |
| M. robusta erecta | green | medium | 2 | 36 |
| Kings Crab | green | $1 i g h t$ | 0 | 13 |
| Marshall Oyama | green | heavy | 10 | 116 |
| Wynema | green | medium | 2 | 137 |
| Liset | purple | heavy | 3 | 13 |
| Pattie | green | heavy | 10 | 205 |
| Patricia | purple | light | 16 | 4 |
| Evelyn | purple | 1ight | 0 | 2 |
| Flame | green | heavy | 2 | 17 |
| Veitch's Scarlet | no fruit | - | - | - |
| Crimson Brilliant | purple | heavy | 6 | 24 |
| Sutherland | purple | medium | 0 | 3 |
| Strathmore | purple | light | 4 | 64 |
| Red Silver | purple | light | 0 | 3 |
| Stirling Apple | green | medium | 2 | 36 |
| Selkirk | purple | heavy | 13 | 52 |
| Garry | purple | medium | 11 | 7 |
| M. coronoria Charlottae | no fruit |  | - | - |
| Leslie | purple | medium | 3 | 8 |
| Jubilee | purple | medium | 5 | 34 |
| Red Jade ${ }^{\text {C }}$ | purple | medium | 0 | 0 |
| 55-71080 | purple | light | 0 | 6 |
| 55-62-117 | purple | medium | 0 | 44 |
| 55-62-114 | purple | medium | 0 | 43 |
| 55-74-02 | green | medium | 5 | 35 |
| 55-58-116 | purple | heavy | 0 | 37 |
| Exzellenz Thiel | no fruit | - | 1 | - |
| 31-0-91; 59-82-01 | green | medium | 1 | 4 |
| 30-8-65; 55-61-06 | green | heavy | 3 | 9 |
| no name | green | light | 4 | 9 |
| no name | green | 1ight | 1 | 7 |
| Royalty | no fruit | - | - | - |

$a_{\text {Examined }}$ in the field starting July 10.
$\mathrm{b}_{\text {Examined }}$ in the field starting Aug. 20.
${ }^{C_{\text {Tree }}}$ damaged, $1 i \mathrm{mbs}$ prostrate on ground.
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