In: Y. Hiratsuka, J. K. Samoil, P. V. Blenis, P. E. Crane, and B. L. Laishley, editors. 1991. Rusts of Pine. Proc. 3rd IUFRO Rusts of Pine Working Party Conference, Sept. 18-22, 1989, Banff, Alberta. For. Can, Northwest Reg., North. For. Cent., Edmonton, Alberta. Inf. Rep. NOR-X-317. 408 p.

THE EFFECT OF AGE ON THE SUSCEPTIBILITY TO BLISTER RUST OF WESTERN WHITE PINE SEEDLINGS

R.S. Hunt

Pacific Forestry Centre Forestry Canada, Pacific and Yukon Region Victoria, British Columbia, Canada

INTRODUCTION

In British Columbia we have initiated a program to select western white pines (*Pinus monticola* D. Don.) that are resistant to white pine blister rust (*Cronartium ribicola* J.C. Fischer) (Meagher and Hunt 1986). Our program screens seedlings; it is similar to the programs in the U.S. Forest Service (Bingham 1983; Hunt 1988). Seedlings are 2 years old when inoculated, because younger *P. strobus* L. seedlings are highly susceptible (Clinton and McCormick 1919; York and Snell 1922) and it is believed that *P. monticola* behaves similarly (Bingham 1983). Likewise, if *P. strobus* is old when tested, it appears highly resistant compared to seedlings (Patton 1961, 1967). It is then possible that scions from highly resistant older *P. monticola* trees may produce very susceptible offspring. The objective in this study was to determine if *P. monticola* seedlings become more resistant with age and whether highly resistant older trees (screened as clones) produce susceptible offspring.

METHODS

In the first test, three seedlots from three different geographic areas (Sooke, Vancouver Island--1 tree; Barriére, Kamloops Forest Region--5 trees (pooled); and Kaslo, Nelson Forest Region--5 trees (pooled)) were grown for 4 successive years and then inoculated (Hunt 1988) at the same time. In the second test, open-pollinated seed was gathered from two highly resistant clones and a susceptible clone (Hunt and Meagher 1989). Infection incidence (needle spots and stem cankers) in offspring (average 51 individuals per seedlot) from these clones were compared to incidence in offspring from candidate trees, including a highly cankered control, and resistant Idaho F_2 (Bingham 1983), all inoculated at the same time.

RESULTS

Older seedlings averaged fewer spots per tree (Table 1) and had fewer trees with many spots compared to younger seedlings of the same seedlots. The 1-year-old seedlings had the fewest spots, because they were small targets, but on a per-metre basis they had 15-70 times as many spots as the older seedlings (Table 1). Spots were more frequent on the current foliage than on older foliage, and stem cankers originated only from spots on current foliage. Cankers were less frequent on 4-year-old seedlings than on younger seedlings.

The susceptible clone (A1) produced more cankered offspring than all other seedlots tested (Table 2). One of the resistant clones (G8) produced about as many spotted and cankered offspring as a control (C) candidate, while the other was about as resistant as Idaho F_2 stock (Table 2).

287

32767.

Age (yr)	Sample size	Mean spots/tree	Mean ^a spots/m	Trees spotted (%)	Trees cankered (%)
1	113	8.7	11.70	100	100 ^b
2	215	30.2	0.67	100	98
3	229	23.8	0.55	99	98
4	179	11.1	0.16	92	88

Table 1. Blister rust spot and canker incidence in three seedlots (pooled) inoculated in 1987 at different ages

^a Crown sizes of all trees were recorded, and two representative seedlings of ages 2, 3, and 4 years had the needles counted and measured to obtain a summed needle length representative for the age class. Needles were counted on all 1-year-old seedlings and summed for the seedlot, then seedlots were averaged.

^b Most trees cankered about 5 months sooner than older seedlings.

Seed parent	Spots/seedling (mean)	Trees cankered after 2 years (%)	
s-A1	8.7	97	
48	7.4	93	
49	6.7	90	
60	13.9	89	
65	8.7	87	
62	6.5	85	
r-G8	8.5	83	
С	8.7	81	
48	8.7	79	
65	9.4	79	
r-B640	6.9	74	
F2	4.3	73	

Table 2.Blister-rust incidence in offspring from resistant (r) and susceptible (s)
clones, candidate trees, and Idaho F_2 orchard seed

DISCUSSION

Four-year-old seedlings become resistant to blister rust, showing fewer spots and cankers than their younger siblings. Cankering of 2- and 3-year-old seedlings was similar, although the latter had fewer spots (Table 1). One-year-old seedlings were very small targets, but developed relatively many more spots and cankers earlier than older seedlings. Like eastern white pine (Clinton and McCormick 1919; York and Snell 1922), 1-year-old seedlings are highly susceptible. The optimal age for rigorously screening seedlings is 2-3 years. For use in field sites of low-inoculum-density, perhaps older seedlings could be screened.

Since cankers were associated only with spots on current foliage, it must be concluded that under our inoculation conditions, all foliage except the current foliage is resistant to blister rust. This is contrary to observations of western white pine by Lachmund (1933) and eastern white pine by Hirt (1936, 1938) and to previous inoculation results of western white pine (Pierson and Buchanan 1938) where current needles are considered the most resistant. Only Snell (1936) and Patton (1961) report that current needles are most susceptible. More field inoculations are needed to confirm the high susceptibility of current needles and that cankers predominately originate from these needles; otherwise, results from screening seedlings may be an artifact of test conditions and not accurately reflect the field situation.

Resistant clones derived from screening old material as clones may produce susceptible offspring (Table 2); thus, this material is not suitable for seed orchards unless their offspring also indicate resistance.

REFERENCES

- Bingham, R.T. 1983. Blister rust resistant western white pine for the Inland Empire. USDA For. Serv., Intermt. For. Range Exp. Stn., Ogden, Utah. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-146.
- Clinton, G.P.; McCormick, F.A. 1919. Infection experiments of *Pinus strobus* with *Cronartium ribicola*. Conn. Agric. Exp. Sta. Bull. 214:428-459.
- Hirt, R.R. 1936. The progress of blister rust in planted northern white pine. J. For. 34:506-511.
- Hirt, R.R. 1938. Relation of stomata to infection of Pinus strobus by Cronartium ribicola. Phytopathology 28:180-190.
- Hunt, R.S. 1988. White pine improvement in British Columbia. Pages 32-36 in R.S. Hunt, compiler. Proc. Western White Pine Management Symp., May 2-5, 1988, Nakusp, B.C. Environ. Can., Can. For. Serv., Pac. For. Cent., Victoria, B.C.
- Hunt, R.S.; Meagher, M.D. 1989. Incidence of blister rust on "resistant" white pine (*Pinus monticola* and *P. strobus*) in coastal British Columbia. Can. J. Plant Pathol. (In press.)
- Lachmund, H.G. 1933. Resistance of the current season's shoots of *Pinus monticola* to infection by *Cronartium ribicola*. Phytopathology 23:917-922.
- Meagher, M.D.; Hunt, R.S. 1986. Western white pine improvement program for British Columbia. Proc. Can. Tree Improv. Assoc. 20(1):225-226.
- Patton, R.F. 1961. The effect of age upon susceptibility of eastern white pine to infection by *Cronartium ribicola*. Phytopathology 51:429-434.

Patton, R.F. 1967. Factors in white pine blister rust resistance. Int. Union For. Res. Organ. 3:876-890.

- Pierson, R.K.; Buchanan, T.S. 1938. Susceptibility of needles of different ages on *Pinus monticola* seedlings to *Cronartium ribicola* infection. Phytopathology 28:833-839.
- Snell, W.H. 1936. The relation of the age of needles of *Pinus strobus* to infection by *Cronartium ribicola*. Phytopathology 26:1074-1080.
- York, H.H.; Snell, W.H. 1922. Experiments in the infection of *Pinus strobus* with *Cronartium ribicola*. Phytopathology 12:148-150.

Since canters were associated only with spors on current toritage. It must be concluded that under our moculation conditions, all foliage except the surrent (vilage is resistant to blatter met. This is contrary to observations of constern white pare by Lachmund (1933) and costern white pine by Hirt (1936, 1938) and to previous incontation results of western white pine (Pierson and Buchasan 1958) where current needles tree considered the most resistant. Only Snell (1936) and Pation (1961) report that cirrent needles are used susceptible. More field inocalitions are needed inconfirm free bight susceptibility of current needles and that canters predominately originate from these meedles (confirments) and that canters predominately originate from current needles must be an antifact of test confitions are needed inconfirm free bight susceptibility of screening weedlings must be an antifact of test confitions and non-needles (confirments) and the susceptibility for

Resistant-clones derived from screening of marculase fores any posture service product service tible offspring (Table 2); thus, this material is not subside for read on bads unless the colloquing also advente resistance.

20040000000