Provenance selection clearly offers little or no potential for improving resistance to *P. syringae,* and, in fact, true genetic resistance to the insect may be rare or nonexistent in green ash. However, possible individual tree differences cannot be ruled out. Some of the non-infested trees are now flowering and controlled crosses will be made, among both attacked and nonattacked trees, to obtain progenies for further testing. Also, we are vegetatively propagating a few select trees by budding for further evaluation.

Literature Cited

1. Dix, M. E., A. D. Tagestad, D. G. Nielsen, and F. F. Purrington. 1978. Biology and control of the lilac borer in the northern Great Plains. USDA Forest Serv. Res. Note RM-358, 4 p.
2. Neal, J. W., Jr. and T. D. Eichlin. 1983. *Seasonal response of six male Sesiidae of woody ornamentals to clearwing borer (Lepidoptera: Sesiidae)* lure. Environ. Entomol. 12:206-209.
3. Peterson, L. O. T. 1971. Control of borers in planted trees in the prairie provinces. Canad. Dept. Reg. Expans., P.F.R.A. Tree Nurs., Indian Head, Sask., T. N. Pamphl. No. 2 (rev.), 15 p.
4. Purrington, F. F. and D. G. Nielsen. 1977. *Biology of Podosesia (Lepidoptera: Sesiidae) with description of a new species from North America.* Ann. Entomol. Soc. Am. 70:906-910.
5. Roberts, E. G. 1956. *Grubs in the trunks of live green ash trees.* J. For. 54:846-847.
6. Solomon, J. D. 1974. *Biology of an ash borer, Podosesia syringae, in green ash in Mississippi.* Ann. Entonol. Soc. Am. 68:325-328.
7. Solomon, J. D. 1983. *Lilac borer (Podosesia syringae) discovered causing terminal mortality and resulting forks in young green ash trees.* J. Georgia Entomol. Soc. 18 (3):320-323.
8. Steiner, K. C. 1983. *A provenance test of green ash.* Northeast. Forest Tree Improve. Conf. Proc. 28:68-76 (1982).
9. Tunnock, S. and A. Tagestad. 1973. Incidence of wood borer activity in green ash windbreak plantings in North Dakota. USDA Forest Serv. Div. of State and Private For., Rep. No. 73-5, Missoula, MT, 13 p.

Respectively, Research Geneticist, U.S. National Arboretum, Agricultural Research Service, USDA, Washington, D.C. and Associate Professor, School of Forest Resources, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

Abstract

EVANS, P. and J. E. KLETT. 1985. **Pruning at planting may not enhance growth.** Am. Nurseryman 162(8):53-57, 60-61.

A rule of thumb in the nursery business is that 30 percent of the tops of bare-root trees should be removed at planting time. Since a tree's fibrous root system is reduced to a few woody stubs during digging, it seems appropriate to reduce the top in some proportion before replanting. However, for almost 100 years, good evidence has existed that dormant pruning may not be beneficial for all bare-root trees. The Department of Horticulture at Colorado State University, Fort Collins, has studied branch thinning with two species that are commonly planted bare-root (Newport plum and Sargent crabapple). One of the surprising results of these experiments was that the variability in new root production was high. Regardless of pruning treatment, the difference in new root development between trees within each group was large enough that no effect of top pruning on root production could be found. Most top pruning on these species might profitably be delayed until the second or third year when more growth is produced. Except for removing major structural defects (such as twin leaders) or balancing the length of major branches, this research indicates that first-year pruning appears largely ineffective in determining structural development or total growth.