

euonymus scale (*Unapsis euonymi*) on euonymus (*Euonymus europaea*), European elm scale (*Gossyparia spuria*) on American elm (*Ulmus americana*), and pine needle scale (*Chionaspis pinifoliae*) on red pine (*Pinus resinosa*). As in earlier work, these trials of 2% oil were divided into two aspects, the product's ovicidal potential and its subsequent efficacy against both crawlers and settled crawlers. Preemergence treatment of some very heavy scale infestations suggests that, although a major reduction in egg hatch of perhaps 75% can be obtained, ovicidal action is slightly less than at the higher 3% concentration. There is also some suggestion that the degree of control obtained via ovicidal action may be related to timing of the application, being more effective when embryos have fully developed and start to hatch, weakening seal of scale cover (test) to surface of host plant. All crawlers, both active and settled, were apparently killed shortly after being contacted by the oil spray.

Summary

The goal of these selected replication trials was

to compare the pesticidal efficacy of 2% oil with results obtained previously using a concentration of 3%. We found that when physically bathed by the spray, the lower concentration was fully as effective as the higher in controlling aphids, mites and scale crawlers. Both concentrations were equally effective against mite eggs with only slight differences in toxicity to scale eggs. Although no indication of foliar phytotoxicity was seen at either dilution, it remains a good rule of thumb to utilize the lowest *effective* dose possible.

Literature Cited

1. Baxendale, R.W. and W.T. Johnson. 1988. *Evaluation of summer oil spray on amenity plants*. J. Arboric. 14:220-225.
2. Cornell recommendations for pest control for commercial production and maintenance of trees and shrubs. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Cooperative Extension. 79 p.

*Research Associate and
Professor of Entomology, respectively
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853-0999*

Errata

We regret that in the layout of one paper in the November issue of the Journal, we inadvertently transposed two lines of type on two columns. Please make the following corrections in your copy of the Journal of Arboriculture or request a corrected reprint from the authors of the paper.

The first two lines on the second column of page 271 should read:

The delay problems or response irregularities of tree crew injection can be minimized through the

The first two lines on the first column of page 272 should read:

tively reduce the majority of expelled material by simultaneously venting the injection system and