INSECTICIDES AND FUNCICIDES.

3. E. W. Tracy. 1896.

Inochtaile.

on

INSECTICIDES AND FUNGICIDES

J. H. Woodbridge Tracy.

INSECTICIDES AND FUNCICIDES.

During the last nine or ten years an increased interest has been manifested in the practice of spraying as a means of holding in check certain insect pests and diseases of plants, especially those due to fungi. In this work wonderful improvements have been made especially in this country where it has been stimulated by the general and state government, and the agricultural and horticultural press.

The beneficial effects of spraying, so far as a prevention of injury from fungi and the attacks from insects are concerned, are now so well recognized that little indeed need be said on the subject. Many of the most destructive diseases of our crops may be readily controlled at a comparatively small expense by the proper application of certain fungicides.

Besides preventing the injury done by fungi and insects there is still another phase of the spraying question which, although as yet has received very little attention, is of great importance. This is the effect of certain fungicides on the growth of plants independent of other considerations. Almost from the beginning of the work in this country it was observed that when certain preparations were used as fungicides the plants made a better growth, yielded a better harvest, and in some cases gave an earlier product than those untreated even though they had no disease present or any insects upon them.

• • The effect of spraying in this direction has been especially marked in the case of the potato, and also where nursery stock has been under treatment. The yield of potatoes has been frequently increased from 25 to 50 % quite independent of any effects produced on the plants by holding in check fungous diseases and pest. We thus see the great importance of spraying.

While a number of preparations and solutions used as fungicides have given promise of value none have been found which filled so many requirements as the Bordeaux Mixture, and it is probably more generally used today than all other fungicides combined. The chief points in its favor are:

- 1. Its thorough effectiveness as a fungicide.
- 2. Its cheapness.
- 3. Its safety from a hygienic standpoint.
- 4. Its harmlessness to the sprayed plants.
- 5. Its beneficial effect on plants other than those resulting from the mere prevention of the attacks of parasites.

The use of Bordeaux Mixture originated in France in the neighborhood of the city of Modoc, which is situated on the banks of the river Gironde. It was first used as a paste and sprinkled on vines and trellises near highways to keep boys from pillaging the vineyards. Prof. A. Millardet professor of botany in the Acadamy of Sciences at Bordeaux France, in a visit to this region in 1882 found that the vines where this solution had been applied did not suffer from mildew. He carried on experiments to test its value with fairly good

results, until in 1884 he published an account of what he had done. From that time it has rapidly come into general use.

All things considered we believe that the best results will be obtained from the use of a mixture made by the following formula:

Copper Sulphate (Cu S 0 4) 4 pounds.

Fresh unslaked lime (Ca 0.H2 0) 4 "

Water 40 gallons.

This can be most easily mixed by placing six gallons of water in a tub or barrel and in this hang four pounds of copper sulphate in a burley or other course sack. Slake the lime, being careful not to add the water faster than the lime will take it up. Strain the lime to remove any lumps that may not have slaked. Pour together and dilute to forty gallons.

Emough lime should be added to neutralize the free acid for if this is not done it will injure the foliage. A good way to test this is to add a few drops of ferro-cyniade of potasium to the solution before it is diluted and if it turns brown the lime is deficient and more should be added until the ferro-cyanide shows no change in color.

certain chemical combinations take place from the mixing of the copper sulphate and the lime solution. The copper is precipitated as cupric hydroxide forming at the same time a slightly soluble sulphate of lime. These two salts together with an excess of lime remain in suspension in the Bordeaux Mixture. The reactions are simple and are expressed

The second secon

by the formula CuSO4. 5H2O+CaO. H2O+Cu(OH)2+CaSO4+5H2O. From this formula a simple calculation shows that to precipitate four pounds of copper sulphate there would be required but .89 pounds of lime. However as the lime is usually very impure it has been found by careful experiments that we need a much greater amount than this and that equal parts of lime and copper sulphate give the best results.

as complex and not as difficult to prepare as many, takes considerable time and more or less experience which probably has much to do with its not being used more generally by market gardeners and those who have but a small number of plants that would be benefited by its use. To overcome this somewhat serious objection it was thought best to experiment with one or more solutions which could be easily and rapidly prepared with comparatively little care.

As Bordeaux Mixture contains as much if not more copper sulphate than lime and it has shown such remarkable results it was thought best to experiment with crystals of copper sulphate dissolved in water. The experiments with this were carried on along several lines. First. A number of different kinds of ordinary flowering plants were sprayed with three different strengths of a solution in which the copper sulphate had been dissolved for the purpose of ascertaining at what strength it could be safely used upon the plants.

Second. A similar experiment was tried with soft water being used instead of hard water to see if there was enough lime in the hard water to make an appreciable difference in

-

the two, it being remembered that copper sulphate added to lime makes Bordeaux Mixture.

Third. Zenoleum, a waste oil product, was used on similar plants to find how strong it could be used without doing injury to the plants.

Fourth. Both Zenoleum and the soft water solution of copper sulphate were used on a large number of trees and shrubs also on five fruit trees, to see if the strength not injurious to the flowering plants were injurious to these.

Fifth. Different vegetables and berries were sprayed with the soft water solution of copper sulphate of a strength one part of copper sulphate to one thousand parts of water, and a Zenoleum solution of one part of Zenoleum to sixty parts of water.

Sixth. The soft water solution of copper culphate and Bordeaux Mixture were used side by side on raspberries, strawberries, pears, apples, and carnations to see their relative merits as fungicides.

Seventh. Zenoleum was used on a number of plants having scale, red spider, thrip, aphis, and fungi on them to see if these were killed.

Following are the tables of the experiments and the results reached from them.

Experiment I.

This experiment consisted in spraying 12 varieties of the following plants with three different strengths of a hard water solution of copper sulphate. The plants were divided into four lots, each lot having the same number of

plants and of the same variety. Lot 1 was sprayed with a solution 1-250. Lot 2 was sprayed with a solution 1-500. Lot 3 was sprayed with a solution 1-1000. Lot 4 was not sprayed at all but was simply used as check upon the work of the other three lots. All plants were sprayed five times at intervals of one week. Notes were taken the second day after each spraying.

Table 1.

Geranium	Lot I.	Lot II.	Lot III.	Lot IV.
Sprayed on April 6	0.K.	0.K.	O.K.	O.K.
• 13		•	•	•
2 0	•	11	•	Ħ
28	•	Ħ	*	•
May 4	•	•	•	Ħ
Stock. April 6	Greenhous	e smoked whi	ch made all r	olants
• 13	sickly un	til by April	20th they we	re
u 20	disregard	led on accoun	t of being pr	ac-
28	tically d	lead.		

May 4.

Sprayed on April 6	Greenhouse smoked which	wilted plants considerable
• 13	Plants in same conditio	on today as on April 6th.
" 20	Same Same	Looks better.Looks better.
# 2 8	Not as well * as on Apr.20.	" much " much "
May 4	Still worse today.	Practically Practically recovered.

			$\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{L}$	
•	**		v.* • ו /	
11	11	11	;;	;; u
"	11	11	4	tt
;†	<u>u</u>	1	1;	, <u>, , u</u>
,	Ħ	t :	::	
	,	•		•

 $m{y}_{i}$, which is the second of $m{y}_{i}$, $m{y}_{i}$, $m{y}_{i}$, $m{y}_{i}$, $m{y}_{i}$, $m{y}_{i}$

and the second of the second o

the second secon

.

Cinneraria	Lot I.	Lot II.	Lot III.	Lot IV.
Sprayed on April 6	Tips of leaves driesome.	Tips of d leaves dried very little.	Tips dried as bad as those of Lot I.	o. K.
• 13	Little more	About the same.	Looks worse	. O. K.
" 2 0	Same as on 13th.		r. * still*	Leaves dried very little.
28	Same as on 13th.	* still *	No change.	
Mary 4	Same as on 13th.	0. K.		0. K.
Primula Sprayed on				
April 6		Looks some better than Lot I.		0. K.
* 13	Same.	Same as on 6th.	W	•
a 30		Improves	Leaves drie very little	
2 8	Leaves drie		No change.	11
May 4	Leaves drie still more.	a •	11 N	11
Carnation. Sprayed on				•
April 6	0. K.	0. K.	0. K.	0K.
• 13	•	•	•	Ħ
* 20	•	•	•	*
28	•	•	•	u
May 4	•	•	•	11
Petunia. Sprayed on April 6	0. K.	0. K.	o. K.	0. K.
• 13	•	w	•	11
2 0	•		•	•
* 28	•		*	
May 4	•	•	•	10

• • •		•		
• •	•			
			3	, E n
	$ \mathbf{u} = \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \right)} \right) \right) \right)} \right) \right) } \right) } \right) } \right) } } } }$		9 B 6.60	- i
	n	A STATE OF	9	•
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	i ;			North State of the
• •	• • ¢			
	11		. (2.11.11)	₩ from a
·· ·		, ! ' , ' '	. # 41 . # 41 . # 144	00 H
ч				
•	. •		. Di C	8 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
•		п	u	C.F. H
ч	11	u	11	Ç 5, - #
#	ž!	Ħ	1f	. н
п	is	N	tt	20 - € 1
	• . • 2	•••		usta 1000 us 100 je prilo Događenia
1	11	tı	Ħ	eret in w
;1	ü	:1	н	σ ≥ π
G.	:	*:	u	ti .
	ü	"	¥3	<u>.</u>

stroblian- thes Dyer- ianius. Sprayed on	Lot I.	Lot II.	Lot III.	Lot IV.
April 6	Wilted con- siderably.	0. K.	.0K.	0. K.
" 13	Same.	•	Wilted some Not as bad Lot I 6th.	*
* 2 0	Little bett	er."	Better.	•
* 2 8	0. K.	•	6. K.	•
May 4		•	*	•
Ageratum Sprayed on	0 7	0 17	0 150	0 V
April 6	0. K.	0. K.	0. K.	0. K.
• 13	•		*	*
* 2 0	•	¥		•
* 2 8	•	Ħ	•	•
May 4	Ħ	Ħ	Ħ	11
Achyranthes Emersonii. Sprayed on	Leaves drie	đ.		
April 8	Looks bette	r. 0. K.	0. K.	0. K.
* 18	0. K.	•	Ħ	Ħ
2 0	•	•	Ħ	Ħ
* 2 8	•	•	•	•
May 4	•	•	w	W
Achyranthes Lindenii. Sprayed on April 6	0. K.	0. K.	0. K.	0. K.
13	n n	1	11	
	17	•	•	et e
20		-		
28	1	•	**	n
May 4	•	•	4	Ħ

n was see	11.1.1		• 4	
9	• •	• • •		1
	. *	H	s reda 4 .	7 . 11
';		"	• • •	3
1	,i	11	ti	
• • •		• •	•	
1;	t?	ч	7	er e u
**	v:	0.	N	* - 11
1	• •	•1	11	n
.;	::	1;	"	(· · ·)
		· • i,	. 1 × 2	
•	•	. zi • i		
•			. 7 . 2	
•	• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• A. • C	. 7 . 2	Section 1
		. /	. 1 x 2 1 x 1 x 1 x 1 x 1 2 x 2 x 2	Section 1
ď	ti	• / • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	. 5 x 2 4 x 5 x 5 x 5 •2 • 6 #	Section 1.
:	11	• / • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	. 2 . 2 -2 . 2 -1 -1	Section 1.
:	11	• / • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	. 2 . 2 -2 . 2 -1 -1	
3 11 11	11	• / • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	. 7 . 2 . 7 . 7 . 7 . 8 . 9	
11 11	# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	. A	. 2 . 2 . 2 . 2 . 3 . 4 . 11	
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	. A	. 7 . 2 . 7 . 7 . 8 . 9	
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	n n n	11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	. 2 . 2 . 2 . 2 . 3 . 2 . 4 . 11 . 11	

Achyranthes Hoveyii. Sprayed on	Lot I.	Lot II.	Lot III.	Lot IV.
April 6	0. K.	0. K.	0. K.	0. K.
* 18	•	11		11
2 0	st .	t!	Ħ	•
* 2 8	Ħ	11	•	11
May 4	tt	*	•	u

It will be noticed that there are some inconsistencies, especially in case of the Primula and Strobilanthes Dyerianius which may have been caused by a difference in individual plants.

Experiment II.

This experiment was similar to the preceding one with the exception that soft water was used and that but nine varieties were sprayed but three times.

Table 2.

Petunia Sprayed on	Lot I.	Lot II.	Lot III.	Lot IV.
April 20		Not thor- oughly heal thy.		0. K.
n 2 8	No change.		11	¥
May 4	M H	17 11	Ħ	ti .
Cinneraria. Sprayed on				
April 20	Tips of leaves dried		0. K.	Looks about as bad as Lot I.
28	bried up more today.	Ħ	*	Look worse.
May 4	No further change.		W	Still worse.

	• • • • • • • •	• P • 1		en e
• •	•	• •	3	
	11		11	· <u></u>
		::		11
"	4		'1	: 3 H
**	18	11	1	

to accept the time of the following to the control of the control

 $\mathbb{D}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{\longrightarrow} \mathbb{D}^{2}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{\longrightarrow$

The state of the s

• a state of the state of the state of

•	•	•		
7	•			
91	11			1
:	*!	11	:1 11	•
				16.2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

		• 2	•		
• 1	•		• •		
•	**	**	••		t:
			7	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
• •	12 ()	1:	**		

Verbena. Sprayed on	Lot I.	Lot II.	Lot III.	Lot IV.
April 20	Leavez dried some.	Same as Lot I.	Not quite as bad as Lot I.	0. K.
2 8	Looks some	No change.	Looks much better.	*
May 4	No change.	19 17	0. K.	W
Heliotrope Sprayed on	•			
April 20	what sickly.	0. K.	.0K.	0. K.
* 28	Poor color. No change.	*	•	Ħ
May 4	Improved some.	w	11	Ħ

Coleus Verischafelteii, Coleus Yellow Verischafelteii, Achyranthes Lindii, Geranium, and Primula were also treated but with no change showing in any of the plants. This table is somewhat more satisfactory. The unsprayed Cinneraria evidently suffering from some outside influence.

Experiment III.

With this experiment from lots of six variaties each were sprayed with Zenoleum of three strengths five times.

Lot I with a solution of one part to 20 of water.

IV was not sprayed at all.

It was noted that the plants in Lot III of the Stock, Cinneraria, Begonia, and Ageratum had been more or less affected so two more lots of these were secured and sprayed with a solution of one part to 80 of water and Lot VI with one part to 100 of water.

• 1...

et us some state of the state o

 $oldsymbol{W}$, $oldsymbol{W}$, oldsymbol

Geranium		Lot	Lot VI.
April 6	0. K.	0.	\$10 mm
" 13	Has very little go	ood v 3.3	
" 20	Leaves st		
11 28	Much wors		-
May 4	Many leav		
Achyrant			
Sprayed April 6	on 0. K.	0.	
" 1.3	u		
" 2 0	u		
" 2 8			
May 4			
Stock. Sprayed	on		.W .O
April 6	Bottom leav	es Ver	
-	yellowish.	108	
	,	ing	tt
" 13	Little wors		
	flowers wil		
	ed some.	lea	
	od somo.	yel	N
. 30	Much worse.		
80	muon morso.	not	
		as	
# 28	No change.	No	-
- 20	no change.	МО	
May 4		v	

•	•		•	• •	•
•	•	•	• •	• •	•
	11	•	*;	•	17
	: 1		q_{∞} ,	•	O n
	7	•	# .		u.
. •	• 1• 1• 1•		tt.		
			•		
	 • \$.	• •	•	. •	
	;;	":	п	*!	4
	"	v	33	7	"
	1.	3	я	**	u u
······································	4	ų	::	'n	
					•
•	• •	•		• 1	
• 1.45	**	•	•		+ *
	11			• 200	31
	f. • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•	: 11 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	. 11
	4		n v	u u	

. . .

	onia.	Lot I.	Lot II	.:: :: :
Spre	wed o	n		•
Apr			ant Not q	
repa.		and ting	of as ba	
		and orps	ack.Lot I	
п	13	Most of	Plants	**
		plant tur	n- ed bad	
		ing black		
12	20	Leaves an		**
	,,,,	tips of	tips f	
			fall- of	
			Tall- of	
		ing off.		
17	28	Dead.	All le	tt
			dead a	
			tips.	
May	4		Plant	tr
			1 10110	
Acces	atum.			
		-		
	wed o			
Apri	TT B		ant Wilte	
		wilted and		
		dried up s	ome.	
11	13	Much worse	. Tips w.	11
			and dr	
			some.	
11	20	Dienta wil	t- Much w	12
	DO	ed.	.u- Much W	**
**			*****	
	28	Dead.	Still 1	11
				,
May	4		Dead.	***
	ıerari			
Spra	wed o	n		
Apri	11 6	Tips of	Tips of	
		leaves dri	ed leaves	
		some.	very 1:	
11	13	Leaves wor		
	10			ti
		flowers	more.	
		dried some		
11	20	Worse.	Leaves	12
			ly wil	
11	28	Bad.	Whole	
	,		wilted	-
May	4	Dead.	Almost	
arces.	-16	Dodu.	A.LING S	10

.

• •		•
•		,
		g e t
	 Windows Research State (1997) Windows Research State (1997) Windows Research State (1997) Windows Research State (1997) 	. 19
	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	e u
	tion to the second of the seco	* *
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
		C 2 4
₩ 3 P 11		
		e 1
,	Here we have the second of the	
•		
		e u
		1.1
		·. ·

Experiment VI.

This experiment was the spraying of the following shrubs and trees with a soft water solution of copper sulphate strength 1-1000 and Zenoleum 1-60 on April 20th, 28th, and May 4th.

Hard Maple. Soft Maple. Sycamore. White Pine. Lilac.

Cork Elm. Arbor Vitae. Honey Suckle. Norway Spruce. Box Elder. Buffalo Currant. Sumac. Golden Elder. Ampelopsis Veitchii. Virginia Creeper.

No effect was noticed from the copper sulphate solution but the Zenoleum killed the leaves on the Ampelopsis Veitchii and the Virginia Creeper.

and cherry with this same solution of Zenoleum and with a copper sulphate solution of twice the strength as used on the other trees, that is a solution 1 to 500. Here too, there was no effect except in the case of the pear. Here the leaves were badly injured especially the smaller ones. The older ones dried up in spots but were less seriously injured.

Experiment V.

This experiment consisted in spraying strawberries, gooseberries, blackberries, raspberries, currants, potatoes, peas, beans, lettuce, cucumbers, and radishes with copper sulphate 1-1000 and Zenoleum 1-60. The copper sulphate did not affect any of the plants but the Zenoleum affected the lettuce, cucumbers, peas, and beans in order named. All recovered however and there was no apparent difference excepting these plants were somewhat later in maturing than those not sprayed.

The state of the s

· ·

Experiment VI.

In this experiment I endeavored to find the relative values of Bordeaux Mixture and Copper Sulphate as preventives of Anthracnose, Apple Scab, Pear Leaf Blight, and Rust on Carnations and Strawberries by spraying five times (on June 23, July 2, 9, 13, 21,) with a soft water solution of copper sulphate 1-600 and with Bordeaux Mixture.

The young shoots of Cuthbert Raspberries were sprayed for anthracnose but as so little anthracnose showed itself on either the sprayed or unsprayed plants no conclusion could be drawn.

Pears were sprayed in a like manner for Pear Leaf Blight. It was found that the Copper Sulphate was injuring the foliage to such an extent that it would be impracticable to use it longer. Believing that possibly some mistake had been made Peas, Apples, Plums, and Cherries were sprayed with solution 1-600 and 1-1200. These were sprayed but twice but the same injurious effect was noticed on the peas sprayed with the solution 1-600, while those sprayed with the 1-1200 solution were not affected at all. The other fruits were not hurt in the least by this spraying. No leaf blight has shown itself on any of the trees sprayed or unsprayed.

A Famense apple tree was sprayed in a similar manner and the results were very marked. The Copper Sulphate solution diminished the number of cases of scab very much, also the severeness with which it attacked the apple.

The Bordeaux Mixture was even more beneficial than the Copper Sulphate. It is safe to say that it diminished the

number of scally apples at least one-half. It also made the scab very much weaker than those where there was no spraying done. Two varieties of strawberries (Pawnee and Swindle) were sprayed in a similar manner for the fungus Sphaerothica. Here the results were very apparent indeed, the sprayed plants in many cases being almost free from the fungus. The Copper Sulphate seemed to be somewhat superior to the Bordeaux Mixture in this experiment as those sprayed with Copper Sulphate seemed to be somewhat freer from the fungus.

Spraying showed a decided improvement in the amount of rust on carnations. The Copper Sulphate was fully as good here as was the Bordeaux Mixture.

It is thus shown that the Copper Sulphate is of considerable value for spraying apples for scab, of equal value with Bordeaux Mixture on carnations, and fully as valuable, if not more so, than Bordeaux Mixture on strawberries.

Experiment VII.

This experiment consisted in spraying different plants five times at intervals of about one week to see if a solution of Zenoleum would kill various insect pests. By a previous experiment it had been found that Zenoleum could not be safely used on plants stronger than one part to sixty of water, so this strength was used. Begonias were sprayed for the scale ecanium hesperidum; Crotons for the Mealy Bug (Dactlopius), Red Spider, Thrip, and the fungus Fumago-vagans; a Sago Palm for the scale ecanium olea; a Spiral Pine for the fungus Fumago-vagans; Chrysantheums for Black Aphis;

Cactus for the scale (Aspidiotus cacti); and an apple tree for the scale known as Mitalispis pomorium.

It was shown very conclusively that this solution will not kill the Fumago-vagans fungus, the mealy bug, red spider, and black aphis. It did however kill the thrip and the decanium olea scale, and greatly reduced the scale on the cactus and apple. However it seems to be impracticable for those two scales for it was not effectual enough to compensate for the time and expense of spraying.

ROOM USE ONLY





