# SALT TOLERANCE OF HUNTALAS COMPARED WITH OTHER AVOCADO ROOTSTOCKS

# P. M. Patel, A. Wallace, and R. T. Mueller

Postdoctoral fellow, research plant physiologist, and staff research associate, University of California, Los Angeles.

Contribution from Plant Nutrition, University of California, Los Angeles.

# INTRODUCTION

The avocado root rot disease, *Phytophthora cinnamomi*, is a major problem to avocado growers. Considerable research has been done by plant pathologists to control the disease. Plant pathologists, plant breeders, and others have long been looking for new resistant avocado rootstocks. Recently Dr. G. A. Zentmyer mentioned in the California Avocado Yearbook that the Huntalas rootstocks (which is under test), a Mexican type obtained from Vista, California, might be resistant to root rot disease (11).

According to U.S. Salinity Laboratory reports (9) avocado is considered to be a saltsensitive plant. Sodium and chloride accumulated in various plant parts of avocado even in a growth medium containing low salt concentrations. The symptoms of Na and Cl toxicity in avocado leaves are always associated with high Na and Cl concentrations (1, 4, 7, 8). No information is available regarding salt tolerance of the Huntalas variety in comparison to other rootstocks. Therefore, the experiments were conducted to examine the salt tolerance and mineral uptake of the Huntalas rootstock with other commercially grown rootstocks (at various salt concentrations in the irrigation water).

# MATERIALS AND METHODS

*Experiment 1:* Four different varieties of avocados (Fuchs 20, Huntalas, Lula 3, and Mexicola) were studied in a glasshouse at UCLA. The rooted cuttings obtained from E. F. Frolich were established in 6 cm peat pots before planting. The seedlings were then transplanted to metal containers 12.5 cm in diameter and 14 cm deep. The mixture of 1/3 krilium treated Yolo clay loam and 2/3 redwood sawdust was used as the growing medium. The plants were irrigated twice a day with distilled-deionized water (dd), dd with medium-salt water (10 me NaCl/L), and dd with high-salt water (20 me NaCl/L), each with 15 ppm N in the form of NH<sub>4</sub>NO<sub>3</sub>. Three plants were harvested at 7 weeks and three at 13 1/2 weeks after adding the treatments. The new leaves, old leaves, stem and root samples were taken, washed with 0.1 M HCl, then distilled deionized water, and dried in an oven. Dry weights were recorded and the samples prepared for analysis by emission spectroscopy (10).

*Experiment 2:* In this experiment Huntalas rooted cuttings (H) vs. Hass grafted on Huntalas rooted cuttings (HH) were used to study the effect of salinity on growth,

mineral content, and some physiological characters of avocado. The same salt concentrations (experiment 1) were used to irrigate the plants. Plants were under treatment for 13 1/2 weeks.

Photosynthesis and transpiration were measured by gas exchange equipment with a modified Siemens null-point chamber (2). These studies were made at 25°C chamber temperature, 310 ppm  $CO_2$  concentration, and 33% relative humidity. The pressure bomb method was used for determining leaf water potential. Soil moisture was kept at field capacity. New and old leaves were harvested and prepared for analysis as in experiment 1. The CI was determined by potentiometric titrimetry.

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Growth decreased in all four varieties as the salt concentrations were increased in the irrigation water (Table 1). Huntalas variety appeared to be more salt-sensitive than the others. Relative tolerance of the different avocado varieties was in the following order: Lula 3

Fuchs 20 Mexicola Huntalas. Particularly in the root-rot resistant Huntalas variety, during the first four weeks, growth was normal and after that tip and slight marginal leaf burn were observed. Salt toxicity became worse after ten weeks of treatment. The symptoms were more pronounced on middle and old leaves of the plants. New growth was least affected by salts. In Mexicola, severe, in Fuchs 20 and Lula 3, slight toxicity was observed. The toxicity symptoms were similar to those described by Kadman (7, 8).

The experiment was harvested at two different stages and the results noted in Table 1. At first stage (7 weeks under treatment) the Na concentrations were found to be almost negligible in the new leaves and only slight in the old leaves. Mostly the Na was associated with the roots and some translocation was observed in the stems. In Lula 3 and Mexicola the Na concentration in the stems was higher than in Fuchs 20 and Huntalas. The Mn content in old leaves, stems, and roots increased as Na content increased in irrigation water.

Although Huntalas was sensitive to salts, very little Na was found in top leaves (Table 1). Salt injury then was not due to Na accumulation of either in roots. In the Huntalas and Fuchs 20 varieties, the Na was accumulated mostly in roots and stems. The Mexicola variety accumulated larger amounts of Na in new and old leaves than the other varieties. The Na concentration was 0.39% in new leaves and 0.58% in old leaves at the hightest salt treatment. This may be the major cause for salt injury with this variety. In all avocado varieties, concentration of Na in new leaves was lower than in old leaves and roots. Considerable differences exist in Na accumulation and in their tolerance to NaCl in different avocado races. Lula 3 was more tolerant than the others which agrees with the results of Embleton et al. (6).

The Zn concentration of Fuchs 20 and Huntalas was decreased by salts in the top leaves. Generally the Fe and Mn concentrations in new and old leaves, stems and roots were increased by salts due to dilution. Interaction was observed between K and Na in roots in salt treatments.

In the second experiment Huntalas rooted cuttings and Hass grafted on Huntalas rooted

cuttings were grown under the same salt treatments. Similar to the first experiment, new and old leaves accumulated almost the same amount of Na, but the Cl concentration was much higher than the Na concentration (Table 2). The new leaves of Huntalas contained 50  $\mu$ g/g Na concentration at the highest salt treatment while Cl concentration was 25 times higher than Na at the same salt treatment. Similar results were obtained in the fruit experiment for Na accumulation. This indicates that the Huntalas variety is sensitive to Cl more than to Na because leaf burn was associated with Cl accumulation in leaves. Cooper (1951) concluded that the leaf burn on Fuerte avocado grown on Mexican rootstock was associated primarily with chloride accumulation in leaves. He observed very low Na concentration in leaves. The Hass scion on Huntalas rootstock accumulated more Cl than Huntalas alone. The P, K and Ca concentrations increased slightly in new and old leaves of the Huntalas variety by addition of salts. The old leaves of Hass grafted on Huntalas contained high Ca, Mg, Fe, and Mn levels in the high-salt treatments.

Gas exchange rates were determined for Huntalas and Hass on Huntalas rooted cuttings at a soil moisture of near field capacity. The data for leaf water potential, photosynthesis, and transpiration are shown in Table 3. In control and at medium-salt treatment very little difference was observed in leaf water potential and photosynthesis. High salt concentration tended to decrease leaf water potential and photosynthesis. Severe reduction in photosynthesis was observed in the Huntalas variety, more so than in Hass on Huntalas at the high-salt concentration. It was 0.90 mg CO<sub>2</sub>, fixed/g dry wt-h while in Hass on Huntalas rootstock it was 3.84 mg CO<sub>2</sub> fixed/g dry wt-h. No differences in transpiration were observed under the various salt treatments in either case. Bernstein (1961) referred to unpublishd data by W. L. Ehrler showing that transpiration per unit leaf area remained the same in control and in salt treatments. A slightly higher transpiration rate was observed in Hass on Huntalas rooted cuttings compared with other rooted cuttings.

# SUMMARY

The Huntalas avocado rooted cuttings were grown in different salt concentrations in comparison with other rootstocks to determine the characteristics of the rootstocks for salt tolerance and mineral uptake. The Huntalas rooted cuttings appeared to be more salt-sensitive than Mexicola, Fuchs 20, and Lula 3 rootstocks. Particularly in Huntalas rooted cuttings Na was accumulated in roots and stems with very little translocated to leaves while CI was translocated and accumulated in considerable amounts in leaves. The leaves of Huntalas accumulated 50  $\mu$ g/g Na and 0.12% of CI at the highest salt treatment. Leaves of Hass scion grafted onto Huntalas rootstock contained more CI than did Huntalas alone. The Zn concentrations of leaves were decreased by salts in Huntalas and Fuchs 20. Generally the salts increased Fe and Mn concentrations in plant parts of different avocados. The transpiration rate was not affected by salts while the leaf water-potential and photosynthesis decreased by salt application in Huntalas and Hass scion on Huntalas rooted cuttings.

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Mr. E. F. Frolich and Dr. G. A. Zentmyer for comments, and for reviewing this manuscript, and to Mr. T. Hartsock for assistance in photosynthesis and transpiration measurements.

# LITERATURE CITED

1. AYRES, A. D., D. G. ALDRICH, and J. J. COONY. 1951. Sodium and Chloride Injury of Fuerte Avocado Leaves. Calif. Avocado Soc. Year book 37:176-178.

2. BAMBERG, S. A., G. E. KLEINKOPF, A. WALLACE, and A. VOLLMER. 1975. Comparative Photosynthetic Production of Mojave Desert Shrubs. Ecology 56:732-736.

3. BERNSTEIN, L. 19-61. Osmotic Adjustment of Plants to Saline Media. I. Steady State. Amer. J. Bot. 48-909-918.

4. BINGHAM, F. T., L. B. FENN, and J. J. OERTLI. 1968. A Sandculture Study of Chloride Toxicity to Mature Avocado Trees. Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc. 32:249-252.

5. COOPER, W. G. 1951. Salt Tolerance of Avocados on Various Root- stocks. Texas Avocado Soc. Yearbook:24-28.

6. EMBLETON, T. W., M. MATSUMURA, W. B. STORY, and M. J. GURBER. 1961. Chloride and Avocado Rootstocks. Calif. Avocado Soc. Yearbook 45:110-115.

7. KADMAN, A. 1963. The Uptake and Accumulation of Chloride in Avo cado Leaves and the Tolerance of Avocado Seedlings under Saline Conditions. Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 83:280-286.

8. KADMAN, A. 1964. The Uptake and Accumulation of Sodium in Avo cado Seedlings. Proc. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci. 85:179-180.

9. U.S. Salinity Laboratory Staff. 1954. Diagnosis and Improvement of Saline and Alkali Soils. USDA Agr. Handbook No. 60. L. A. Richards (ed.).

10.WALLACE, A., A. M. ABOU ZAMZAM, and G. ALEXANDER. 1972. Measurement of Changes in Total Plant Composition of Five Ions Simul taneously by Emission Spectography. 1974. Comm. in Soil Sci. and Plant Analysis 3 (5) :375-380.

11.ZENTMYER, G. A. and L. L. LEWIS, 1975. Avocado Root Rot Research Program. Calif. Avocado Soc. Yearbook 58:89-92.

Intermaning Tweeke under Treatment by Table Mag 20Total maning 103Markete under Treatment 20Total Mag 20Total Mag 20Total Mag 20Packs 20026.0NN			lat Commi	ing /7 We	oka und		same w		2nd Samn	ling (191 )	Weeks	mder 7	reatme	ent)
Fuch   Norm   Norm <th< td=""><td></td><td>Salt Conc.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Total Yield</td><td></td><td>K</td><td>Zn</td><td>Fe</td><td>Mn</td></th<>		Salt Conc.							Total Yield		K	Zn	Fe	Mn
Pache 20   0   26.0    7   2.0   7   3.1   7   3.1   7.0	Varieties		g/Plant	$\mu g/g$	%	µg∕g	µg∕g	$\mu g/g$	g/Plant	μg/g	%	µg∕g	μg/g	µg∕g
Indiana   Indiana <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>]</td><td>New Lea</td><td>aves</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>						]	New Lea	aves						
And ParticularAnd<	Fuchs 20	0	26.0	< 7	2.01	<b>28</b>	45	371	40.1	<7		31		
Initials   0   2.3		10	28.3	<7	1.79	20	52	1120						
Image   10   17.3   <7   1.86   30   72   100   19.7   <7   1.56   35   92   1320     20   16.9   <7		20	17.0	<7	2.09	19	93	1250	20.0	160	2.80	<5	169	3090
10   10   14.3   17   82   140   16.6   46   1.97   18   135   208     Lula 3   0   24.1   <7	Huntalas	0	24.3	$<\!\!7$	1.64	32	55	185	30.1	<7	1.87	31	40	205
India 3   India 4   <		10	17.3	<7	1.86	30	72	1040	19.7	<7	1.56	35	9 <b>2</b>	1320
Initial   10   24.4    7   1.92   22   58   100   25.5   500   2.11   21   70   1180     20   22.0   44   1.63   22   58   100   25.5   500   2.11   21   70   1180     Mexicola   0   24.6   <7   1.53   32   54   70   21.0   <7   1.46   55   50   2.11   21   70   1180     10   22.6   83   1.33   36   33   36   32   16.4   34   1.46   66   50   172     10   1.15   10   2.1   2.2   10   1.50   2.1   1.92   2.5   1.50   32   3   1.00   2.0   1.00   2.0   1.00   2.0   1.00   2.0   1.00   2.0   1.00   2.0   1.00   2.0   1.00   2.0   1.00   2.0   1.00   2.0   2.0		20	16.9	<7	1.43	17	82	1140	16.6	46	1.97	19	135	2080
10   11   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   2   0   2   3   3   1   1   1     Mexicola   0   24.6   <7	Lula 3	0	24.1	<7	1.80	36	60	312	26.2	<7	1.80	35	43	305
Mexicola   0   24.6   37.7   1.6.8   37.7   1.1.7   1.1.7     Mexicola   0   24.6   83   1.33   36   43   375   16.4   434   1.87   34   74   668     20   14.5   56   1.68   33   36   232   10.6   320   1.72   32   92   469     Fuchs 20   0   14.5   73   1.49   12   52   106   104   1.48   14   91   1890     20   20   20   1.28   99   1.60   1.45   13   109   2285     Huntalas   0   .   83   1.26   29   52   276   85   1.60   3.5   32   121   201   20   1.61   2.6   3.5   1.60   3.5   3.5   1.60   3.5   3.5   1.61   3.5   3.5   1.61   3.5   3.5   3.5   3.5   3.5   3		10	24.4	<7	1.92	22	58	1000	25.5	500	2.11	21	70	1180
Index of the second s		20	22.0	41	1.69	27	60	976	17.3	2600	2.38	38	151	1720
Image: Section of the sectin of the section of the section	Mexicola	0	24.6	<7	1.53	32	54	70	21.0	<7	1.46	55	50	192
Int   Int <td></td> <td>10</td> <td>22.6</td> <td>83</td> <td>1.33</td> <td>36</td> <td>43</td> <td>375</td> <td>16.4</td> <td>434</td> <td>1.87</td> <td>34</td> <td>74</td> <td>608</td>		10	22.6	83	1.33	36	43	375	16.4	434	1.87	34	74	608
Fuchs 20091116341711		20	14.5	56	1.68	33	36	232	10.6	3920	$1_{\bullet}72$	32	92	469
Interform   10   73   1.4   12   22   104   1.64   14 <th10< th="">   10   10</th10<>						0	ld Leave	es						
10 <td>Fuchs 20</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>91</td> <td>1.98</td> <td>17</td> <td>46</td> <td>341</td> <td></td> <td>77</td> <td>1.92</td> <td>25</td> <td>51</td> <td>755</td>	Fuchs 20	0		91	1.98	17	46	341		77	1.92	25	51	755
Huntalas0831.262952276851.353238375101021.5728991480751.61201018020661.331010818653491.60331212135Varieties $\frac{135}{me/L}$ $\frac{Na}{\mug/g}$ $\frac{K}{\mug/g}$ $\frac{Zn}{\mug/g}$ $\frac{Na}{\mug/g}$		10		73	1.49	12	52	1080		104	1.84	14	91	1890
		20		90	2.40	22	104	1530		47	1.85	13	109	2285
20 66 1.33 10 108 185 349 1.60 33 213 2135   Varieties Sait Conc. Na K Zn Fe Mn Mg/g Ware Mg/g Mg/g Ware Mg/g <td>Huntalas</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>83</td> <td>1.26</td> <td>29</td> <td>52</td> <td>276</td> <td></td> <td>85</td> <td>1.35</td> <td>32</td> <td>38</td> <td>375</td>	Huntalas	0		83	1.26	29	52	276		85	1.35	32	38	375
Introduction of the part		10		102	1.57	28	99	1480		75	1.61	20	110	1800
VarietiesSalt Conc. me/LNa $\mu g/g$ K $\mu g/g$ Zn $\mu g/g$ Fe $\mu g/g$ Mn $\mu g/g$ Na $\mu g/g$ K $\mu g/g$ Zn $\mu g/g$ Fe $\mu g/g$ Mn $\mu g/g$ Lula 30<7		20		66	1.33	10	108	1865		349	1.60	33	121	2135
VarietiesSalt Conc. me/LNa $\mu g/g$ K $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ Zn $\mu g/g$ $\mu g/g$ $\mu g/g$ $\mu g/g$ $\mu g/g$ Na $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ Na $\kappa$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ Na $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ Na $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ Na $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ Na $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ K $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$ $\mu g/g$ $\kappa$		1et	Sampling (7	Wooks ur	der Ti	reatme	nt)		2nd Sa	nnling (13	1 Weel	cs unde	r Trea	tment)
Lula 30<71.502762409611.73395247910<7	Varieties			K	Zn	Fe	Mn		Na	K	Zn	F	e	Mn
Lula 30<71.502762409611.73395247910<7		me/L	μg/g	%	µg∕g	μg/g			µg∕g	%	μg/g	μg,	g	µg/g
20 $43$ $1.93$ $25$ $75$ $857$ $2093$ $1.68$ $28$ $90$ $1240$ Mexicola $0$ $82$ $1.21$ $29$ $52$ $181$ $92$ $1.36$ $46$ $57$ $233$ $10$ $71$ $0.93$ $27$ $55$ $380$ $524$ $1.47$ $27$ $60$ $485$ $20$ $63$ $1.50$ $33$ $53$ $368$ $535$ $2.22$ $42$ $87$ $597$ $20$ $63$ $1.50$ $33$ $53$ $368$ $5835$ $2.22$ $42$ $87$ $597$ $Fuchs 20$ $0$ $50$ $1.95$ $74$ $38$ $184$ $60$ $1.07$ $71$ $34$ $164$ $10$ $209$ $1.55$ $72$ $39$ $279$ $106$ $1.65$ $73$ $65$ $592$ $20$ $581$ $1.56$ $142$ $75$ $355$ $1240$ $1.45$ $93$ $109$ $670$ Huntalas $0$ $62$ $1.60$ $30$ $34$ $673$ $51$ $1.15$ $15$ $25$ $869$ $10$ $60$ $1.80$ $20$ $18$ $1200$ $1406$ $1.25$ $38$ $51$ $910$ Lula 3 $0$ $48$ $1.45$ $41$ $46$ $82$ $99$ $0.98$ $48$ $39$ $131$ $10$ $353$ $1.56$ $54$ $31$ $175$ $1148$ $1.15$ $45$ $41$ $715$ $20$ $2890$ $1.24$ $44$ <td>Lula 3</td> <td>0</td> <td>&lt;7</td> <td>1.50</td> <td>27</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>61</td> <td>1.73</td> <td>39</td> <td>5</td> <td>2</td> <td>479</td>	Lula 3	0	<7	1.50	27				61	1.73	39	5	2	479
Mexicola0821.212952181921.36465723310710.9327553805241.47276048520631.50335336858352.224287597Fuchs 200501.957438184601.077134164102091.5572392791061.657365592205811.561427535512401.4593109670Huntalas0621.603034673511.15152586910601.802018120014061.25385191011131742523134020701.224743155011130481.45414682990.984839131103531.56543117511481.1545417152028901.24444022627700.747154766Mexicola0411.111721202791.132026266105171.13202740616150.961632586201		10	<7	1.48	20	57	815		450	1.73	61	10	6	1040
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		20	43	1.93	25	75	857		2093	1.68	28	5	00 1	1240
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Mexicola	a 0	82	1.21	29	52	181		92	1.36	46	5	7	233
Fuchs 20   0   50   1.95   74   38   184   60   1.07   71   34   164     10   209   1.55   72   39   279   106   1.65   73   65   592     20   581   1.56   142   75   355   1240   1.45   93   109   670     Huntalas   0   62   1.60   30   34   673   51   1.15   15   25   869     10   60   1.80   20   18   1200   1406   1.25   38   51   910     20   313   1.74   25   23   1340   2070   1.22   47   43   1550     Lula 3   0   48   1.45   41   46   82   99   0.98   48   39   131     10   353   1.56   54   31   175   1148   1.15   45   41   715		10	71	0.93	27	55	380		524	1.47	27	6	0	485
Fuchs 200501.957438184601.077134164102091.5572392791061.657365592205811.561427535512401.4593109670Huntalas0621.603034673511.15152586910601.802018120014061.253851910203131.742523134020701.2247431550Lula 30481.45414682990.984839131103531.56543117511481.1545417152028901.24444022627700.747154766Mexicola0411.111721202791.132026266105171.13202740616150.9616325862018601.25152144521900.502437471		20	63	1.50	33	53	368		5835	2.22	42	8	7	597
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$							Stems							
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Fuchs 20	) 0	50	1.95	74	38	184		60	1.07	71	3	4	164
Huntalas0621.603034673511.15152586910601.802018120014061.253851910203131.742523134020701.2247431550Lula 30481.45414682990.984839131103531.56543117511481.1545417152028901.24444022627700.747154766Mexicola0411.111721202791.132026266105171.13202740616150.9616325862018801.25152144521900.502437471		10	209	1.55	72	39	279		106	1.65	73	6	5	592
Initial 10 60 1.80 20 18 1200 1406 1.25 38 51 910   20 313 1.74 25 23 1340 2070 1.22 47 43 1550   Lula 3 0 48 1.45 41 46 82 99 0.98 48 39 131   10 353 1.56 54 31 175 1148 1.15 45 41 715   20 2890 1.24 44 40 226 2770 0.74 71 54 766   Mexicola 0 41 1.11 17 21 202 79 1.13 20 26 266   10 517 1.13 20 27 406 1615 0.96 16 32 586   20 1880 1.25 15 21 445 2190 0.50 24 37 471		20	581	1.56	142	75	355		1240	1.45	93	10	9	670
20 313 1.74 25 23 1340 2070 1.22 47 43 1550   Lula 3 0 48 1.45 41 46 82 99 0.98 48 39 131   10 353 1.56 54 31 175 1148 1.15 45 41 715   20 2890 1.24 44 40 226 2770 0.74 71 54 766   Mexicola 0 41 1.11 17 21 202 79 1.13 20 26 266   10 517 1.13 20 27 406 1615 0.96 16 32 586   20 1880 1.25 15 21 445 2190 0.50 24 37 471	Huntalas	0	62	1.60	30	34	673		51	1.15	15	2	5	869
Lula 3 0 48 1.45 41 46 82 99 0.98 48 39 131   10 353 1.56 54 31 175 1148 1.15 45 41 715   20 2890 1.24 44 40 226 2770 0.74 71 54 766   Mexicola 0 41 1.11 17 21 202 79 1.13 20 26 266   10 517 1.13 20 27 406 1615 0.96 16 32 586   20 1880 1.25 15 21 445 2190 0.50 24 37 471		10	60	1.80	20	18	1200		1406	1.25	38	5	1	910
10 353 1.56 54 31 175 1148 1.15 45 41 715   20 2890 1.24 44 40 226 2770 0.74 71 54 766   Mexicola 0 41 1.11 17 21 202 79 1.13 20 26 266   10 517 1.13 20 27 406 1615 0.96 16 32 586   20 1880 1.25 15 21 445 2190 0.50 24 37 471		20	313	1.74	25	23	1340		2070	1.22	47	4	.3	1550
10 353 1.56 54 31 175 1148 1.15 45 41 715   20 2890 1.24 44 40 226 2770 0.74 71 54 766   Mexicola 0 41 1.11 17 21 202 79 1.13 20 266   10 517 1.13 20 27 406 1615 0.96 16 32 586   20 1880 1.25 15 21 445 2190 0.50 24 37 471	Lula 3	0	48	1.45	41	46	82		99	0.98	48	3	9	131
20   2890   1.24   44   40   226   2770   0.74   71   54   766     Mexicola   0   41   1.11   17   21   202   79   1.13   20   26   266     10   517   1.13   20   27   406   1615   0.96   16   32   586     20   1880   1.25   15   21   445   2190   0.50   24   37   471		10	353	1.56	54	31	175		1148	1.15	45	4	1	715
10   517   1.13   20   27   406   1615   0.96   16   32   586     20   1880   1.25   15   21   445   2190   0.50   24   37   471		20	2890		44	40	226		2770	0.74	71	5	4	766
10 517 1.13 20 27 406 1615 0.96 16 32 586   20 1880 1.25 15 21 445 2190 0.50 24 37 471	Mexicola	a 0	41	1.11	17	21	202		79	1.13	20	2	6	266
20   1880   1.25   15   21   445   2190   0.50   24   37   471														
										<u>C</u>	ontinue	ed		

Table 1. Yields and Mineral Concentrations (on Dry Weight Basis) of Different Varieties of Avocado Irrigated with Differentially Saline Water

	<u>1st Sam</u>	pling (7 V	Veeks ur	der Trea	(tment		2nd Samp	bling $(13\frac{1}{2})$	Weeks	under Ti	eatment)
Varieties	Salt Conc. me/L	Na %	$_{\%}^{\mathbf{K}}$	Zn μg/g	Fe µg∕g	Mn μg/g	Na %	K %	Zn μg/g	Fe µg/g	Mn μg/g
						Roots					
Fuchs 20	0	0.17	1.78	180	3530	981	0.03	1.33	110	4440	771
	10	0.41	0.85	94	5000	253	0.35	0.80	81	4750	2870
	20	1.00	0.65	95	5820	3080	1.39	0.72	87	5595	3195
Huntalas	0	0.07	1.75	75	2150	560	0.02	1.88	81	5250	375
	10	0.35	0.95	95	3460	1720	0.33	0.84	65	3875	1070
	20	0.46	0.80	90	4565	1945	1.19	0.73	89	3750	1585
Lula 3	0	0.24	2.40	105	2760	742	0.08	2.12	108	5210	547
	10	0.26	0.90	101	3560	564	0.92	0.81	72	3665	1299
	20	1.10	0.57	52	4700	1720	1.49	0.73	107	4480	138 <b>9</b>
Mexicola	0	0.16	1.88	92	3040	262	0.07	1.88	98	3895	222
	10	0.33	0.70	67	4070	800	0.36	0.98	80	3665	521
	20	0.63	0.65	98	3345	460	0.89	0.52	67	4680	1760

Table 2. Composition of Top and Bottom Leaves of Avocado Plants (on Dry Wt.) Basis)

#### Irrigated with Saline Water.

Varieties	Salt Conc. me/L	Total Yield g/Plant	$\mathbf{P}$ %	Na µg/g	Cl µg∕g	к %	Ca %	$\overset{\mathrm{Mg}}{\%}$	Zn μg/g	Fe µg/g	Mn μg/g
					New Le	aves					
Huntalas	0	25.1	0.15	<7	38	1.43	0.33	0.24	22	39	102
	10	20.6	0.17	30	889	1.54	0.75	0,23	19	52	95
	20	17.9	0.22	50	1235	2.70	1.26	0.27	29	45	275
Hass on	0	22.8	0.11	76	73	0.97	1,43	0.24	17	59	450
Huntalas	10	22.3	0.13	51	1207	2.03	0.30	0.16	17	42	171
	20	12.9	0.10	222	2164	1.74	0.68	0.17	22	62	298
					<u>Old Le</u>	aves					
Huntalas	0		0.17	<7	74	1.71	1.00	0.25	24	30	484
	10		0.22	34	703	2.12	0.83	0.28	34	43	432
	20		0.27	39	1081	2.96	1,33	0.33	29	83	431
Hass on	0		0.17	90	96	2.24	0.37	0.19	20	30	304
Huntalas	10		0.16	76	1861	2.11	1.20	0.28	19	48	362
	20		0.10	495	2821	2.46	1.57	0.35	17	83	427

Varieti <b>e</b> s	Salt Conc. me/L	Leaf $\psi$ – bar	Photosynthesis mg/Co <sub>2</sub> fixed/g dry wth	Transpiration g water lost/ g dry wth
Н	0	7.8	5.3	0.5
Н	10	9.5	6.1	0.5
Η	20	13.0	0.9	0.6
HH	0	7.6	5.3	0.6
HH	10	7.5	4.8	0.5
HH	20	16.1	3.8	0.7

Table 3. Leaf Water Potential, Net Photosynthesis, and Transpiration of Huntalas

(H) and Hass on Huntalas Rootstock (HH) of Avocado Irrigated with Saline Water.