

appeared, the clover not being affected so much as the grass which turns brown, and is withered as if about dead. There are fifteen or twenty such spots. I thought lime from the brick walls might be the cause, but in only one or two of the spots could I find any, and then but very small pieces. An answer will greatly oblige,

SUBSCRIBER.

Evidently something is wrong with the soil in those spots. Possibly too much lime or other element. Possibly the best remedy will be the removal of the earth five or six inches deep, and the replacing with earth that is rich and clear of such impurities.

Moth Catchers.

1236. SIR,—As I am interested in fruit growing, I sent for a moth-trap from S. A. Haseltines, Springfield, Mo., U. S., which did not give very good satisfaction, so I got a contrivance made to fit on an ordinary farm lantern which proved more satisfactory. If I were to send a number, free of all cost, would you mind trying one yourself or

give them to a good practical fruit grower who will give them a fair test?

I would also like to know if there are any moths beneficial to farmers, if so, where will I find their description and the benefits the farmers derive from them.

Branchton.

A. LAKE.

We cannot say much in favor of this hazardous, wholesale method of killing insects, not one in twenty of which would be injurious to fruits, while friends as well as foes would be included in the wholesale destruction. Those who have examined batches, so collected, say that very few of the codling moths are attracted by the light, and this is one of the most serious of our insect enemies in Ontario.

For information about injurious insects we would refer our subscriber to "Saunders' Insects Injurious to Fruits," or to "Weed's Insects and Insecticides."

Open Letters.

The Fruit Marks Act.

SIR,—While admitting your right to criticise the action of the Senate regarding the Fruit Marks Act, 1901, will you permit me to say that the comments in July number of the Horticulturist furnish an amusing commentary on the claim for superior knowledge. You set up for certain "wise heads," who have taken some interest in this legislation.

In the first place the Bill you publish, "as finally amended and assented to by the Senate and the House of Commons," is not the act as so passed. You are evidently unaware of the fact that in addition to striking out clauses 6 and 7 as the Bill passed the Commons, the Senate made three other important amendments thereto.

As one who took part in expunging clauses 6 and 7, I might reply to your complimentary remarks by saying that the persons who drafted these clauses and asked parliament to ratify them, were evidently ignorant of their real bearing, but I forbear, as that might seem discourteous. Here are the clauses in question.

6. No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale any fruit packed in a closed package, upon which package is marked "A No. 1 Canadian" unless such fruit consists of nearly uniform size, of good color for the variety, of normal shape and not less than ninety per cent. free from scab, worm holes, bruises and other defects, and properly packed.

7. No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale any fruit packed in a closed package, upon which package is marked the grade "No. 1 Canadian" unless such fruit consists of specimens of one variety, sound, of fairly uniform size and not less than eighty per cent. free from scab, worm holes, bruises and other defects, and properly packed.

These clauses if enacted would declare to the world that a barrel of No. 1 Canadian apples might contain 20 quarts of wormy or scabby apples, and that a barrel of A No. 1 Canadian apples might contain 10 quarts of similarly defective fruit. It would in my opinion be impossible to give a more damaging advertisement than this, to Canadian fruits, and our American competitors would be very dull if they did not point triumphantly to the low standard thus created by the Parliament of Canada. Clauses 6 and 7 were vicious because they