

young trees, it will be necessary to take active measures against them, but unless this occurs, in view of the great assistance derived from their presence in combating the saw-fly, it would be advisable neither to destroy nor encourage them.

In districts where the attack of the saw-fly is pronounced it would be well to postpone the planting of young larch trees, unless some remedial measures such as have been suggested can be carried out. If the land cannot be spared another species of conifer might be planted, as *N. erichsoni* strictly confines its attention to the larch.

If the natural means of control, such as birds, are encouraged, and it is upon these and the parasites that the extermination of the pest chiefly depends, the attack will last for a much shorter length of time, and there will ultimately be a less pecuniary loss than if a policy of *laissez faire* be adopted.

*Illustrations of Figures.*

- Fig. 1. The Small Field Vole, *Microtus agrestis*, which feeds largely on the larvae of the saw-fly during the winter months. (Three-quarters natural size.)
- " 2. Cocoon of *N. erichsoni* from which the larva have been extracted by the Field Vole. The cocoon makes itself easily visible on many of the cocoons shown. (Natural size.)
- " 3. Dead terminal shoots of larch, showing characteristic curled appearance, caused by the winding of the saw-fly larva and sawdust in depositing their eggs.
- " 4. *Microtus erichsoni*, Grass. An Elm-wood pest of the larch saw-fly. (Three times natural size, which is shown by the cross lines.)

I am indebted to Dr. O. A. Darbishire for photographing Figs. 1 and 2.