taking the utmost pains that we were able to secure a fair measure of control.

In analyzing the results of this work we are unable to make comparison with check plots, as the owner did not desire to leave any trees untreated, and to have done so would have disturbed our

COMPARISON	OF	VALLEY	CROP	WITH	THAT	OF	EXPERIMENTAL ORCHARD,
				TABLE	No. 1.		

Vear	Total crop for entire valley bbls.	Percentage of previous seasons' crops	Total actual crop in orchard	Percentage of previous years crops all varieties	Total theoretical crop in orchard	No. bbls. Grav.	No. bbls. Nonpareils	No. bbls. Russets
1910	323,000							
1911	1,740,000	538.7	2200			220	95	600
1912	993,338	57.1	1800	81.4	1256	206	55	400
1913	650,901	65.5	1300	72.4	1179	123	110	81
1914	650,900	100.0	780	60.	1300	159	4	75
1915	613,882	94.3	560	71.8	735	90	1	46
1916	681,470	111.0	360	. 64.3	621	39	3	25
1917	744,730	109.26	1465	406.9	393	246	75	330

sprayed plots to some extent, owing to the flying in of adults from the untreated plots. It was, therefore, necessary to compare the quantity and quality of apples obtained in 1917 with that obtained in previous years, and further to compare this with the general crop for the whole Valley over the same period. This is to make certain that the results obtained actually represent the effects of our work, and not of other factors which might have operated over the entire district. Last of all, we will compare the results obtained by our own work with those obtained on the portion sprayed by the owner, as far as this is possible. In doing so, it should be remembered that the comparative inexperience of the man who did the spráying, would render effective control unlikely. On the other hand, however, the infestation in this part of the orchard was much lighter than the rest.

Table No. 1 shows that in 1911 there was a phenomenally large crop, following an abnormally low one of the previous year. The crop of 1912 was also large, but since that year the fluctuations have not been wide.

395