every month except May (-.26 inch)and June (-.03 inch). There was good snow cover in the previous winter. Killing frost in 1957 occurred September 16.

Results

The reduction of leafhopper populations by tree canopy sprays as compared to ground sprays is shown in Figure 1.

Although mesophyll - feeding leafhoppers of the genus Edwardsiana are unlikely to transmit little cherry virus, they were included in total leafhopper counts because they could be identified on sight, and because their high numbers showed the effects of the sprays. The residue of the foliage spray of August 12 appeared to hold down their numbers. Ground spraying had no deleterious effect on this predominantly treeand shrub-living group. The first generation bred mostly on native shrubs growing along the fence referred to, but from early June the succeeding and overlapping generations bred on the cherry trees.

Macrosteles and Psammotettix were genera collected regularly. Week by week comparisons among counts of adult Macrosteles fascifrons show that numbers in the ground spray plot were greater than in the others. There appeared to be no migratory flights of *Macrosteles*. When the pooled numbers were plotted against time, the curve was bimodal with peaks about July 3 and September 4, suggesting two generations.

The pooled numbers of other species of leafhoppers were reduced by both programs. These species are likely to include vectors of little cherry virus.

Leafhoppers were more attracted to yellow colored sticky boards than they were to white colored sticky boards (3).

Summary

Two sprays of dieldrin, applied to ground cover only, had little effect on the numbers of leafhoppers in sweet cherry trees. By comparison, DDT-Sulphenone sprays, applied to tree canopies, gave economic control. The effects of the spray programs were assessed by comparing leafhopper counts on 10 sticky boards per plot with counts from 10 boards in the adjacent check plot. Ground sprays were tested against conventional tree canopy sprays because many leafhopper genera found in cherry orchards spend a portion of their lifecycle in orchard cover crop.

References

- 1. Cox, Constance E. Handbook on statistical methods. Can. Dep. Agr. Publ. 3 (processed) 1954.
- Kaloostian, G. H., and M. S. Yeomans. A sticky board trap used in scouting for pear psylla. U.S. Dep. Agr. Bur. Entomol. Plant Quarantine, ET 220. 1944.
- 3. Wilde, W. H. A. A note on color preferences of some Homoptera and Thysanoptera in British Columbia. Can. Entomol. 94: 107. 1962.

Phyciodes mylitta Edw. on Vancouver Island

Available records make no mention of this butterfly as occurring on Vancouver Island, although records are frequent enough on the mainland of British Columbia.

I first ran across it in September, 1961, when two males were taken in separate localities in the general area of Coldstream. As **P. mylitta** is known to be double brooded and to feed on thistle in the caterpillar stage, I searched in the spring of 1962 for individuals of the first brood. After investigating many possible habitats I was at last rewarded by finding a small population of both sexes in the same district, thus establishing its existence on Vancouver Island.

It would interest me to know if anyone else has come across it. Why it has been overlooked for so long is a mystery for it is not particularly shy or retiring. It could be a recent introduction either by natural or artificial means, or with its very early and late appearance in the year and restricted habitat it could simply have eluded observation.

-George A. Hardy, Provincial Museum (Rtd.), Victoria, B.C.