by a single polar flagellum. It is therefore referable to Cohn's Bacterium as amended by Smith and is given the name *Bacterium tabacum.* The detailed account of the cultural studies and inoculation experiments which have been made, and of the distribution and dissemination studies which are in progress, is reserved for subsequent publication.

F. A. Wolf,
A. C. Foster
North Carolina Experiment Station

PLANT DISEASES IN CANADA

To the Editor of Science: Two plant diseases have recently been observed in the Dominion of Canada which have not been recorded before, viz., *Dothichiza Populea* Sacc. et Briard, on Lombardy poplar, St. Andrews, N. B., and *Colletotrichum cereale* Manns, on spring wheat, Charlottetown, P. E. I.

A third disease affecting seed pods of turnips grown for seed in P. E. I. caused by *Leptosphaeria Napi* (Fuckel.) Sacc., of which the conidial form *Sporidesmium exitiosum* was found, does not appear to have been recorded as causing trouble on the continent of America. It is well known in Europe, where it is disastrous to seed turnip cultures.

H. T. Güssow

COMMON PLANT NAMES

To the Editor of Science: May I draw attention to a point in the discussion on popular names of plants, which M. A. Bigelow, in Science of July 6, seems to ignore; that is, the great literary value of a good common name and the danger that such names may be lost through being ignored by teachers. Of course children can learn any name—they memorize far more easily than grown people—but do not let us give them scientific names to learn as a part of nature study, unless they are going in for botany as a science. Scientific names are usually clumsy and pedantic, almost always lacking in character, and often can not be gracefully absorbed into the English language.

The names which Professor Bigelow cites as being both popular and scientific are sufficiently euphonious, but are almost all those of garden plants, which may be allowed to bear florists' names. The few wild flowers he mentions all have good common names, which apparently he is willing to discard. Primrose is an older name than *Primula,* I fancy, and for the matter of that, surely rose, lily and violet antedate the systematists! *Clematis* and *Trillium* are pretty enough, but virgin's bower and wake-robin are names to make a poet sing for joy. Most eastern wild flowers have fairly good names and even in the west—a young civilization is apt to be content with variations of "bells" and "roses"—they have some fine names, such as "our Lord's candle" (*Yucca Whipplei*), "sweet-after-death" (*Achlys triphylla*) and "flaming sword" (*Fouquiera splendens*). Such names as these enrich our language and should be preserved at all costs.

Shall we encourage children to gather nosegays of *Blepharipappus, Mesembryanthemum* and *Malacothrix?* Heaven forbid! Only give them time and children will evolve good names for all conspicuous wild flowers, if we do not thwart them by teaching the scientific ones unnecessarily. Cat's breeches, named by Utah children, may not be elegant, but it is quaintly appropriate and is certainly better for every-day use than *Hydrophyllum capitatum.* Let us go slowly in these matters and so long as men like Dr. Jepson are continually on the lookout for good common names we need not despair.

Margaret Armstrong

A SIMPLE EXPLANATION

In Science, August 31, 1917, page 212, Professor C. A. Mooers writes as follows:

> The writer has assumed that Dr. Hopkins could give a simple explanation for his conflicting estimates, as given in Science, November 3, 1916, p. 652, and in Science, March 2, 1917, p. 214. In the former article he says: "For each dollar invested rock phosphate paid back $2.29," but in the latter article he says, with regard to the same data, "Easy computations show profits per dollar invested of . . . $1.29 from phosphate rock."