

structure had ever been found in the entire order of copepods, and hence Dana must have been mistaken in what he thought he saw. Steenstrup and Lütken described and figured a similar structure in the maxillipeds of their new genus *Perissopus* (*Kongelige Danske Vidensk. Selskabs Skrifter*, ser. 5, vol. 5, 1861, pl. 12, fig. 25), and there is every reason for believing the structure in both genera to be genuine.

Absolutely hypothetical reasoning like that quoted above can have but little influence, and it certainly does not possess sufficient merit to prove or disprove the validity of any genus.

CHAS. B. WILSON

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
WESTFIELD, MASS.

NEW DUST TREATMENTS FOR OATS SMUTS

SINCE the introduction of copper carbonate for wheat bunt control (Darnell-Smith, and Ross, 1919)¹ considerable interest has been shown in dust treatments for grain smuts. It was found by one of us (Thomas)² in field tests in 1924 that copper carbonate alone was not effective in controlling oats smuts. However, when one part of either copper carbonate or copper sulfate was mixed with two parts of mercuric bichloride the dust was effective. These mixtures are too expensive for general use even though rapid and easy of application. Other tests showed that the mixture was less effective when inert fillers were added. In 1926 a mixture of one part of copper sulfate, one part of mercuric bichloride and one part of cresylic acid was found to control oats smuts. While the cost of this dust was only about half that of the copper sulfate-mercuric bichloride dust, yet it is also too expensive for general use.

None of these dusts, although they gave satisfactory control of oats smuts, was as cheap as the liquid formaldehyde. This liquid treatment is objectionable because of the difficulty in handling the wet grain and the possibility of seed injury. Since formaldehyde is so effective against smut, and the wet methods of grain treatment are objectionable, an attempt was made to put formaldehyde in a dust form. This was done by mixing 40 per cent. formaldehyde with either infusorial earth or charcoal. These dusts stick well and thoroughly coat the grains when mixed with them. In these tests dusts containing 9 per cent., 15 per cent. and 25 per cent. of 40 per cent. formaldehyde were used, each at the rate of 3 ounces per bushel

of grain. While the checks showed 47 per cent. smut the various formaldehyde dusts reduced smut to less than one per cent.

Another new treatment, iodine vapor dust, was tried in these same experiments. This dust was made by mixing finely ground solid iodine with infusorial earth. The iodine vaporizes readily at ordinary temperatures and diffuses through the infusorial earth giving it a light yellow-ochre color. This dust contained 5 per cent. by weight of iodine and was applied at the same rate as the formaldehyde dust. Only three smutted heads were found in three one-hundredth acre plots which were treated with this dust. It is possible that lower concentrations of iodine dust will also control the oats smuts. Further tests are under way. The cost of treating grain with these dusts is estimated at considerably less than 5 cents a bushel.

J. D. SAYRE

R. C. THOMAS

OHIO AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
WOOSTER, OHIO

DO CATS SHARPEN THEIR CLAWS?

LAST winter the family cat (castrated male, 3½ years old) shed a number of claws in the house. These were found during January and February, some of them split lengthwise, the others intact. It struck the writer that the shedding of claws is probably a normal phenomenon with cats comparable to related phenomena, as that of the shedding of horns by deer. If this were true, it might be expected that some of the claws would be left in the bark of those trees which the cat used regularly for scratching. Upon investigation in April this bit of evidence was found in the form of two halves of a claw stuck into the bark of an elm and several halves lying under different trees used by the animal. The section of the bark was cut from the tree and with the pieces of claws has been mounted and placed in the college zoological museum.

This is but an isolated observation. There are good grounds, however, for believing the conjectured explanation to be correct. Cats do not instinctively or from experience select good grinding surfaces, slightly rough and hard, such as a cement walk, the foundation stone or the corner boards of a house, or smooth hard posts. They make use of the rough bark of trees which is always much softer than their claws. Observations of their scratching movements show that the animals do not scrape downward over the surface of the object, but catch the claws into the surface and with a circular stroke pull first downward and then outward and slightly upward. Careful examination of the cat's paws each time when a

¹ Darnell-Smith, G. P. and Ross, H. A dry method of treating seed wheat for bunt. *Agr. Gaz. N. So. Wales* 30: 685-692, 1919.

² Thomas, Roy C. Dust treatment for smut in oats. *SCIENCE*, No. 1567, Vol. LXI: 47-48. January 9, 1925.