there are at present any areas in the state which can properly be classified as "non-resistant." It can also be concluded that the degree of tolerance by this species to DDT is not the same in all areas of the state, and that the reasons for this are not known to the authors.

The widely varying results with DDT against different species, as shown in Table 2, also present a difficult problem of interpretation. While it is true that the highest kills were obtained with *Anopheles quadrimaculatus* and *Aedes aegypti* secured from laboratory colonies, the variable results obtained with DDT against the other species, all collected from natural breeding areas, do suggest that the natural tolerance of a species to DDT should be considered. However, the malathion data do not indicate a wide difference in susceptibility to this insecticide among the species studied.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. The authors are indebted to J. S. Haeger of the Entomological Research Center, Florida State Board of Health for his assistance in obtaining and rearing the test mosquitoes, and to E. J. Beidler, Director of the Indian River Mosquito Control District, and his staff for furnishing and operating the equipment for most of the tests. We are also grateful to the following directors of mosquito control for their cooperation in this research: W. W. Warner, Monroe County; F. H. Stutz, Dade County; R. E. Bartnett, St. Johns County; T. W. Miller, Lee County; J. Melton Williams, Sarasota County; Paul Patterson, Citrus County; and George Carmichael, Chatham County, Georgia. David Lieux and Doyle Taylor, Entomologists, Florida State Board of Health, actively assisted by collecting and transporting adult mosquitoes from certain counties to the Research Center. Finally we wish to acknowledge with sincere appreciation the fine cooperation and generosity of the Entomology Research Branch, Agricultural Research Service, U.S.D.A., at Orlando, Florida for furnishing eggs of *Aedes aegypti* and *Anopheles quadrimaculatus* from their laboratory colonies.

Literature Cited

DEONIER, C. C. and GILBERT, I. H. 1950. Resistance of salt-marsh mosquitoes to DDT and other insecticides. Mosquito News 10(3):138–143.

MCWILLIAMS, J. G. and MUNN, B. L. 1957. Studies of mosquito resistance to insecticides at some naval activities. Mosquito News 17(4): 258–260.

ROGERS, A. J., BEIDLER, E. J. and RATHBURN, C. B., JR. 1957a. A progress report on dosage tests with mosquito adulticides. Mosquito News 17(3):190–194.

———. 1957b. A cage test for evaluating mosquito adulticides under field conditions. Mosquito News 17(3):194–198.

REPLY TO REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Editor: In the *Mosquito News* just received, I note a query from Bob Armstrong about how to recover dusts to measure recovery at distances from the emitting machine. At Ft. Belvoir we used 6 x 6 in. glass plates coated with oil. These plates were recovered and the captured material (DDT) was analyzed quantitatively, using Dr. Haller's method, which was a relatively simple one after it was set up. I do not know if they continued this after I left or devised a better way. Perhaps members Carl Wesley or Lafe Edmunds could tell you. We tried laying the plates horizontally and hanging them up vertically and decided that our recovery was adequate either way. This measures the amount actually reaching the ground or passing through the foliage. I'd suggest a note to Carl or Dr. Edmunds might bring a response of interest since they've been at it over two years since I left and no doubt have added a lot to my primitive techniques.—(Signed) AUSTIN MORRILL, JR.