

Alaska peas, and Mingren sunflower.

"Major emphasis was given to detecting herbicide translocation symptoms in the seed crop. Thus far our study shows that via germination bioassays only dicamba shows evidence of such transmission and it shows only in peas," Erickson stated.

Concerning the possible pollution of the soil by long-lasting residues, Erickson reported that soils treated approximately May 20 were sampled on September 1, and later tested by pea bioassay for the presence of herbicide residues.

"Detectable residues were found for all herbicides for all rates," he explained. "However, after 50 days of incubation in the greenhouse, the soils were again bioassayed and no residues were found except for picloram."

Erickson also reported that these studies revealed no significant effect on the chemical composition of plants.

Perennial Weed Control

Putting chemicals on weeds to make them grow might seem a strange way of eradicating weeds, but scientists at Stanford Research Institute believe this may be the answer for certain perennial weeds.

Dr. Charles A. Beasley, manager of SRI's Plant Biology Laboratory, has managed to manipulate the growth pattern of Johnson grass so that the plant is more vulnerable to herbicides. The objective of this research is to allow the plant to be killed with a single application of herbicide.

"One of the major problems with applying herbicides to Johnson grass is that while one part of the plant is growing vigorously other parts may be in various stages of dormancy," Dr. Beasley explained. "Herbicides usually kill only those parts which are active, and are relatively ineffective on the dormant buds."

In laboratory experiments a chemical called Ethrel (2-chloroethane phosphonic acid), when applied to Johnson grass, acted in such a way as to cause most of the vegetative buds to become active simultaneously, allowing one application of herbicide to eradicate the entire plant.

Bartles Continues Fight Against Wood-Burning Ban

William H. Bartles of W. H. Bartles Tree Service, Hyde Park, N.Y., has quite a few bones to pick with the ban on open burning of wood, brush and leaves. While no one can deny the need for preventing air pollution, Bartles says, the major contributors to this pollution—motor vehicles and industrial smokestacks—should be attended to and not the "little guy," i.e. "smoke from wood, which burns clean anyway."

Municipal disposal areas, already taxed to capacity by a throw-away society, are now faced with the additional problem of incorporating logs, brush and stumps into their land fill system, he says. Governing officials, instead of trying to repeal the unnecessary ban on open burning of wood, are going to great lengths to dream up impractical ways to make the anti-wood burning resolutions work.

One scheme that will gobble up tax dollars, according to Bartles, is the "chipper plan." This proposal pertains to the use of chippers to dispose of brush and logs dumped at central sites. Officials fail to realize—and do not ask experienced tree service businessmen about limitations of chippers, Bartles says. These machines, he points out, are not effective when working on material that is dirty or when metal is present.

As Majority Leader of the Dutchess County Board of Representatives, Bartles has questioned the wood-burning ban from the beginning. His guest

editorial in the April, 1968 issue of **Weeds Trees and Turf** Explained why the ban is unsound.

In his continued fight to repeal the ban in New York State, Bartles has proposed that sites be picked in open areas where private individuals and municipalities can truck their burnable wood by-products and debris. Crews could then rotate from site to site and burn the piles under proper atmosphere and safety conditions.

This plan, he says, would lessen the load on town disposal areas where garbage is now being covered in the land fill method. It would also provide persons in the tree service business a place to properly dispose of such debris.

"It is impossible to level and cover 'uniformly' as the rules specify, and it is not practical to use any other method of disposal than burning," Bartles contends.

In his fight to get state authorities to repeal the wood-burning ordinance, Bartles and others have sent copies of specially passed resolutions to the governor, state legislators and every county government in New York. They also called a special meeting to present to state and federal officials reasons for seeking the repeal of the ban.

Bartles reveals that hearings have been held by the Board of Health in New York in answer to ever-increasing pressure to revise the resolutions. Some changes may come about, he reveals, although he cannot tell what they might be.

Bartles has asked that every New York tree service company will contact their governing officials to try to make them see the impracticability of the chipper plan. The Dutchess County proposal—which has since fallen through due to lack of funds—would have cost half-a million dollars for the first three years, he reveals, and the plan would not have worked. Federal funds were to have been used.