

sumer has to pay from \$15 to \$18 a ton for them. Such screenings frequently contain seeds injurious to the health of animals, but it has been found that sheep are able to eat them without any apparent injury, and indeed thousands of sheep are fattened on such screenings every year. The feeding value of such screenings depends largely upon the character of the fodder grains found in them. For example a composite sample of wheat screenings was found to give the following analysis:— 20 per cent. wheat and barley; 12 per cent. oats and wild oats; 30 per cent. buckwheat screenings; 12 per cent. lamb's quarters; 3 per cent. tumbling mustard; 2 per cent. other mustards; 2 per cent. other weed seeds; 19 per cent. chaff, etc.

It was explained how, that on account of this gigantic waste the present system of grain inspection has been evolved. All grain, practically, coming to Fort William, is docked. The average dockage in wheat is 2½ per cent., and on flax is 5 per cent. to 7 per cent. As a rule the elevator companies get whatever revenue comes from the sale of all screenings. The total dockage for 1911-12 was as follows:— wheat, 23,000 tons; flax, 14,000 tons; oats, 1,500 tons; barley, 750 tons.

In conclusion Mr. Dymond pointed out the importance of doing two things: (1) To provide some means whereby grain screenings could be devitalized on a commercial basis, and (2) to take out such seeds as are injurious to stock, and to dispose of the saleable part to Canadian stock men rather than to Americans.

In discussing fungi, Mr. Eastham first reviewed some general characteristics of the class, such as absence of chlorophyll, parasitism and saprophytism. He referred to the injurious nature of parasitic fungi in causing many diseases in plants and to the equally beneficial nature of saprophytic fungi in reducing fallen leaves, trees and other organic debris to simpler materials which at once become the food of growing plants again. He stated that there was no hard and fast line separating saprophytic from parasitic fungi, as for example, when a certain species of parasitic fungus had worked the destruction of a living tree it might still continue to exist upon the wood of the dead tree (saprophytic). He pointed out that the part that one sees above the substratum on which it grows is but the fruiting body, whereas the part which actually destroys the wood, viz., the mycelium, is buried out of sight and is found penetrating the fibres of the wood sometimes for several feet from the point where the external fruiting body is located. He traced the evolution in the structure of the fruiting body from the simplest of freely exposed plate-like discs to the more complex gill-bearing and tube-forming species. In this connection it was also noted