

"I am convinced that in none of the above listed samples is there any evidence of intended fraud. The irregularity is apparently due to ignorance of legal requirements for shorts (middlings), and a mistaken idea that a low grade flour is even better value, than middlings as usually understood. I feel justified in recommending that for this first inspection under the Feeding Stuffs Act, leniency be exercised towards the vendors, and their attention called, to the requirements of the Act."

It is a matter for consideration whether G. 968 should not be amended by addition of this description of feed under the name "FEED FLOUR"; in such case it would be necessary to amend the Act in Section 2 (b), by exclusion of the term "FEED FLOUR" as a commercial feeding stuff requiring registration.

The standard for bran, shorts and chop feeds, as defined in G. 932, were amended on June 7, 1911, by the following clause: 'And must be free from vital seeds of any of the noxious weeds defined by the Governor in Council under the Seed Control Act.' (See G. 968).

Examination of all the samples herein reported as to their content in vital weed seeds has been made by the courtesy of the Department of Agriculture, through the office of the Seed Commissioner.

Samples were submitted to the Seed Commissioner on the twentieth of March, but this being the busiest season for that department of work, it was found impossible to report them until the 15th instant; which accounts for the considerable delay in issuing this Bulletin.

On that date, I received a very valuable and exhaustive report from the Seed Commissioner accompanied by the subjoined letter of explanation:—

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SEED COMMISSIONER,
OTTAWA, May 15, 1913.

MR. A. MCGILL,
Chief Analyst,
Inland Revenue Department, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,— Herewith I am sending you six folios containing summary results of the analysis of the samples of brans, shorts, middlings and chop feeds submitted with your letter of March 20.

For your convenience, we have arranged these in consecutive order according to your laboratory test numbers. If and when you have occasion to refer to the analysis of any sample, I shall be obliged if you will kindly quote our laboratory test number.

We have not made germination test of any of the weed seeds enumerated to determine whether they are vital. We have, however, enumerated only those weed seeds which were found to be fully matured and in perfect condition; these we have assumed to be vital.

Nature has provided most kinds of noxious weed seeds with a hard or mucilagenous seed coat by which the germ may be protected, even though the seed may be exposed to the best possible conditions for germination; such weed seeds do not lend themselves readily to artificial methods for determining their percentage vitality.

From research work that has been done in our seed laboratory and elsewhere, however, we have good reason to believe that there are exceedingly few fully matured and uninjured seeds of plants that can properly be characterized as noxious weeds that are not capable of germinating. The fact that they cannot be forced to germinate until nature has prepared them for such is the principal factor that brings them within the category of noxious weeds and makes them so troublesome to farmers.

Yours very truly,
GEO. H. CLARK,
Seed Commissioner.