



ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

Contenu archive

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Agriculture et Agroalimentaire Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Agriculture et Agroalimentaire Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.

SURVEY OF THE
PREVALENCE OF PLANT DISEASES
IN THE
DOMINION OF CANADA.

1922

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

Vol. II

POTATO DISEASE SECTION.

DIVISION OF BOTANY
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS BRANCH
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

632.30971
C212
v. 3, pt. 2
1922
c. 2

POTATO

In the arrangement of data collected on the prevalence of potato diseases each province is dealt with separately, giving for each one notes of a general nature supplied by our collaborators and a report from the Potato Certification Service of the Division of Botany, covering all the provinces except British Columbia, in which the tabulated results are furnished by the Provincial Department of Agriculture, which conducts its own seed certification work.

As was the case in last year's data, in the fields inspected the growers had requested the service, anticipating that they would pass for certification. In Ontario a large number of fields entered in the provincial field crop competition were also inspected and the figures included in the following tables. The results given there would more nearly approximate the general prevalence of the diseases.

BRITISH COLUMBIA-

Coast and Kootenay-

LATE BLIGHT, caused by
Phytophthora infestans (Mont.) deBary

Late Blight appeared in the Chilliwack Valley somewhat late in the season, but has resulted in considerable tuber infection, in several cases the percentage being 50. Field inspection of growing crops showed the following average percentages of diseases:

Non-certified seed

No. of fields	Total acreage	Leaf roll	Mosaic	Blackleg	Rhizoc- tonia	Wilt
220	624.25	5.49	6.48	9.40	-	2.90

Certified seed

257	177.30	1.06	3.02	1.02	1.67	.74
-----	--------	------	------	------	------	-----

The tables from which these figures were obtained are appended, showing the disease distribution by districts.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

SYNOPSIS OF INSPECTION OF NON-CERTIFIED SEED FIELDS - 1922

<u>District</u>	<u>No. fields</u>	<u>Acreage</u>	<u>Average percentage of</u>				<u>Notes</u>
	<u>Inspected</u>	<u>Approximate</u>	<u>Leaf Roll</u>	<u>Mosaic</u>	<u>Wilt</u>	<u>Blackleg</u>	
1. Revelstoke	9	10.50	2.65	4.16	2.25	-	Vigor fair
2. Arrowhead	12	5.00	2.00	1.80	2.00	-	Poor
3. Rock Creek	11	8.25	12.70	7.00	-	-	Poor
4. Enderby	8	47.50	14.00	26.70	-	-	Fair to Poor
5. Essondale	6	22.00	6.2	1.00	-	1.1	
6. Armstrong	15	26.75	6.93	23.60	-	-	Poor
7. Thrums	7	42.50	7.00	-	-	-	
8. Lulu Island	10	15.5	3.70	4.45	1.19	.50	Fair
9. Ladner	10	25.0	2.90	5.00	1.40	.75	Fair
10. Cloverdale	18	76.0	3.40	3.09	2.60	1.37	Fair
11. Comox	6	8.5	6.75	5.10	2.30	1.25	
12. Coombs	6	.75	-	2.00	3.50	-	
13. Victoria	10	18.0	13.3	18.9	.75	-	
14. Matsqui	12	14.1	.46	2.0	1.22	.5	
15. Langley	6	11.	7.10	3.1	4.25		
16. Metchosin	16	21.	5.05	7.3	4.00	1.0	
17. Agassiz	14	17.75	.87	2.06	1.44	.87	
18. Mission	4	9.5	-	1.25	2.42	.25	
19. Denman Island	10	2.75	-	6.60	9.60	-	
20. Aldergrove	15	13.	2.58	1.38	.97	1.06	
21. Sardis	15	102.	1.30	3.20	6.63	.75	
<hr/>							
220 fields 624.25			5.49	6.48	2.90	9.40	

BRITISH COLUMBIA

SYNOPSIS OF INSPECTION OF CERTIFIED SEED - 1922

<u>District</u>	<u>Fields</u>	<u>Acreage</u>	<u>Leaf Roll</u>	<u>Mosaic</u>	<u>Blackleg</u>	<u>Rhizoctonia</u>	<u>Wilt</u>	<u>Impurities</u>
Chilliwack	51	33	1.5	1.36	.75	1.8	1.8	.46
Comox	71	22.25	.45	3.8	.32	1.1	.56	.8
Errington	6	4.	.37	1.58		1.75	1.3	.25
Cowichan	20	20.	.6	1.58		2.86	.59	
Windermere	25	18.25	1.45	3.15	2.0	.8		.5
Keating	3	5.2	1.2	2.75				
Victoria	16	7.	1.26	1.4			.625	
Grand Forks	31	43.65	1.9	3.79		1.25	.875	
Kelowna	14	12.	1.42	2.8		1.17	.5	
Malakwa	13	5.95	.43			1.8	.5	.75
Vernon	6	5.		9.25		2.5		
Kamloops	1	1		1.75				

Average for
diseased fields 257 177.30 1.06 3.02 1.02 1.67 .74 .55

ALBERTA-

SCAB, caused by Actinomyces scabies (Thax.) Güssow

Amount varies from one to almost one hundred per cent.

Reports indicate fifty per cent above the average;
attributed to dry season by farmers (DeLong).

Mosaic, leafroll and blackleg present at Lacombe,
but slight amount (DeLong).

The following table shows not only the prevalence of
the various diseases in the fields inspected, but also the various reasons why certain fields failed to come up to certification standard. The outstanding causes would appear to be blackleg, presence of foreign varieties and wilt.

ALBERTA

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
226	628 $\frac{1}{2}$	129	176 $\frac{3}{4}$	57.1	28.1			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 2.0	L.R. .3	Mos. 1.9	Wilts 1.4	E.B. .07	L.B. .2	Rhiz. 6.3	T.B. .2
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.5	.2	.7	1.0	.1	.5	4.5	.3
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	4.1	.4	3.5	1.8	0.0	.05	7.6	.2

Of the 97 fields rejected, 27 containing 208 acres were rejected owing to

9	"	24 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	Blackleg
2	"	6	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic
11	"	26 $\frac{3}{4}$	"	"	"	"	"	Leaf roll
37	"	134 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	Wilts
5	"	7	"	"	"	"	"	Foreign varieties
6	"	52 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	Lack of vigour
								Mosaic & Blackleg

SASKATCHEWAN-

EARLY BLIGHT, caused by
Alternaria solani (E. & M.) J. & G.

Common and severe in some places.

RHIZOCTONIA, caused by
Corticium vagumsolani B. & C.

Very common, and doing much damage as usual.

The following table indicates that the presence of foreign varieties, blackleg and mosaic, was largely responsible for fields not coming up to certification standard.

SASKATCHEWAN

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
282	844	207	385	73.4	45.6			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	1.4	.6	1.4	.05	.9	.002	6.4	.9
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.65	.37	.74	.04	.87	.003	5.4	.6
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	3.7	1.2	3.3	.06	.9	0.0	9.3	1.8

Of the 75 fields rejected, 4 containing 10 acres were rejected owing to Mosaic
 25 " 175 " " " " " " Blackleg
 41 " 266 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " " " " Foreign varieties
 2 " 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " " " " Mosaic & Blackleg
 2 " 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " " " " Mosaic & Leaf Roll
 1 " $\frac{1}{4}$ " " " " " Lack of vigour

MANITOBA-

EARLY BLIGHT, caused by
Alternaria solani (E. & M.) J. & G.

This disease was more general and abundant than last year, and sometimes a factor in prematurely ripening the tops.

TIP BURN: cause unknown

Scarcely noticed. Leaf hoppers were found almost throughout the province.

LEAF ROLL: cause unknown

The manifestations of leaf roll were somewhat variable, in some cases the typical rolling and thickening of the leaves being confined strictly to the lower part of the plant, while the rest of the plant was as healthy looking as its neighbours. A marked increase over last year was apparent, although from both Ontario and Minnesota origin, crops found free or nearly free last year, have produced crops this year both free and diseased up to 10% or more. Efforts to discover an explanation were unsuccessful.

MOSAIC: cause unknown

Some crops showed a marked increase over last year, and a slight increase may have been general. One field with over 5% of what was believed to be Mosaic, when seen a month later had lost these symptoms, but had many plants, presumably the same ones, lodged on

the ground with all foliage gone except a tuft at the end of each branch. Something like the leaf drop of P. A. Murphy's bulletin seems indicated.

CURLY DWARF: cause unknown

Infrequently met.

SPINDLING SPROUT: cause unknown

Occasionally met with.

BLACK LEG, caused by
Bacillus solanisaprus Har.

Responsible for many severe losses this year. In some fields too retentive of the heavy rains as much as a third of the plants were lodged and rotted at the surface of the ground, and this regardless of how free of black leg the source of the seed may have been last year. The infection would seem to have been almost invariably at the surface and not from the tuber, and in the case of the severest attack did its work quickly, like a sudden epidemic. In some cases rotting of the lower stem is believed to have been an advanced stage of severe Rhizoctonia stem-rot.

WILTS, caused by
(Fusarium oxysporum Schl.
(Verticillium albo-atrum MCA.

As distinguished by the wilting of the tops, this disease was seldom noticed, but in a few crops

browning of the vascular bundles may have been caused by *Fusarium*; *Rhizoctonia* complications were so generally present that determination of wilts was unsatisfactory.

RHIZOCTONIA, caused by
Corticium vagumsolani B. & C.

As also last year, lesions on the stems were general; but unlike last year, when the effect on the growing crop was seldom severe, the crop this year very commonly showed injury, especially as the season advanced. In many cases the tubers were crowded together at the surface of the ground, and deformed or even cracked, and frequently the growth was forced into the tops. Practically all crops had more than 10% of the tubers quite noticeably covered with black scurf, and from that to over 75%. So severe was the infection from the soil, that plots treated with corrosive sublimate had no ultimate advantage over untreated plots. Some advantage in favour of immaturity at digging was again noticed.

COMMON SCAB, caused by
Actinomyces scabies (Thax.) Güssow

Seldom present to any great extent, but a few crops with over 50% on sandy or freshly manured fields.

NET NECROSIS: cause unknown

Distinct netting or other flesh discolorations infrequent.
One crop had a stem end browning in severe form.

DRY ROT, caused by
Fusarium oxysporum Schl.

At the end of winter storage several crops of Early Ohios were considerably affected with dry rot which had penetrated deeply beneath the skin, commonly from a point of injury. Not found in any other variety.

BACTERIAL ROT, caused by various bacteria

Not found in storage, but occasionally in the growing season.

HOLLOW HEART: cause unknown

Not of much consequence this year.

Another probably distinct disease type occurred in many fields in small numbers, and was characterized by a compact, stiffly upright vine, with the underground part of the stem somewhat thickened and fleshy and almost translucent. These stems were apt to be free of Rhizoctonia lesions than others. The habit of the plant suggested leaf roll, but was due probably to shorter jointed growth not to the rolling and upright slant of leaf found in leaf roll.

The following table shows that leaf roll, blackleg and the presence of foreign varieties were the principal causes of certain fields not coming up to standard for certification:

MANITOBA

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
191	976	113	533	59.2	54.6			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 1.2	L.R. 2.3	Mos. .6	Wilts .17	E.B. 2.1	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 10.0	T.B. .2
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.5	1.2	.4	.15	2.3	0.0	9.2	.3
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	2.2	3.5	.9	.2	1.9	0.0	10.9	.06

Of the 78 fields rejected, 27 containing 85 acres were rejected owing to

1	"	13	"	"	"	"	"	Leaf Roll
5	"	9	"	"	"	"	"	Blackleg & Wilt
3	"	7	"	"	"	"	"	Insect Injury
14	"	56	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic & Leafroll
13	"	156	"	"	"	"	"	B lackleg
5	"	96	"	"	"	"	"	Foreign varieties
3	"	5	"	"	"	"	"	Lack of vigour
1	"	2	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic
	"	6	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic & Blackleg

ONTARIO-

The following tables cover the prevalence of plant diseases in the standing field crop competitions and the fields for which applications were made for inspection, the summaries for each being given separately. Tabulated results are given for each district, with reasons for certain fields failing to come up to certification standard:

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (S.F.C.C.)
FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922.

Summary:

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
349	220 $\frac{1}{2}$	119	74 $\frac{1}{4}$	34.1		33.7		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	.9	1.9	3.8	.02	.7	.4	1.8	.6
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.7	.8	2.1	.001	.9	.3	2.0	.5
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.0	2.3	4.7	.03	.7	.4	1.7	.6

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (S.F.C.C.)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922.

Algoma District:

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
55	46 $\frac{1}{2}$	25			20	45.5		43.0
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	1.2	.5	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	1.3	.5	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.2	.6	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0

Of the 30 fields rejected, 15 containing 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres were rejected owing to

10	"	11	"	"	"	"	"	"	Foreign varieties
2	"	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic
2	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	"	Blackleg
1	"	$\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic & Leaf Roll
									Lack of vigour

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (S.F.C.C.)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922.

Kenora District:

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
9	5½	1	½	11.1		9		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 2.3	L.R. .7	Mos. 2.7	Wilts .14	E.B. .5	L.B. .5	Rhiz. 0.0	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	2.6	0.0	2.3	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	2.0	.5	2.8	.2	.6	.6	0.0	0.0

Of the 8 fields rejected, 4 containing 2½ acres were rejected owing to Foreign varieties

1	"	½	"	"	"	"	"	Blackleg
2	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic
1	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	Lack of vigour

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (S.F.C.C.)
FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Muskoka District:

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
53	31	21	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	39.6	46.8			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .06	E.R. 1.0	Mos. 4.2	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. .7	T.B. 1.4
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.01	1.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	.6	2.1
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.1	1.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	.8	.9

Of the 32 fields rejected, 7 containing 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ acres were rejected owing to Foreign varieties

4	"	2	"	"	"	"	"	"	Leaf roll
11	"	7 $\frac{1}{4}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic
6	"	3	"	"	"	"	"	"	Lack of vigour
1	"	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	Insect injury

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (S.F.C.C.)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922.

Parry Sound District:

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
122	65	32	16 $\frac{3}{4}$	26.2	25.8			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .32	L.R. 4.9	Mos. 5.5	Wilts .01	E.B. .9	L.B. .01	Rhiz. 3.4	T.B. .9
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.3	1.3	2.8	.009	1.6	.16	4.9	1.4
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.34	6.2	6.5	.01	.7	.06	2.9	.7

Of the 90 fields rejected, 26 containing 15 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres were rejected owing to

29	"	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	Foreign varieties
26	"	13 $\frac{3}{4}$	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic
5	"	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	Leaf roll
								Mosaic and
4	"	2	"	"	"	"	"	Leaf roll
								Lack of vigour

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (S.F.C.C.)
FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922.

Rainy River District:

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>				<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
21	25½	6				4½	28.6	18.8
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	.2	5.4	4.2	0.0	1.9	1.9	.5	1.7
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	1.7	2.9	0.0	0.0	1.7	.8	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.3	6.9	4.7	0.0	2.5	2.0	.3	2.3

Of the 15 fields rejected, 6 containing 11 acres were rejected owing to Foreign varieties

2	"	4½	"	"	"	"	"	"	Leaf roll
5	"	3	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic and
									Leaf roll
1	"	½	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic
1	"	1½	"	"	"	"	"	"	Lack of vigour

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (S.F.C.C.)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922.

Temiskaming District:

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
43	23 $\frac{1}{2}$	10	4 $\frac{3}{4}$	23.3	20.4			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 1.4	L.R. .7	Mos. 4.1	Wilts .01	E.B. .2	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 3.4	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.2	1.2	2.3	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.5	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.8	.6	4.7	.02	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0

Of the 33 fields rejected, 15 containing 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres were rejected owing to foreign varieties

8	"	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic
1	"	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	Blackleg
5	"	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	Lack of vigour
2	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic and Leaf roll
2	"	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic and Blackleg

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (S.F.C.C.)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922.

Thunder Bay District:

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>		<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
46	24	24		13		52.2		54.2	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilt	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.	
	.8	.2	2.6	0.0	1.1	.3	1.9	.2	
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.3	.1	1.7	0.0	1.2	.4	1.9	0.0	105
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.4	.4	3.6	0.0	.9	.3	1.8	.4	

Of the 22 fields rejected, 8 containing 4 acres were rejected owing to Foreign varieties
 1 " 1 1/2 " " " " " " " " Blackleg
 8 " 4 " " " " " " " " Mosaic
 5 " 2 1/2 " " " " " " " " Lack of vigour

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Summary:

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
148	231 $\frac{5}{4}$	85	130 $\frac{1}{2}$	57.4	56.3			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .8	L.R. .9	Mos. 2.8	Wilts .1	E.B. 1.0	L.B. .1	Rhiz. 2.6	T.B. .87
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.3	.7	1.2	.1	1.2	.2	2.5	1.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.1	1.0	4.0	.1	.7	.04	2.8	.7

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Algoma District:

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
10	16½	3	5½	30	35.5			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .4	L.R. .5	Mos. 3.8	Wilts .06	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 4.0	T.B. 1.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.15	.3	.4	.3	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.5 ^{1/3}
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.5	.6	5.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0

Of the 7 fields rejected, 4 containing 7 acres were rejected owing to Mosaic

2	"	2	"	"	"	"	"	Foreign varieties
1	"	2	"	"	"	"	"	Lack of vigour

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Kenora District:

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
20	21½	7	4½	35	20.9			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	2.2	.8	2.6	.8	1.5	0.0	.5	.25
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.4	1.1	1.7	.6	2.0	0.0	.7	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	3.1	.7	3.2	1.0	1.2	0.0	.4	.4

Of the 13 fields rejected, 5 containing 11 acres were rejected owing to Blackleg
 3 " 1½ " " " " " " " Mosaic
 4 " 4 " " " " " " " Lack of vigour
 1 " ½ " " " " " " " Wilts

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Muskoka District:

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
13	11 $\frac{1}{4}$	9	8	69.2		71.1		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .2	L.R. .7	Mos. 2.5	Wilts 0.0	E.B. .4	L.B. .4	Rhiz. 1.7	T.B. 1.7
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.2	.3	1.1	0.0	.5	.5	2.2	1.7
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	1.5	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2

Of the 4 fields rejected, all, containing 3 $\frac{1}{4}$ acres, were rejected owing to Mosaic

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Parry Sound District:

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
4	2	1			1	25		50
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	.8	3.1	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.3	1.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.9	3.8	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0

Of the 3 fields rejected, 2 containing 1 acre were rejected owing to Mosaic

1 " $\frac{1}{2}$ " " " " " " Leaf Roll

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
25	42	15			29		60	69-	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 0.0	L.R. .9	Mos. 1 3	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 3.6	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 4.1	T.B. 3.0	
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	.6	1.2	0.0	5.0	0.0	2.8	2.7	
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	.9	1.4	0.0	1.5	0.0	5.0	3.5	

Of the 10 fields rejected,	4	containing	$5\frac{1}{2}$	acres were rejected owing to Lack of
	4	"	$5\frac{1}{2}$	" " " " vigour
	1	"	2	" " " " Insect injury
	1	"	$\frac{1}{2}$	" " " " Mosaic
				" " " " Foreign varieties

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Sudbury District:

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>		<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
3	17	1		1½		33.3	8.9	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	1.3	.2	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.3	.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.8	.05	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0

Of the 2 fields rejected, 1 containing 12 acres was rejected owing to Foreign varieties

1 " 3½ " " " " " Mosaic and Black-
leg

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Temiskaming District

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
11	27	5			16		45.5	59.3
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .4	L.R. .8	Mos. 2.2	Wilts 0.0	E.B. .5	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 3.0	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.3	1.3	.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.5	.4	3.0	0.0	.8	0.0	3.5	0.0

Of the 6 fields rejected, 3 containing $8\frac{1}{2}$ acres were rejected owing to Foreign varieties

1	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	" Mosaic
1	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	" Mosaic & Leaf Roll
1	"	$\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	" Lack of vigour

NORTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922.

Thunder Bay District:

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
62	94½	44	65	71.0	68.8			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 1.1	L.R. .23	Mos. 1.3	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 1.8	L.B. .7	Rhiz. 4.2	T.B. 1.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.7	.1	.7	0.0	1.7	.9	4.5	1.3
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	2.2	.5	2.7	0.0	2.2	.3	5.5	.3

Of the 18 fields rejected, 4 containing 5½ acres were rejected owing to Mosaic
 5 " 1½ " " " " " Blackleg
 4 " 3½ " " " " " Lack of
 4 " 4½ " " " " " vigour
 " " " " " " Foreign
 " " " " " " varieties
 1 " 2 " " " " " Mosaic and
 " " " " " " leaf roll

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, S.F.C.C.

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

SUMMARY

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
246	266 $\frac{5}{4}$	69	73 $\frac{1}{2}$	28	27.6			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .29	L.R. 4.8	Mos. 3.5	Wilts .06	E.B. .09	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. .56	T.B. .1
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.19	2.7	1.1	.02	.5	0.0	.6	1.3
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.37	5.6	4.0	.009	0.0	0.0	.5	.1

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, S.F.C.C.,
FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922.

Bruce Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>per cent acres passed</u>	
10	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	1	10		9.5	
Average per cent in total fields inspected	B.L. .12	L.R. 7.0	Mos. 4.0	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 1.0 T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	2.6	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.13	7.5	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1 0.0

The nine fields containing 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres rejected, were all rejected owing to Leaf Roll

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, S.F.C.C.

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Carleton Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
9	9	1	1	11.1		11.1	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .06	L.R. 7.5	Mos. 2.0	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 1.2 T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	4.0	.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.07	7.9	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3 0.0

of the 8 fields rejected, 2 containing 2 acres were rejected owing to Foreign varieties

4	"	4	"	"	"	"	"	Leaf roll
1	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	Leaf Roll
1	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	and Mosaic
								Mosaic

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, S.F.C.C.

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Dufferin Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
51	59½	21	21	41.2	35.3			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 1.2	L.R. 1.1	Mos. 4.3	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 1.3	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.66	1.2	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	.5
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.7	1.1	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0

Of the 30 fields rejected,	12 containing	16 acres were rejected	owing to	
11	"	13	"	" Foreign varieties
3	"	4	"	" Mosaic & Leaf Roll
2	"	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	" Mosaic & Blackleg
1	"	1	"	" Blackleg
1	"	1	"	" Blackleg & Leaf Roll

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, S.F.C.C.

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Durham Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
13	13	0	0	0	0			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	0.0	2.8	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	.4	0.0

Two fields containing 2 acres were rejected owing to Leaf Roll

Eleven fields containing 11 acres were rejected owing to Foreign Varieties

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, S.P.C.C.

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Grey Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
31	35 $\frac{1}{4}$	10			12		32.2	36.1
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	1.3	2.6	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	.5	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	1.2	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	.5	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.9	3.2	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	.5	0.0

Of the 21 fields rejected, 10 containing 10 acres were rejected owing to

4	"	4	"	"	"	"	"	"	Leaf Roll
1	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic
4	"	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	Leaf Roll
									Foreign
									varieties
2	"	2	"	"	"	"	"	"	Lack of vigour

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, S.F.C.C.
FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Halton Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
11	11	6	6	54.5	54.5			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .03	L.R. 4.6	Mos. 1.4	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 0.0	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.05	2.6	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	7.1	1.4	0.0.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0.

Of the 5 fields rejected, 2 were rejected owing to Leaf Roll, containing 2 acres
 3 " " " " Foreign varieties, " 3 "

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, S.F.C.C.

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Hastings Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>		<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
47	43½	7		9½		14.9		21.8
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .28	L.R. 6.3	Mos. 5.8	Wilts .12	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. .14	T.B. .5
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.4	2.5	1.3	.14	0.0	0.0	.7	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.25	7.0	6.6	.1	0.0	0.0	1.5	.6

Of the 40 fields rejected, 18 containing 17½ acres were rejected

7	"	5½	"	"	"	owing to Mosaic and Leaf Roll
8	"	5½	"	"	"	owing to Foreign varieties
6	"	5	"	"	"	owing to Lack of vigour
1	"	½	"	"	"	owing to Leaf Roll
						owing to Blackleg

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, S.F.C.C.
FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Middlesex Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
13	13	2			2		15.4	15.4
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .4	L.R. .5	Mos. 9.2	Wilts .23	E.B. .8	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. .8	T.B. .8
Average per cent disease in fields passed	1.0	.4	2.9	.15	5.0	0.0	0.0	18.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.3	.5	10.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	.9	.9

-103-

of the 11 fields rejected, 6 containing 6 acres were rejected owing to Mosaic

5 " 5 " " " " Foreign
varieties

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, S.F.C.C.

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Ontario Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
11	11	0	0	0		0	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz. T.B.
	0.0	8.3	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 0.0

The 11 fields containing 11 acres were rejected owing to Mosaic and Leaf Roll.

Russell Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
1	1	1	1	100		100	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz. T.B.
	0.0	0.0	.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0 0.0

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, S.F.C.C.
FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Simcoe Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
10	10	5			5		50	50
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 0.0	L.R. 5.5	Mos. .3	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 0.0	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	2.1	.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	9.0	.06	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

of the 5 fields rejected, 4 containing 4 acres were rejected owing to Leaf Roll

1 " 1 " " " " " " Lack of vigour

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, S.F.C.C.
FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Wellington Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
12	12	6	6	50		50	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .5	L.R. 1.5	Mos. 3.0	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. T.B. 0.0 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.4	1.1	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.7	1.9	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Of the 6 fields rejected, 2 containing 2 acres were rejected owing to Mosaic & Leaf
 Roll

1	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic
3	"	3	"	"	"	"	"	"	Foreign varieties

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922:

No. fields inspected	No. acres inspected	No. fields passed	No. acres passed	Per cent fields passed	Per cent acres passed			
13	13	7	7	53.8	53.8			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .05	L.R. 2.8	Mos. 1.7	W.B. 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 2.3	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.04	2.6	.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.05	3.1	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Of the 6 fields rejected, 5 containing 5 acres were rejected owing to Foreign vari-	
	eties
1 " 1 " " " "	Leaf Roll & Mosaic

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, S.F.C.C.

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

York Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
14	27	2	2	14.3	7.4			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .1	L.R. 16.3	Mos. 4.6	Wilts .022	E.B. .4	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. .3	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.1	2.8	.1	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.1	18.6	5.3	.025	0.0	0.0	.4	0.0

Of the 12 fields rejected, 9 containing 22 acres were rejected owing to Leaf Roll

2	"	2	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic &
									Leaf Roll
1	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	"	Foreign
									varieties

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Summary

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
136	327 $\frac{3}{4}$	68			152 $\frac{1}{4}$	50		47.2
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	E.L. .3	L.R. 2.2	Mos. 4.1	Wilts 0.0	E.B. .7	L.B. 1.2	Rhiz. 1.2	T.B. 3.1
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.3	1.0	1.1	0.0	.7	.5	.7	1.7
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.1	3.1	5.3	0.0	.4	1.0	1.0	2.6

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)
FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922.

Bruce Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
2	3 $\frac{3}{4}$	0	0	0	0			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 0.0	L.R. 1.3	Mos. 20.1	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 2.5	T.B. 0.0

These two fields, containing 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ acres, were rejected owing to Mosaic

Carleton Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
2	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	100	100			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 2.8	L.R. 0.0	Mos. 0.0	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 2.5	T.B. 0.0

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Dufferin Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
9	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	1			2	11.1		7.0
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .6	L.R. .8	Mos. 12.1	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. .7	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	E.O. 0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.7	.9	13.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	.5	0.0

Of the 8 fields containing 26 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres rejected, all were rejected owing to mosaic

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Durham Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
5	5	1			5	20		10	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.	
	0.0	1.4	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	15.0	
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	3.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	1.1	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	18.6	

Of the 4 fields rejected, 3 containing $3\frac{1}{2}$ acres were rejected owing to Mosaic

1 " 1 " " " " " " Lack of Vigour

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, 1922 (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Elgin Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
10	10½	6	9½	60	88.1			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L..	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.L.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	.03	7.6	.6	0.0	.5	1.0	1.0	2.5
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.05	.6	.5	0.0	.8	1.6	1.6	4.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	18.5	.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Of the 4 fields, containing 1½ acres, all were rejected owing to Leaf Roll.

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Grey Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
1	1	0	0	0		0		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	0.0	2.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

This field was rejected owing to foreign varieties

Hastings Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
3	6	3	6	100		100		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	.5	.4	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
3	9	0	0	0	0			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	E.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	.1	.2	.3	0.0	3.3	11.6	5.0	11.6

1 " 3 " " " " " Late Blight

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Lanark Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
16	14 ³ / ₄	10	12 ³ / ₄	62.4		91.1	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .04	L.R. 1.9	Mos. 1.1	Wilts 0.0	E.B. .3	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 1.2 T.B. .6
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	1.2	.03	0.0	0.0	0.0	.5 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.1	3.0	3.0	0.0	.8	0.0	2.5 1.6

Of the 6 fields rejected, 2 containing $\frac{1}{2}$ acre were rejected owing to Foreign varieties

2	"	$\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic
2	"	$\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	Lack of vigour

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Leeds Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
5	5½	1			1		20		19
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 0.0	L.R. 3.2	Mos. 1.6	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0		L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. .8	T.B. 1.3
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	4.0	1.6	0.0	0.0		0.0	1.2	2.5

Of the 4 fields rejected, 2 containing 2½ acres were rejected owing to Foreign varieties

1	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	"	" Mosaic
1	"	¾	"	"	"	"	"	"	" Leaf Roll

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Middlesex Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
7	27	3			14		42.9	51.8
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	.03	.3	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.8	.7	3.9
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.06	.4	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	2.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	.25	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	1.5	6.9

-118-

Of the 4 fields rejected, 1 containing 4 acres was rejected owing to Mosaic &
Foreign varieties
1 " 3 " " " " " Foreign varieties
2 " 6 " " " " " Lack of vigour

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Norfolk Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
9	20½	7	13½	77.7		65.9		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .03	L.R. .8	Mos. 1.0	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 2.9	L.B. 3.6	Rhiz. .5	T.B. 5.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.04	.9	.09	0.0	3.6	4.7	.7	4.3
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	.6	4.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	5.0

Of the 2 fields rejected, 1 containing 6 acres was rejected owing to Mosaic.

1 " 1 " " " " " Foreign varieties.

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Ontario Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
8	52½	1	2	12.5	3.8			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .5	L.R. 3.9	Mos. 5.2	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 0.0	T.B. 3.7
Average per cent disease in fields passed	1.3	2.6	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.3	4.1	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3

Of the 7 fields rejected, 2 containing 2½ acres were rejected owing to Mosaic

3	"	19½	"	"	"	"	"	Foreign varieties
1	"	3	"	"	"	"	"	Leaf Roll
1	"	4	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic & Leaf Roll

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Peel Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
5	4	0	0	0	0			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	0.0	8.8	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Of these 5 fields, 4 containing 3 acres were rejected owing to Leaf Roll.

1 " 1 " " " " " Foreign varieties.

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Peterboro' Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
7	7	5	4½	71.4		64.3	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 0.0	L.R. 2.3	Mos. 1.1	Wilts 0.0	E.B. .7	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. T.B. .7 3.5
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	.8	.6	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0 5.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	6.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 0.0

Of the 2 fields rejected 1 containing ½ acre was rejected owing to Leaf Roll & Mosaic

1 " 2 " " " " " Lack of vigour

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922Simcoe Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
10	39	4	13	40	33.3			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .09	L.R. 4.3	Mos. 4.5	Wilts 0.0	E.B. .5	L.B. .5	Rhiz. 1.5	T.B. 1.2
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.15	2.6	.5	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.2	1.9
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.05	6.2	7.2	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.6	.8

of the 6 fields rejected, 3 containing 13 acres were rejected owing to Mosaic

3 " 13 " " " " " " Leaf Roll

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Welland Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
15	19 $\frac{1}{2}$	15	19 $\frac{1}{2}$	100		100		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	E.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	0.0	.7	.1	0.0	5.0	3.3	.3	10.0

Wellington Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
12	60 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	45	50		74.4		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	.2	1.8	6.6	0.0	.8	.8	2.0	.8
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.3	1.3	1.1	0.0	1.6	0.0	1.6	1.6
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.1	2.3	12.1	0.0	0.0	1.6	2.5	0.0

Of the 6 fields rejected, 1 containing 11 acres were rejected owing to Mosaic
 1 " 3 " " " " " Leaf Roll
 1 " 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " " " Foreign varieties

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Wentworth Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
5	8	2	4	40		50		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 0.0	L.R. .8	Mos. 10.3	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 0.0	T.B. 3.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	1.3	15.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6

Of the 3 fields rejected, 2 containing $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres were rejected owing to mosaic

1 " $1\frac{1}{2}$ " " " " " Foreign
varieties

SOUTHERN ONTARIO, (certified seed)

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

York Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>		<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
2	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	1		4	50		72.7	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 1.1	L.R. 1.4	Mos. 3.8	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. .5	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	1.6	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.6	1.3	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The 1 field containing 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres rejected, was rejected owing to Mosaic

QUEBEC

EARLY BLIGHT, caused by
Alternaria solani (E. & M.) J. & G.

This disease was quite common, and in August and September the foliage was considerably spotted. The spots were not large and rarely coalesced, and it is not likely that the resulting loss in yield was appreciable.

LATE BLIGHT, caused by
Phytophthora infestans (Mont.) deBary

Not seen to any extent.

MOSAIC and LEAF ROLL: cause unknown

Were present, but not serious, although aphids were found in considerable numbers during mid October.

TIP BURN

Was prevalent during September, and leaf hoppers were common on late varieties.

BLACK DOT, caused by Verinicularia sp.

This new disease which is being studied by the author was of frequent occurrence during the latter part of this season. In some fields it was present to the extent of 5%. It is impossible to say yet whether it causes serious injury, but

it was usual to find affected plants dying down two or three weeks earlier than healthy ones in the same plot. The root systems, stolons and ground-level stem tissues are attacked and killed. The development of tubers depends upon the stage at which the stolons are affected.

The following are summaries of disease prevalence by counties as determined by the seed certification service:-

QUEBEC.

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Summary

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
682	2369 $\frac{1}{2}$	526	1956 $\frac{1}{2}$	77.1	82.6			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .29	L.R. .26	Mos. 1.6	Wilts .07	E.B. .58	L.B. .42	Rhiz. .7	T.B. .06
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.19	.24	.58	.075	.65	.63	.54	.03
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.35	.52	4.1	.03	.05	.02	.83	.11

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922.

Arthabasca Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>		<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent Acres passed</u>
3	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	2		1 $\frac{3}{4}$		66		70
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz...	T.B.
	0.0	.3	7.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	.5	.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in field rejected	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The field containing $\frac{3}{4}$ acre, rejected, was rejected owing to Mosaic.

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Bagot Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
2	5½	2	5½	100	100			
Average per cent disease in fields inspected and passed	B.L. 0.0	L.R. .1	Mos. .1	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 0.0	T.B. 0.0

Bellechasse Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
1	2	1	2	100	100			
Average per cent disease in field inspected and passed	B.L. 0.0	L.R. 0.0	Mos. 0.0	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 0.0	T.B. 0.0

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Bonaventure Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
95	163 $\frac{1}{2}$	76	130 $\frac{1}{2}$	80		79.8	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .3	L.R. .2	Mos. .6	Wilts .05	E.B. 0.0	L.B. .16	Khiz. T.E. .8 .1
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.3	.14	.46	.02	0.0	.16	.33 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.27	.42	1.2	.2	0.0	0.0	2.7 .5

Of the 19 fields rejected, 1 containing 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres was rejected owing to Blackleg & Wilt
 1 " 1 " " " " " Mosaic & Leaf Roll
 1 " $\frac{1}{2}$ " " " " " " Leaf Roll & Mosaic
 2 " 3 " were " " " " Lack of vigour
 1 " 3 " was " " " " Insect Injury
 13 " 24 " were " " " " Foreign varieties

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Champlain Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
4	6½	3	5	75		82.3	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz. T.B.
	.07	.07	7.7	.07	0.0	1.2	0.0 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.1	0.0	.2	.1	0.0	5.0	0.0 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	.3	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 0.0

The field rejected, containing 1½ acres, was rejected owing to Mosaic

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Charlevoix Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
26	204	25	200	96.2		98.0	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .24	L.R. .68	Mos. .18	Wilts .04	E.B. .38	L.B. .38	Rhiz. T.B. 1.3 .2
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.23	.47	.13	.04	.4	.4	1.0 .2
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.3	6.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0 0.0

The field rejected, containing 4 acres, was rejected owing to Leaf Roll

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Dorchester Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
2	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	100	100			
Average per cent disease in fields inspected and passed	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	.5	1.8	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Drummond Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
1	2	1	2	100	100			
Average per cent disease in fields inspected and passed	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	0.0	0.0	.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
38	50 $\frac{1}{2}$	25	36 $\frac{3}{4}$	65.8	73.1			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 1.0	L.R. .008	Mos. .2	Wilts .03	E.B. 1.6	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. .6	T.B. .7
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.58	0.0	.17	.04	.4	0.0	.6	1.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.8	.02	.3	.02	3.8	0.0	.7	0.0

Of the 13 fields rejected, 8 containing 7½ acres were rejected owing to Foreign varieties
3 " 4½ " " " " " Lack of vigour
1 " 1 " was " " " Insect Injury
1 " 1 " " " " " Blackleg

Total	13	$13\frac{1}{2}$
-------	----	-----------------

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Jacques Cartier Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
2	1	2	1	100	100			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected and passed	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	.3	0.0	1.3	.2	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Kamouraska Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
7	17 $\frac{3}{4}$	5	12 $\frac{3}{4}$	71.4	71.8			
Average per cent disease in fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	.1	.3	1.1	.04	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.1	.4	.3	.06	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	.3	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Of the 2 fields rejected, 1 containing 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres was rejected owing to Mosaic
 1 " 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " " " " Foreign Varieties

Total 4 5

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

La Prairie Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
1	1	1	1	100		100	
Average per cent disease in field inspected and passed	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz. T.B.
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Lac St. Jean Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
34	39 $\frac{1}{2}$	7	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	20.6		18.9	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz. T.B.
	1.0	.12	4.9	.02	0.0	0.0	1.7 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.3	.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.2	.02	6.3	.02	0.0	0.0	2.4 0.0

Of the 27 fields rejected, 20 containing 23 acres were rejected owing to mosaic
 1 " 3 " was " " " Mosaic & Blackleg
 2 " 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ " were " " " Blackleg
 4 " 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " " " Foreign
 varieties
 Total 27 32

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Laval Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>		<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
23	63	22		60		95.7		95.2
Average per cent disease in fields inspected	B.L. .16	L.R. .31	Mos. .37	Wilts .01	E.B. 3.7	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 2.8	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.17	.32	.39	.01	3.9	0.0	3.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

One field containing 3 acres was rejected owing to foreign varieties

Levis Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>		<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
4	9½	4		9½		100		100
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .07	L.R. .5	Mos. .3	Wilts .3	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 0.0	T.B. 0.0

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

L'Islet Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
12	50 $\frac{1}{2}$	9			41	75		81.2
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .2	L.R. .1	Mos. .2	Wilts .025	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 0.0	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.3	.13	.25	.03	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	.1	.1	.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Of the 3 fields containing 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres rejected, all were rejected owing to
foreign varieties.

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
142	643½	93	524½	65.5	81.5			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	1.3	.9	3.6	.02	3.1	2.6	6.4	.6
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.66	.18	.68	.03	4.0	3.7	4.8	.43
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	2.4	2.3	9.2	.006	1.5	.4	9.6	1.1

Of the 49 fields rejected,	23	containing	$57\frac{1}{2}$	acres	were	rejected	owing to	Mosaic
	13	"	$25\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	Foreign varieties
	5	"	$9\frac{3}{4}$	"	"	"	"	Mosaic & Leafroll
	1	"	$1\frac{1}{2}$	"	was	"	"	Leaf roll
	2	"	4	"	were	"	"	Leaf roll &
								Blackleg
	1	"	$2\frac{1}{2}$	"	was	"	"	Blackleg
	4	"	$18\frac{3}{4}$	"	were	"	"	Lack of vigour

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Megantic Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
8	7½	4	4½	50	56.7			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 1.0	L.R. .2	Mos. .9	Wilts .1	E.B. .6	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 0.0	T.B. .6
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.07	0.0	1.1	.3	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	2.0	.3	.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1

Of the 4 fields rejected, 3 containing 2½ acres were rejected owing to Foreign varieties

1 " 2 " was " " " Blackleg

Total 4 " 4½

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Montmagny Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
2	2	2	2	100	100			
Average per cent disease in fields inspected and passed	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	.15	.15	.45	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Rimouski Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields inspected</u>	<u>Per cent acres inspected</u>			
141	616 $\frac{3}{4}$	135	578 $\frac{3}{4}$	95.7	93.8			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	.4	.1	.7	.02	1.1	0.0	1.6	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed								
	.4	.1	.6	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.7	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected								
	.7	.2	2.6	0.0	.8	0.0	1.7	0.0

Of the 6 fields rejected, 5 containing 12 acres were rejected owing to Foreign varieties
 1 " 26 " was " " " Mosaic

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Rouville Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
1	2	1			2	100		100
Average per cent disease in field inspected and passed	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	0.0	0.0	.6	.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

St. Hyacinthe Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
1	1	1			1	100		100
Average per cent disease in fields inspected and passed	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Shefford Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
9	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	8			1 $\frac{1}{2}$	88.8		60.0
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 0.0	L.R. 0.0	Mos. 3.7	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 0.0	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	0.0	.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

One field containing one acre was rejected owing to Mosaic

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Temiscouata Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
122	438 $\frac{3}{4}$	82	282	67.2		64.3		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .9	L.R. .06	Mos. 1.4	Wilts .32	E.B. 0.0	L.B. .2	Rhiz. .4	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.65	.02	.45	.32	0.0	.24	.3	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.4	.14	3.3	.3	0.0	.12	.62	0.0

Of the 40 fields rejected, 30 containing 116 acres were rejected owing to Foreign varieties

7	"	32 $\frac{3}{4}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic
3	"	8	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic & Blackleg

Total

40

156 $\frac{3}{4}$

QUEBEC

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Terrebonne Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
39	85 $\frac{3}{4}$	38	79 $\frac{3}{4}$	97.4		93.0		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .2	L.F. .34	Mos. .3	Wilts .09	E.B. 3.0	L.B. .6	Rhiz. 1.8	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.2	.34	.3	.09	3.0	.6	1.8	0.0
Average per cent disease in field rejected	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

One field containing 6 acres was rejected owing to Foreign varieties.

NEW BRUNSWICK -

BLACK LEG, caused by
Bacillus Solaniasaprus Har.

Practically no fields are free from this disease. The amount varies from 1% to 10%; more abundant this year than usual. Two fields planted with seed in which Black leg had not been present for three seasons at least, developed the disease, indicating that it might have been carried in the soil. There were no reasons for anticipating other sources of infection.

LATE BLIGHT, caused by
Phytophthora infestans (Mont.) DeBary

This fungus usually causes considerable loss in New Brunswick, frequently amounting to 25 and 50% of the crop. Spraying with Bordeaux mixture, which is the general practice among the larger growers, successfully controls the disease. The south-eastern section of the province, where the growers do not spray, and which is subject to heavy fogs, always has heavy infection, resulting in low yields and large percentage of rot; this season running as high as 15%.

MOSAIC: cause unknown

This disease has been common for at least eight seasons. During that period it has been increasing except where vigorous roguing and selection has been practised, favored by favorable climatic conditions

and the absence of aphid. Field studies undoubtedly prove that the aphid spreads the disease. Further, that the rose bush is the chief if not the only host of the aphid. Localities without rose bushes are free from aphid and the native potato stock in these localities is relatively free from Mosaic. Restigouche and parts of Gloucester counties have many localities suitable for the production of Mosaic-free seed stock. Considerable stock is now available containing less than 2% Mosaic, and much of it with less than 1%. The symptoms are more easily noted on Green Mountains, Bliss Triumphs, American Giants, than on Irish Cobblers, Cumming's Pride and varieties of the Rural group.

LEAF ROLL: cause unknown

This disease is not nearly so common as Mosaic. It occurs more commonly on the Irish Cobbler and other blue sprout varieties. Varieties of the Green Mountains are relatively free from it.

SPINDLING TUBER TROUBLE

A trouble resulting in low yields, long pointed tubers accompanied by an excessive number of deep eyes, has been on the increase during the last three years. This trouble is chiefly noticeable in Irish Cobblers and Spaulding Rose seed stock. Only three strains of Irish Cobblers are known to show less than 5%, and many fields

will show from 25 to 50%. The cause is not known; nevertheless it is now established that the trouble is spreading and increasing rapidly.

DROP, caused by
Sclerotinia libertiana Pck.

This fungus was first noted in potato fields at Centreville, N.B., in 1919. It has not been noted in that district since. In 1922 it was found to be somewhat common in Restigouche County in conjunction with *Botrytis cinerea*, causing a premature wilting of the plants.

GRAY MOLD, caused by
Botrytis cinerea Pers.

This fungus has been found in the same fields with *Sclerotinia* as described under *Sclerotinia libertiana*. It appears to cause premature death of the plants and may be more injurious than suspected.

EARLY BLIGHT, caused by
Alternaria solani (E. & M.) J. & G.

It is not considered serious. It occurs on the early varieties and undoubtedly causes considerable loss. It does not develop to any marked extent on the late varieties.

WILTS, caused by
(Fusarium oxysporum Schl.
(Verticillium albo-atrum Mca.

Wilts are present, but of relatively little importance, except during very warm seasons. Very few fields developed this disease in 1922.

The following tables of disease prevalence are summarized for the province, as well as by counties. The prevailing causes for failure of certain fields to come up to standard for certification are also given:-

NEW BRUNSWICK

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Summary:-

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
785	3134½	316			1258½		40.3	40.1
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 1.0	L.R. .36	Mos. 10.1	Wilts .03	E.B. 1.3	L.B. 1.2	Rhiz. 1.4	T.B. .08
Average per cent disease in total fields passed	.39	.31	1.4	.02	1.5	1.1	2.1	.1
Average per cent disease in total fields rejected	1.3	.42	14.4	.03	1.1	1.2	1.4	.06

NEW BRUNSWICK
FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Alberta Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>		<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
13	16 $\frac{3}{4}$	8		10 $\frac{3}{4}$		61.5		64.2
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .09	L.R. .02	Mos. 2.27	Wilts .02	E.B. .8	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. .8	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.16	0.0	.73	.03	1.2	0.0	1.2	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	.05	4.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Of the 5 fields rejected, 3 containing 4 acres were rejected owing to Mosaic

	1	"	1	"	was	"	"	"	Foreign
	1	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	varieties
	-		-						severe insect
									injury
Total	5		6						

NEW BRUNSWICK

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Carleton Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>			<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
153	1153	59			356			38.6	30.9
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.	
	1.2	.8	12.7	.07	.9	2.7	2.0	.4	
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.69	.84	.84	.07	.2	3.3	2.5	.4	
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.5	.8	20.1	.05	1.4	2.2	1.8	.4	

Of the 94 fields rejected, 54 containing 459 acres were rejected owing to	Mosaic
21 " 169½ "	" Foreign varieties
4 " 125 "	" Blackleg
4 " 5½ "	" Mosaic & Leaf roll
3 " 5½ "	" Mosaic & Blackleg
2 " 14 "	" Lack of vigour
2 " 17½ "	" Insect Injury
2 " 1½ "	" Blackleg & Leafroll
2 " 3½ "	" Leaf Roll
Total	94
	797

NEW BRUNSWICK

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Gloucester Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
77	225½	22	90	28.6		39.9		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 3.1	L.R. .3	Mos. 10.3	Wilts .03	E.B. .3	L.B. 1.9	Rhiz. 2.0	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.37	.18	1.2	.1	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	4.3	.35	13.9	0.0	.4	2.7	2.4	0.0

Of the 55 fields rejected, 28 containing 65 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres were rejected owing to Mosaic

12	"	28	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic & Blackleg
10	"	33	"	"	"	"	"	"	Foreign varieties
3	"	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	Blackleg
2	"	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	Blackleg & Leaf Roll

Total	55	135 $\frac{1}{2}$
-------	----	-------------------

NEW BRUNSWICK
FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Kent Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
29	58½	7	14	24.1	24.0			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 1.03	L.R. .09	Mos. 9.8	Wilts 0.0	E.B. .9	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. .7	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.93	.04	3.07	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.06	.1	11.9	0.0	1.1	0.0	.9	0.0

Of the 22 fields rejected, 14 containing 33½ acres were rejected owing to Mosaic

1	"	1	"	was	"	"	"	Mosaic &
7	"	10	"	were	"	"	"	Blackleg
								Foreign
								varieties

Total	22	44½
-------	----	-----

NEW BRUNSWICK
FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

King's Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
24	47 $\frac{1}{4}$	10	14 $\frac{3}{4}$	41.7		31.2	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .11	L.R. .1	Mos. 5.1	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 1.9	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 2.5 T.B. .4
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	.2	1.4	0.0	3.0	0.0	2.5 1.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.21	.02	7.7	0.0	1.1	0.0	2.5 0.0

Of the 14 fields rejected, 6 containing 13 acres were rejected owing to mosaic

7	"	18 $\frac{3}{4}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	Foreign varieties.
1	"	$\frac{3}{4}$	"	was	"	"	"	"	Insect Injury

Total	14	32 $\frac{1}{2}$
-------	----	------------------

NEW BRUNSWICK

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Madawaska Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
33	143	3	20	9.1		14.0		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 1.3	L.R. .48	Mos. 15.03	Wilts .18	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 2.9	Rhiz. 2.1	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.3	.58	2.08	0.0	0.0	6.6	6.6	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.4	.47	16.3	.2	0.0	2.5	1.7	0.0

Of the 30 fields rejected, 23 containing 103½ acres were rejected owing to

1	"	1½	"	was	"	"	"	"	Mosaic
1	"	3	"	"	"	"	"	"	Blackleg
1	"	3	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic & Blackleg
1	"	4	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic & Leaf Roll
3	"	8	"	were	"	"	"	"	Leaf Roll Foreign varieties

Total 30 123

NEW BRUNSWICK

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Northumberland Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
28	42	2	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	7.1	4.2			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .56	L.R. .92	Mos. 20.6	Wilts 0.0	E.B. .18	L.B. 1.9	Rhiz. 0.0	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	.12	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.61	.98	22.0	0.0	.2	2.1	0.0	0.0

Of the 26 fields rejected, 23 containing 33 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres were rejected owing to mosaic

1	"	1	"	was	"	"	"	Leaf roll
2	"	6	"	were	"	"	"	Foreign varieties
Total	26	40 $\frac{1}{2}$						

NEW BRUNSWICK

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Queen's Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
22	34 $\frac{1}{2}$	11	15 $\frac{1}{4}$	50		44.5	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .25	L.R. .23	Mos. 8.9	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 2.9	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. T.B. .5 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.05	.24	1.35	0.0	5.0	0.0	.9 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.47	.23	16.5	0.0	.9	0.0	0.0 0.0

Of the 11 fields rejected, 6 containing 14 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres were rejected owing to Mosaic

5 " 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " " " " Foreign
varieties

Total 12 19

NEW BRUNSWICK

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Restigouche Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>				<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
106	520 $\frac{1}{2}$	85				80.2		35.7
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 1.6	L.R. .01	Mos. 1.8	Wilts 0.0	E.B. .4	L.B. .52	Rhiz. 2.6	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	1.1	.015	.64	0.0	.01	.59	3.4	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	3.7	0.0	6.7	0.0	1.7	.23	4.3	0.0

Of the 21 fields rejected, 8 containing 46 acres were rejected owing to Mosaic

7	"	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic &
6	"	13	"	"	"	"	"	"	Blackleg
									Foreign
									varieties

Total	21	74 $\frac{1}{2}$
-------	----	------------------

NEW BRUNSWICK
FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922.

Sunbury Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>		<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
45	99½	26		50½		57.8	50.8	
Average per cent in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	W.B.
	.26	.3	6.4	0.0	1.8	.2	.1	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.24	.2	.33	0.0	.38	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.29	.44	14.6	0.0	3.7	.53	.26	0.0

Of the 19 fields rejected, 17 containing 44½ acres were rejected owing to Mosaic

2 " 4½ " " " " " Foreign varieties

Total 19 49

NEW BRUNSWICK

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Victoria Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
33	210½	6	65½	18.2		31.1		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 1.4	L.R. .73	Mos. 17.2	Wilts .07	E.B. .3	L.B. 2.9	Rhiz. 3.5	T.B. .3
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.5	.75	1.25	0.0	1.4	.08	5.8	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.6	.73	20.8	.09	0.0	3.3	2.9	.4

Of the 28 fields rejected, 18 containing 92 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres were rejected owing to Mosaic

1	"	4	"	was	"	"	"	Blackleg
1	"	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic & Leaf Roll
8	"	47	"	were	"	"	"	Foreign varieties

Total	28	145
-------	----	-----

NEW BRUNSWICK

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Westmorland Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>		<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
120	242	60		130 $\frac{3}{4}$		50		54
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .77	L.R. .09	Mos. 9.0	Wilts .02	E.B. 5.4	L.B. 2.8	Rhiz. 1.7	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.54	.38	1.3	.04	8.1	4.4	2.2	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.1	.61	16.7	0.0	2.8	1.25	1.3	0.0

Of the 60 fields rejected, 40 containing 74 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres were rejected owing to mosaic

2	"	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	"	"	"	"	"	" Blackleg
1	"	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	"	was	"	"	"	" Blackleg & Leaf Roll
17	"	32 $\frac{3}{4}$	"	were	"	"	"	" Foreign varieties

Total	60	111 $\frac{1}{2}$
-------	----	-------------------

-161-

NEW BRUNSWICK

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

York Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>		<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
102	342	17		43½		16.6		12.6
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 1.1	L.R. .66	Mos. 12.7	Wilts .01	E.B. 1.5	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. .15	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.17	.44	2.0	0.0	.9	0.0	.6	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	1.3	.7	14.9	.02	1.6	0.0	.06	0.0

Of the 85 fields rejected, 71 containing 259½ acres were rejected owing to Mosaic

2	"	4	"	"	"	"	"	"	Blackleg
7	"	11½	"	"	"	"	"	"	Foreign varieties
4	"	20	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic & Blackleg
1	"	4	"	was	"	"	"	"	Lack of vigour

Total	85	298½
-------	----	------

NOVA SCOTIA

The following tables of disease prevalence are summarized for the province as well as by counties. The Garnet Chili variety is separated from other varieties because the growing of this variety is for one market, that of Bermuda.

NOVA SCOTIA

Garnet Chili

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922Summary

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
125	235 $\frac{3}{4}$	81	156 $\frac{1}{2}$	64.8		66.4	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .54	L.R. 3.69	Mos. .14	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. .87	Rhiz. and T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.14	.93	.05	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	2.0	6.5	.12	0.0	0.0	.7	0.0

NOVA SCOTIA

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Garnet Chili

Colchester Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
73	143	55	112	75.3		78.3		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .17	L.R. 2.7	Mos. .04	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. .7	Rhiz. 0.0	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.2	.7	.05	0.0	0.0	.8	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	.7	8.9	.02	0.0	0.0	.3	0.0	0.0

Of the 18 fields rejected, 10 containing 19 acres were rejected owing to Leaf Roll.

6	"	9	"	"	"	"	"	"	Foreign varieties.
2	"	3	"	"	"	"	"	"	Lack of vigour

Total

18

31

NOVA SCOTIA

Garnet Chili

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922Hants Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
9	11½	9	11½	100		100		
Average per cent disease in fields		B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz. T.B.
inspected and passed		0.0	.34	.07	9.0	0.0	1.1	0.0 0.0

King's Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
39	79	14	30	35.9		37.9		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected		B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz. T.B.
		.3	10.9	.24	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed		.25	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected		.33	16.2	.37	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0 0.0

Of the 25 fields containing 49 acres rejected, all were rejected owing to Leaf Roll

NOVA SCOTIA

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Garnet Chili

Pictou Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
4	2 $\frac{1}{4}$	3	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	75.0		66.7		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 1.7	L.R. .8	Mos. .075	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 0.0	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.1	1.0	.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	6.6	.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The field rejected, was rejected owing to Blackleg

NOVA SCOTIA

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Varieties other
than Garnet Chili

Summary

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
87	135½	61	87¾	70.1		64.8		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 4.2	L.R. .22	Mos. 4.0	Wilts .008	E.B. .075	L.B. .5	Rhiz. 2.4	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.03	.03	1.4	.01	.02	.46	1.2	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	4.1	.37	7.2	0.0	.13	.41	2.1	0.0

NOVA SCOTIA

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Varieties other
than Garnet Chili

Annapolis Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
6	4½	4	3½	66.7		72.2		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 0.0	L.R. 1.1	Mos. 2.9	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. .8	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	.07	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	0.0	8.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0

The 2 fields containing 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres, were rejected owing to Mosaic

NOVA SCOTIA

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922Antigonish Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>			<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
1	1	0			0			0	0
Average per cent disease in field		B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
inspected and rejected		50.0	0.0	.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The field was rejected owing to Blackleg

Cape Breton Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>			<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
2	2	2			2			100	100
Average per cent disease in fields		B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
inspected and passed		0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0

NOVA SCOTIA

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922Colchester Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
10	10½	7	6	70		57.1	
Average per cent in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz. T.B.
	.03	1.3	5.4	.1	0.0	3.0	2.2 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.04	.14	.47	.14	0.0	3.5	2.5 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	4.1	17.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.6 0.0

Of the 3 fields rejected, 2 containing 1½ acres were rejected owing to Leaf Roll

1 " 3 " was " " " Mosaic

NOVA SCOTIA

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922Cumberland Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
3	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	66.7		55.5	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 0.0	L.R. .1	Mos. 3.0	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. T.B. 5.8 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.2 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	.3	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0 0.0

The field rejected, containing 2 acres, was rejected owing to Mosaic.

NOVA SCOTIA

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Digby Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
1	1½	0	0	0		0		
Average per cent disease in field inspected and rejected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0

The field was rejected owing to Mosaic

Hants Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
12	20	9	12	75.		60.		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	0.0	0.0	2.05	0.0	0.0	0.0	.8	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	0.0	2.07	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Of the 3 fields rejected, 1 containing 6 acres was rejected owing to Mosaic

2 " 2 " were " " " Lack of vigour

NOVA SCOTIA

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922Inverness Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
1	1	1	1	100		100		
Average per cent disease in field inspected and passed	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

King's Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>		
23	46 $\frac{1}{2}$	21	43	91.3		88.7		
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	0.0	.04	2.5	0.0	.2	0.0	1.8	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	.04	2.1	0.0	.2	0.0	1.7	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	0.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0

Of the two fields containing 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres, both were rejected owing to Mosaic

NOVA SCOTIA

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922Pictou Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>			<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>
20	31½	11			13½		55		42.4
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. .15	L.R. 0.0	Mos. 12.6	Wilts 0.0	E.B. 0.0	L.B. .6	Rhiz. 1.3	T.B. 0.0	
Average per cent disease in fields passed	.3	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.4	0.0	
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	0.0	25.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	

Of 9 fields containing 18 acres, all were rejected owing to Mosaic

Victoria Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>		<u>No. acres passed</u>		<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
1	1	0		0		0		0	
Average per cent disease in field inspected and rejected		B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
		0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

This field was rejected owing to severe insect injury.

NOVA SCOTIA

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Yarmouth Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
7	9 $\frac{3}{4}$	4	4 $\frac{3}{4}$	57.1		48.7	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 0.0	L.R. .09	Mos. 3.8	Wilts 0.0	E.B. .7	L.B. 2.1	Rhiz. T.B. 1.4 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	0.0	.15	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	1.6	3.3	1.6 0.0

The 3 fields rejected, containing 3 acres, were rejected owing to Mosaic

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND-

LATE BLIGHT, caused by
Phytophthora infestans (Mont.) deBary

The seasonal conditions for 1922 were very favourable for the development of blight, and the disease was severe and general throughout the province. Usually all varieties were badly affected with the exception of Irish Cobblers. Although moist conditions made the complete control of the disease difficult, thorough spraying, particularly with high pressure outfits, fairly well held the disease in check.

The following tables give results of disease prevalence in a summary for the province and by counties, as well as the causes which prevent certain fields coming up to standard for certification:-

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Summary

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>		<u>Per cent acres passed</u>	
621	2367	553	2155	89.0		90.6	
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 2.3	L.R. .39	Mos. 6.0	Wilts .21	E.B. .12	L.B. .09	Rhiz. T.B. .01 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	1.8	.36	2.0	.21	.12	.04	.01 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	4.7	.54	29.4	.33	.23	.33	0.0 0.0

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

King's Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
154	416	131	346	85.0	83.2			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 2.1	L.R. .4	Mos. 8.9	Wilts .2	E.B. 0.0	L.B. 0.0	Rhiz. 0.0	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	1.8	.38	2.9	.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	4.1	.51	42.7	.65	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Of the 23 fields rejected, 16 containing 58 acres were rejected owing to Mosaic
 2 " 3 " " " " " Mosaic &
 1 " 4 " was " " " Blackleg
 2 " 2 " were " " " Blackleg
 2 " 3 " " " " Foreign
 varieties
 Lack of
 vigour

Total	23	70
-------	----	----

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
102	423	80	362	78.4	85.6			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L.	L.R.	Mos.	Wilts	E.B.	L.B.	Rhiz.	T.B.
	2.5	.46	6.4	.27	0.0	.14	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	1.7	.45	1.6	.34	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	5.1	.5	23.8	.04	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0

Of the 22 fields rejected,	10	containing	32	acres were rejected owing to	Mosaic
	2	"	5	" " "	" Blackleg
	1	"	5	" was	" Mosaic &
					" Leaf Roll
	1	"	2	" " "	" Mosaic &
					" Blackleg
	7	"	$13\frac{1}{2}$	" were	" Foreign varieties
	1	"	$3\frac{1}{2}$	" was	" Lack of vigour

Total	22	61
-------	----	----

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

FIELD INSPECTION OF POTATOES, 1922

Prince Co.

<u>No. fields inspected</u>	<u>No. acres inspected</u>	<u>No. fields passed</u>	<u>No. acres passed</u>	<u>Per cent fields passed</u>	<u>Per cent acres passed</u>			
365	1528	342	1447	93.7	94.7			
Average per cent disease in total fields inspected	B.L. 2.2	L.R. .3	Mos. 2.6	Wilts .16	E.B. .37	L.B. .12	Rhiz. .04	T.B. 0.0
Average per cent disease in fields passed	2.0	.26	1.6	.14	.35	.13	.04	0.0
Average per cent disease in fields rejected	5.0	.6	20.6	.3	.7	0.0	0.0	0.0

Of the 23 fields rejected, 9 containing 37 acres were rejected owing to Mosaic

2	"	15	"	"	"	"	"	"	Mosaic &
1	"	3	"	was	"	"	"	"	Blackleg
2	"	8	"	were	"	"	"	"	Leaf Roll &
4	"	6	"	"	"	"	"	"	Blackleg
4	"	11	"	"	"	"	"	"	Foreign varieties
1	"	1	"	was	"	"	"	"	Lack of vigour
									Lack of cultivation
Total		23		81					