In connection with the wheat survey made in New York the past summer, some interesting matters have come up in regard to the fate of variety names in the hands of the public.

One very interesting case was found in western New York, where we frequently found that "No. 6" was attached to the name of what we took to be at first several different varieties of wheat. For example, there was "No. 6," "International No. 6," "Rochester No. 6," "Clawson's No. 6," "Michigan No. 6," "Rural New Yorker No. 6," and "No. 16." Head samples were collected of all these varieties for comparison and they appeared to be the same thing, which led us to believe that this long list of names had a common origin. A little investigation suggested, at least, how some of the names arose. For example, it was found that about thirty years ago the International Seed Company, of Rochester, N. Y., had put out a variety called "No. 6." This would account for the first three names on the list. It is not as clear how the other names came into existence, but probably in the case of "Michigan No. 6" the wheat might have been sold in Michigan and then brought back from that State by some farmer. Clawson's No. 6 is probably the correct name, as Garrett Clawson put several varieties on the market. At any rate, we have evidence that the old name "No. 6" or "International No. 6," as I believe it was called at first, has been construed in a number of ways.

This brings up the question of whether it would not be desirable to take some steps for straightening out the nomenclature of our farm crops. I referred to this matter at the Columbus meetings of this Society as a result of some studies with a collection of oat samples secured principally from the seedsmen and experiment stations of the