

To illustrate: A barrel of beautifully-faced Spys which I bought in Montreal last spring at a high price contained nothing but rubbish under the facings. The honorable dealer from whom I bought it paid me back \$1 of his own accord, and my own loss was certainly \$2 more. Now, what would a 50 cent fine against a packer of more than nine such barrels in a 100 amount to? Wouldn't it be a farce?

Everybody knows the penalty for light weight in the "staff of life," and heartily approves that *every loaf* so found wanting shall be confiscated and sent to the hospitals. Now, why should the fraudulent packer of this universally used fruit (which could very properly be called the "staff of good health")—why should he escape with any lesser penalty? If any discrimination between the two be made should it not be in favor of the baker, whose fraud can so easily be detected and without appreciable trouble, and which of course is by no means the case in a fraudulent barrel of apples, as so many of us know at our cost?

I therefore beg leave to "move an amendment" to Sec. 3, and to substitute therefore:

"Sec. 3.—1. That all apples packed in closed packages be subject to inspection by the Government Inspector, and in case of any package of any one grade being found fraudulently packed and not up to the standard of the grade labelled upon such barrel, that the same be confiscated by the Government Inspector.

"2. That full reports of all such confiscations be published in the next succeeding number of the Canadian Horticulturist and such other papers as may be deemed advisable."

It seems to me that any less stringent regulation would be ineffective, and would not commend itself to the public generally, and I hope your *honest* fruit growers will be satisfied with nothing less.

There is still another serious objection to your section 3. Every one knows that a packed barrel of apples cannot be properly inspected and repacked without injury to the keeping qualities of the fruit, for no matter how carefully it be done, many of the apples are sure to get fresh bruises.

Now, under your section 3, no one would be at all safe in buying any barrel *not inspected*; but the proposed amendment would very soon, I think, be effective in reducing the number of barrels necessary to be repacked and inspected fully 75 per cent, perhaps more, to the considerable advantage of the keeping qualities of the fruit, and would of course greatly reduce the work and cost of inspection.

Is not "an ounce of prevention" worth far more than "a pound of cure" in this case?

Would not this suggested amendment be to the *eventual* profit of *all* fruit growers, for would it not force some of them, perhaps unwillingly at first to invest in sprayers and to carefully use them, and also to cut down worthless trees in their orchards, replacing them by better kinds? They might also soon get into the way of thinning their growing fruit, to its great improvement and better financial return.

Does some one "second my amendment" or offer a better one? GEO. O. GOODLINE.

Danville, P.Q., 26th Jan., 1900.

NOTE BY EDITOR.—The criticisms of our correspondent reveal an ambiguity in the wording of clause 3, which has since been corrected. The clause was intended to save the labor of inspecting every package by providing that if ten per cent. were found fraudulent the whole lot might be so classed without further examination. Thus, if the first ten barrels opened out of a lot of 100 be found fraudulent, the inspector could count the whole lot as fraudulent and fine the shipper \$50 on the whole lot.

The following is the amended reading of the clause:

"3. That all apples or pears packed in closed packages be subject to inspection by the Government Inspector, and if on opening one-tenth of the number of packages in any one lot, these be found fraudulently packed, then the nine-tenth. remaining shall be so classed, and the shipper be liable to a fine not exceeding 50 cents a barrel for all packages of that grade in the same shipment."

More About Flowers.

SIR,—I like your magazine; it is good in every way, except that more space might be devoted to flower and vegetable culture. I don't grow any fruit, and I suppose there are a dozen who are fond of gardening who do not to one who does. We have not got one good *gardening* magazine in Canada that I know of. I cannot call yours such yet, though I hope it will become one—that department of your magazine is only, one might say, rudimentary yet. I know *American Gardening*, and better still, in its earlier stages, *Gardening*, of Chicago. It was an excellent publication then, now sadly fallen off. I'd gladly double my subscription to yours to get the information and helps *Gardening* once furnished its readers with. I say this to encourage you to work in the direction of gardening as distinct from fruit growing more. There is a large and growing field for such a magazine in this country.

Yours truly, A. B. O.

Ingersoll.

We have frequent requests from flower lovers asking that more attention be given to floriculture, and quite as often we have letters from fruit growers asking that more attention be given to their particular department. Primarily, of course, our journal is intended