

# The Canadian Horticulturist

COMBINED WITH

## THE CANADIAN HORTICULTURIST AND BEEKEEPER

With which has been incorporated  
The Canadian Bee Journal.

Published by The Horticultural  
Publishing Company, Limited  
PETERBORO, ONTARIO

The Only Magazines in Their Field in the  
Dominion

OFFICIAL ORGANS OF THE ONTARIO AND QUEBEC  
FRUIT GROWERS' ASSOCIATIONS  
AND OF THE ONTARIO BEEKEEPERS ASSOCIATION

H. BRONSON COWAN, Managing Director

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVES  
STOCKWELL'S SPECIAL AGENCY  
Chicago Office—People's Gas Building.  
New York Office—236 5th Avenue.

1. The Canadian Horticulturist is published in two editions on the 25th day of the month preceding date of issue. The first edition is known as The Canadian Horticulturist. It is devoted exclusively to the horticultural interests of Canada. The second edition is known as The Canadian Horticulturist and Beekeeper. In this edition several pages of matter appearing in the first issue are replaced by an equal number of pages of matter relating to the bee keeping interests of Canada.

2. Subscription price of The Canadian Horticulturist in Canada and Great Britain, 60 cents a year; two years, \$1.00, and of The Canadian Horticulturist and Beekeeper, \$1.00 a year. For United States and local subscriptions in Peterboro (not called for at the Post Office), 25 cents extra a year, including postage.

3. Remittances should be made by Post Office or Express Money Order, or Registered Letter.

4. The Law is that subscribers to newspapers are held responsible until all arrears are paid and their paper ordered to be discontinued.

5. Change of Address—When a change of address is ordered, both the old and the new addresses must be given.

6. Advertising rates, \$1.25 an inch. Copy received up to the 20th. Address all advertising correspondence and copy to our Advertising Manager, Peterboro, Ont.

### CIRCULATION STATEMENT

The following is a sworn statement of the net paid circulation of The Canadian Horticulturist for the year ending with December, 1912. The figures given are exclusive of samples and spoiled copies. Most months, including the sample copies from 12,000 to 15,000 copies of The Canadian Horticulturist are mailed to people known to be interested in the growing of fruits, flowers or vegetables.

January, 1912.....	9,908	August, 1912.....	11,148
February, 1912.....	10,437	September, 1912.....	10,977
March, 1912.....	10,877	October, 1912.....	10,971
April, 1912.....	11,788	November, 1912.....	11,162
May, 1912.....	12,112	December, 1912.....	11,344
June, 1912.....	10,946		
July, 1912.....	10,906		132,556

Average each issue in 1907.	6,637
" " " " 1908.	8,995
" " " " 1909.	8,979
" " " " 1910.	9,867
" " " " 1911.	9,541
" " " " 1912.	11,857

May, 1913.....11,609

Sworn detailed statements will be mailed upon application.

### OUR GUARANTEE

We guarantee that every advertiser in this issue is reliable. We are able to do this because the advertising columns of The Canadian Horticulturist are carefully edited as the reading columns, and because to protect our readers we turn away all unscrupulous advertisers. Should any advertiser herein deal dishonestly with any subscriber, we will make good the amount of his loss, provided such transaction occurs within one month from date of this issue, that it is reported to us within a week of its occurrence, and that we find the facts to be as stated. It is a condition of this contract that in writing to advertisers you state: "I saw your advertisement in The Canadian Horticulturist."

Borrowers shall not ply their trade at the expense of our subscribers, who are our friends, through the medium of these columns; but we shall not attempt to adjust trifling disputes between subscribers and honorable business men who advertise, nor pay the debts of honest bankrupts. Communications should be addressed

THE CANADIAN HORTICULTURIST,  
PETERBORO, ONT.

## EDITORIAL

### A SPARTAN EFFORT

The elimination of the middleman, by selling direct from orchard to consumer, has been the dream of the fruit growers of Ontario for some years. Outside of a few growers securing private customers, not much has been done towards making the dream come true. Last fall and winter, however, as previously noted in these columns, an attempt was made to sell direct to the general public of Toronto by an Elgin county man—Mr. J. A. Webster, of Sparta. In the progress of his efforts and results there are some lessons worth noting.

With exceptional valor, like the Spartans of ancient Greece, this modern Spartan had the courage of his conviction that the people of Toronto would consume large quantities of fruit if they could buy it at a reasonable price, and "direct from orchard to consumer." With this in mind and with more money for himself, as the producer, in view, he secured storage space in the basement of the St. Lawrence market, and commenced to sell wholesale and retail—and then the trouble commenced. Various situations and differences arose between Mr. Webster and the city officials, some of which resulted in law suits. The city did not permit the selling by retail in the storage rooms, nor selling anywhere in the market in quantities of less than one bushel; it doubled Mr. Webster's rent, and moved him from one place to another.

Mr. Webster's experiences in the St. Lawrence market serves to show that the Toronto City Council, which is influenced in this matter probably by the Retail Merchants' Association and by the wholesalers and commission men, does not intend to encourage the fruit growers to sell direct to the people. It is altogether unreasonable, for instance, for Toronto to charge seventy dollars a month rent for storage and selling space to only one grower who wants to sell a few apples. What a tremendous revenue the city would acquire should a few hundred growers undertake the same scheme!

One local result of Mr. Webster's efforts has been the opening of the market to farmers and hucksters for the selling of fruit in small packages. Although many farmers did sell apples in the past in small quantities, they constantly were in fear of being fined for so doing. Some of them were fined at times as a warning to themselves and others. Of course, the consumers did not do this nor want this regulation to stand. But there were others with sufficient reasons and influence to demand it. Since Mr. Webster's testing of the by-law, one can go there on market days and find everybody buying and selling in any quantities desired. This may all yet be put back into the old order by subsequent city by-laws, should the council forget its duty to the consuming public, and give way to the pressure of selfish interests, which will be sure to be applied once more as soon as the present interest of the consumers subsides.

The case of Mr. Webster brought out incidentally another factor in fruit marketing that at first thought is rather complicated. A certain large hotel in Toronto had been buying Oakville apples at two dollars a box through a well known commission firm. Mr. Webster offered his

apples to the hotel at one dollar and a half a box—the same price that he quoted on the market to the general public—and got an order. Later, when soliciting for a repeat order from the same hotel, he was refused and told that the commission man was then supplying the Oakville apples at one dollar and thirty-five cents a box. This was a deliberate under-cut on the part of the commission man. Who lost the difference between the one dollar and thirty-five cents and two dollars? Did Mr. Webster injure the Oakville fruit grower? Would any one or more growers with fruit for sale in Toronto, were they to endeavor to sell it at a reasonable price direct to the consumer, be injuring the fruit industry of the province? Would a distributing centre in Toronto, as proposed by the Niagara Peninsula Fruit Growers' Association, hurt all other growers in the Niagara district who are compelled by circumstances to ship to commission men? If this would happen, what is the use of all the talk about eliminating the middleman? In our opinion, no grower or body of growers would be injured in the long run. The uncertainty of the methods practiced by some, not all, of the commission men, and the fact that the growers would be selling, like Mr. Webster, direct to the people at prices more near what production warrants, would soon counterbalance any apparent temporary injustice.

While the Sparta grower probably has not been over successful this year, on account of high rents, strenuous opposition, cost of law suits and other discouraging factors, his propaganda is worthy of further efforts on the part of himself and other growers. The expenses of the scheme are too great for one man alone. Schemes of this kind could be handled much more economically and more profitably by our fruit growers' associations. Should it be found that they are not wanted in the St. Lawrence market, they should, and could, establish a fruit market of their own.

### ROADSIDE PESTS

The article in this issue of The Canadian Horticulturist, by Professor F. M. Straight, serves to show the extent to which the wild fruits may become a source of infection in our commercial orchards. Anyone who has carefully examined a wild apple tree could not but be impressed by the diversity of pests that it harbors. The trunk not infrequently is perforated with borers, the bark covered with scale, the branches and leaves draped with webs, and the fruit a veritable happy hunting ground for codling worm.

The destruction of these breeding grounds of orchard pests is a phase of orcharding that has not received the attention that it merits. There are two main reasons why these outside sources of infection have been somewhat neglected. First, the extent to which they menace the orchard has not been fully realized; second, their destruction has often been matter outside the orchardists' control. In respect to the former, fruit growers are more and more coming to realize the extent of such infection and the need for immediate action. In the latter case we meet with a difficulty not easily removed.

No matter how much he may wish to destroy wild trees on the property of a careless neighbor. Perhaps this neighbor has a small orchard that is never sprayed and is really growing under wild conditions. Here is where the law must step in, as it