

Is there not room for more to be done in this line? Other branches of agriculture are receiving strong government support in the way of opening up markets and the proper grading and distribution of products. How about honey markets and the grading of honey? Fruit, dairy products, etc., must be inspected by a qualified government official before going on the market. Honey can be shipped in any careless form, and the careful shipper must take a share of the consequences. Other lines are put to the front; bee-keeping is crowded back. Poultry-keeping, fruit-growing, flower-culture, are considered dignified occupations, bee-keeping is a joke. We are "bee-men," or "honey-men"—spoken with a smile. Why should this be? Wherein does the remedy lie? In ourselves. I find bee-keeping taken more seriously in some parts of the country than others. I attribute the difference to the attitude of the bee-keepers themselves. Self-confidence and ability inspire the confidence of others. But we need the help of the power that is helping others along. Are we using the help we already have to the best advantage.

We already receive a considerable amount of money from the Government. A large portion of it goes to defray the expenses of the directors while attending the regular conventions of the Association. More of it goes to the local Associations, and is used by them to send delegates to the convention. Is this the best way in which the money can be used for the advancement of bee-keeping? If the directors work earnestly during the year to organize and enlighten the bee-keepers of their respective districts, and to increase the profits of our business, and some prepared to report progress at the convention; if the delegates seek to promote the interests of their respective Associations while at the convention, and go home filled with practical

ideas for the benefit of those who sent them, it is well. But why this double expense? Why not let the local Associations be district Associations, and let each district Association appoint its delegate to the provincial convention? This delegate, being the representative of his district, should become the director for that district of the Ontario Association. He, if he truly and conscientiously represents the Association sending him, should be entitled to his expenses at the annual convention. I consider that this is the only way in which the districts can be truly represented, as we will all admit that the attendance at an annual convention, aside from those having expenses paid, is mostly local.

Another plan for electing directors would be that suggested by me in the "Canadian Bee Journal" some time ago. Supply each member with a list of members arranged according to their districts, and let voting be done by ballot. The present system of open voting cannot, in my estimation, be too strongly condemned.

Mr. Byer—I wonder the committee appointed me to take up such a delicate question. I think perhaps it is because I have been guilty of making some criticisms along the line of Mr. Pettit's paper. I don't know that I can enlarge on what Mr. Pettit has said. I may say that I agree almost entirely with what he has said. With regard to the election of officers I don't know that I would altogether approve of the system he has suggested. I agree, however, that it would be better than the method we have at present. As to the social side of our convention that has been criticised, but I don't think I would care to under-estimate the social side. It appeals to me to come here and meet so many bee-keepers from all over the province and have a talk with them. About useless discussion, I believe I wrote an article in the Canadian Bee