of the e recom-

opposite

Flavor.... Sealed cells.... Freedom from pop holes.... Absence of travel stain or propolis on wood or comb. Evenness of color of honey .... Evenness of comb (drone or brood).... Pollen in the sections ..... Neatness of crating ..... Style of section ....

Total

Be it furthermore resolved that this Association recommends that where display is mentioned as well as quality, display and quality count equal, display count a maximum

		-8	•		•	•	•		•	•			•	•	٠	•	٠	٠		50
Neatness and	artistic	design		•	 ٠	٠	٠	•	٠	•	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠			٠	15
Magnitude Originality Neatness and	·····						,						,							35

That in sections where quality of honey is not considered, artists be secured as judges.

That a copy of this resolution be sent to the secretaries of the leading exhibitions in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. McEvoy: I wouldn't want to work according to this card, which gives 40 for flavor, 30 for body and 25 for color. Get color and body and the flavor will take care

Mr. McKnight: No standard of merit that could be formulated would be satisfactory to all concerned, and I question very much if the scheme proposed is an improvement to any extent on the old system. There was a good deal of confusion as to what certain things meant before, and it depended on the view the judges took for the time being, and there will be a diversity of opinion in the future as in the past. I think it was Mr. Deadman who wrote to the Bee Journal recommending an entire revision of

Mr. McEvoy: Yes, and it was a good one.

Mr. McKnight: That is a question. It was said that it was impossible for a judge to interpret the word "display" in any other way than one. But if it was put, so much for the best display of the best 50 lb. of extracted honey, instead of merely, so much for the best display, no stickler could have any two opinions in the matter. And I don't know how any judges could have two opinions, taking our old prize list. Everyone knows that there was \$50 for display alone, irrespective of quality. And that was the best money ever expended in connection with our show. It converted it from a helter-skelter display to a nice, respectable, artistic display. Every award previous to that list should have been on quality alone. I don't see how this proposed scheme is going to remove any trouble.

Mr. Deadman: My article in the Bee Journal advocated judging separately for display and quality. That has nothing to do with Mr. Holtermann's proposal. Mr. Holtermann arranges a mark for quality, and that should help in the judging. And let there be a separate prize for display. No one could tell at the exhibition last year whether the prize was for display or for quality.

Mr. Walton: I see much reason for a score card. I see more reason for having good judges. Many who make honey cannot judge honey.

e indicatdefects