

ordered 600 honey
ars. My car was
ing ready to load.
a packed and ad-
olt from the blue.
n the managers
of honey. With
I have done my
tractive display.
s we get—to be
parently a second
o the matter. I
of fancy glass
r from last year.
honed the man-
there was any
considering their
in the negative,
y only chance, I
ould accept \$50
vilege of selling.
d, if possible, of
Still I was re-
amazement, they
l for the fee of
cent enough to
ey and express
ense and trouble

could, of course.
bited for prizes.
here would have
\$75 to \$100 of
exhibitor, and
y seem quite an
ed, let me warn
one's expenses.
ensation for the
uring, putting up
ble exhibit such
any prize money

r readers a very
as that a honey
rom outside the
First, there will
ht and cartage.
are for two peo-
or room rent for
; \$2 for tickets

of admission to the grounds; \$100 for
plate and window glass and glass jars
and pails; \$10 for front rails to keep
back the crowd, and decorations; also
about \$15 for board. This makes a
total of \$175. Of course, when this
glass is carried over to the second year
the expense would be cut down greatly,
but there is always considerable break-
age and new material has to be added
if one is to be a successful prize-winner,
so that the actual expenses will run
close to \$100, and with four or five com-
petitors, a green exhibitor would not be
likely to win more than \$50. Where,
then, in view of these facts, is the in-
ducement for any one to put up an ex-
hibit at Toronto for their wonderful
prizes?

Now let me say that, from dear ex-
perience, I know that the exhibitor who
prepares and puts up a really fine ex-
hibit of honey earns from \$200 to \$300,
which would mean that if he is not to
be allowed to sell honey, his prize
money must amount to \$300 or \$400 in
order that he may have a reasonable
compensation for his difficult task after
his expenses are paid. Now, if the
management of the Exhibition want to
cut out the selling of honey, and yet
are desirous of a creditable honey ex-
hibit, let them multiply their prize list
by ten, and they will possibly accom-
plish the desired result.

Now, in conclusion, lest some might
misunderstand my motive in writing
this article, and think that my object
was the hope of personal gain, let me
say that I never again expect to be an
exhibitor at the Toronto Exhibition.

HORIZONTAL-COMB METHOD OF SECURING QUEEN CELLS

In our August issue we were able,
through the courtesy of the Editor of
Gleanings, to reproduce a very valuable
article on the horizontal-comb method
of securing queen-cells. This method

has come to stay. As described in the
C.B.J., Oscar Dines' device perfects the
method, and does away with the make-
shift manner of laying the prepared
comb on top of the colony.

Mr. Hopkins contributes some further
valuable notes on this subject to our
esteemed contemporary, which we take
the liberty of reproducing in extenso.

Mr. Hopkins' experience bears out
that of Mr. Dines' in nearly every
particular. It has been objected that
a single colony cannot rear a large
number of queens at a time, but Mr.
Hopkins states that a *strong* colony,
with large numbers of nurse bees, will
rear 60 or 80 cells at a time, and these
will be found to contain lots of un-
consumed jelly after the queens have
emerged.

"Under the conditions mentioned, in
"the proper season for queen-rearing,
"there will be a larger number of fine
"cells built in a natural manner by this
"plan than by any other I know of."

In Mr. Hopkins' opinion, the graft-
ing system, taken generally, is respon-
sible for more worthless queens than
it is possible to calculate. The great
importance, therefore, of a system from
which such a delicate operation as
grafting is eliminated cannot be over-
estimated, and the unstinted thanks of
bee-keepers generally are due to Messrs.
Dines and Hopkins for the details that
they have furnished, which enable even
the novice to raise their own queens in
quantity.

The following is Mr. Hopkins' recent
article referred to above:

Referring to my letter published Aug.
1, and also to the footnote, I
wish to say that, if illustrations 1 and
3 had been printed the other way up,
as the photo prints were marked, they
would have looked much better. As
the cells are foreshortened in the photo,
they look much smaller than they really
were.

Preparing the Combs for Cells.

In the copy I sent I wrote, "I prefer
a last-season's-built comb that has not