

Letters to the Editor

EXHIBITIONS AND EXHIBITING

What is Their Function?—What Does the Government Give Grants For?

To my mind, the intention is to encourage and develop the industries of agriculture and horticulture, and to show to the world what can be done by any one individual, whether he be a farmer, gardener, poultry fancier or stock breeder. By looking over prize lists I find that all produce and stock of all kinds have to be the product of the exhibitor, and why should the apiarist be otherwise classed? I know that our industry with proper management need not take second place with any other industry, for there is none of the other branches which will equal the bee industry with the same amount of money invested. I can easily prove my statements by the following bee-keepers or (I will class them a little higher) honey producers: Mr. J. B. Hall, Mr. Jacob Alpaugh, Mr. McEvoy, Mr. Martin Emigh and several others whom I might mention, who produced honey and did not make a practice of buying it for exhibition purposes.

I notice by C.B.J., page 461, December issue, that one of the exhibitors is trying to explain why the change was made from requiring all of the honey to be the exhibitor's own product. It seems by the exhibitor's own statements that he consulted quite a number of bee-keepers. Possibly they were not honey producers, or he might have got different advice, as no honey producer would think of deceiving the public that way.

The writer refers to an unseemly row (as he calls it) at the Fruit, Flower and Honey Show of 1907. Now this row was raised in this way: All honey was to be the product of the exhibitor, and it was, as far as I was concerned; but it was quite different with some other exhibitors. One of them had some of my own comb honey that he had bought from a man in Guelph. I thought it rather too bold to put my own honey in

competition against myself, so I entered a protest and proved my case to the directors satisfactorily. But this exhibitor has never acknowledged that he did anything wrong. The directors just let him slip and made a change so that it could not occur again, or, as the writer terms it, "placed all exhibitors on an equal footing." It seems at the discussion before the board Dr. Orr stated that he wished to avoid dealers making an advertising scheme of it when they were not bee-keepers. He should have said: "Not producers." Now he told me a different story. He told me that he had a notion to cease giving prizes altogether, for he did not think it fair to be allotting so much valuable space to dealers who went all over buying honey from wholesale houses, bee-keepers and farmers, and bringing it in in barrels and milkcans and other vessels to be retailed as their own. It seems as if Messrs. Root and Hutchinson are in favor of cancelling the rule also. Probably you are not all aware they are not large producers. The A. I. Root Company may be classified as jobbers, for they buy honey from all over the country. If jobbers and dealers are allowed to exhibit there should be a separate class for them, so that the public would know whether they were dealers or producers. I have had people by the score state to me that they were surprised, for they supposed that all of the honey on exhibition was produced by the exhibitor.

He says further: "Out of four exhibitors at the 1907 exhibition"—(all that was there)—"three asked to have the change." That is natural enough, as they were all in the same boat, save the one, who produced his own honey—so why should I want a change?

By the writer's own statement he has been exhibiting comb honey several years without a break—always entered in the name of the producer. He claims that it was never counted in display. Now this is just where I raised the objection. As there was always 80 points for quality,

considerably
e been treated
badly heated.
into considera-
um-gum treat-
ount of propo-
that a lot of
ings of combs,
was the case
re wax left in
nly old combs
arger the num-
more wax will
led no pressure
mass.

oing February
and any mis-
mentioning the
were quickly
t "J. A. R."
to the method
loes to get the
t when he has
tioned he prob-
f as much as
e. Then think
18 pounds of
press you can
to 300 pounds
satisfaction of
ing most of the
s mentioned as
s, being ganged
material, the
d the number
vd into a day
a few days ago
wax, and that
ket in consider-
of ten hours
d enough, too
to use in mak-
axed paper; it
used for the
bought in New

The above is
nd we have
eatly apprecia-