

time and the passing away to "the beyond" of most of those who were prominently active in founding this organization. As one of the few who yet remain, and must soon go over to the majority, I might fitly dwell on life's brevity, and the duty of diligence while its little day lasts. I might recall many reminiscences of departed ones, read a chapter of lamentations on their loss, and, like many a long-visaged divine, ply you with exhortations on the uncertainty of sublunary things, and the vanity of man as mortal. But these topics are not in my line. Neither my philosophy nor my religion teach me that there is any virtue in solemnity. I can see some sense in being cheerful and joyous. Gladness lubricates the wheels of life, but solemnity is a drag and a break. The most solemn animal is the ass; the most solemn bird is the owl. "Stupid as an ass," and ironically, "wise as an owl" have passed into proverbs. It is no cause for gloom that one is getting old, if only the heart be young, and mine grows younger every day! My present object is a practical one. I wish to look over the history of this organization, glance at what it has accomplished, and picture some of the possibilities of the future.

The idea of a National Bee-Keepers' Convention, originated in Michigan, the State which has given us a Cook, a Heddon, a Hutchinson, a Bingham, a Cutting, a Taylor, and a "Cyula Linswik," with other noted bee-keepers "too numerous to mention," also many apicultural ideas, "good, bad, and indifferent," including the best bee-hive, smoker and honey-knife extant, the pollen theory and last but not least, the theory of hibernation.

When I read away up in Canada, the call for a National Convention at Indianapolis, Dec. 21, 1870, I said to myself, why can't this thing be international and continental? I resolved to go, and use my influence to have it so. Though I

(To be continued next week.)

QUERIES AND REPLIES.

UNDER THIS HEAD will appear Questions which have been asked, and replied to, by prominent and practical bee-keepers—also by the Editor. Only questions of importance should be asked in this Department, and such questions are requested from everyone. As these questions have to be put into type, sent out for answers, and the replies all awaited for, it will take some time in each case to have the answers appear.

GENERAL PURPOSE QUEENS.

QUERY No. 115.—What are the most desirable queens for *general purposes*, those bred of cells built during the natural swarming season and under the

swarming impulse, or those reared of cells built in strong colonies after the swarming impulse is over, by stimulative feeding from freshly laid eggs? What is the difference in the qualities of the two.—ABBOTT L. SWINSON, Goldsboro, N. C.

ALLEN PRINGLE, SELBY, ONT.—I think the former are more desirable and prefer them.

H. COUSE, CHELTENHAM, ONT.—Those raised under the swarming impulse are supposed to be more vigorous.

DR. A. B. MASON, WAGON WORKS, OHIO—I have seen no difference in the quality of queens raised by both methods.

JUDGE ANDREWS, MCKENNY, TEXAS.—There is no difference, except as the former class may happen to be reared from advanced larvæ, then such queens are inferior.

PROCREATIVE POWER OF VARIOUS DRONES.

QUERY No. 116.—Are drones from an unfertile queen which has never met a drone capable or profitable for copulation with queens? (My experience has shown that they are not capable of that duty.) Are drones from eggs laid by a queen that has lost her *fertility* capable of copulation with a queen? (I say they are not according to my experience.) Are drones from eggs laid by "*fertile-workers*" capable of copulation with a queen? (I answer, they are not.)—ABBOTT L. SWINSON, Goldsboro, N. C.

H. COUSE, CHELTENHAM, ONT.—Cannot answer these questions from experience, but would not raise drones from either.

JUDGE ANDREWS, MCKENNY, TEXAS.—(1) Such drones are both capable and profitable for mating with queens. (2) Such drones are capable. (3) Drones from eggs laid by workers are also capable.

ALLEN PRINGLE, SELBY, ONT.—This is a tough one to tackle late at night, and I guess the "short and easy" road out of the difficulty will be to say laconically, I don't know. I will, however, just venture on one suggestion and then on one opinion. The suggestion is that such and such drones might be quite "capable of copulation," and at the same time be very unprofitable copulators. The opinion is that drones from "*fertile-workers*" are no use at all and not to be encouraged for any service, and least of all, copulation.