

colonies is sufficient for a locality, taking one year with another.

Mr. Frith.—What would be the territorial dimensions for that?

Mr. Holmes.—Two and one-half miles in 150 to 250 colonies each direction. Perhaps I will be too severe in my views of that matter.

Mr. Frith—Do you think any apiaries should be placed any closer than five miles from you?

Mr. Holmes—If a person who chances to be located within a mile and a half of me wants to keep bees, he has a perfect privilege to do so. It is not my prerogative to tell him to remove to California if he wants to keep bees.

Mr. Frith—For profit you think apiaries should not be closer than five miles a part?

Moved by Mr. Best, seconded by Mr. Frith, that a vote of thanks be tendered to Mr. Post for his excellent paper on the question of "Overstocking." Motion. Carried. (With applause).

Review of Papers of Last Annual Meeting by Allan Pringle

The duty which has been assigned me on this occasion is to review the papers presented to this Association at the last annual meeting, with the exception of the president's address, which, of course, was not an apicultural subject, and my own address on "Education."

The first paper presented was by Mr. A. E. Sherrington, on "Conventions." The leading ideas of the brief paper were, first, that conventions are not only useful for the dissemination of knowledge, but are important social agencies, with which nearly everybody will I suppose agree whether our own meetings are as sociable and harmonious as they might be (is another question); second,—that, in regard to the papers and essays that are read at Conventions, they should be more in the line of questions than mere essays,—with which many will not agree, and third, that "the officers of an Association should be changed quite frequently"—a very doubtful proposition which needs much qualification and from which many will dissent.

As to the desirability of "essays being mostly in the line of questions", I do not agree with that at all. We have our "Question Box" where any member may deposit his question and it will receive attention; and that is the proper place for questions.

Following out the line of question essays, what sort of report could we present to the government and the public? Instead of

good substantial papers embracing the mature, thought and experience of the best apiarists and members of this society from year to year we should have a crude mass of off-hand discussion, some of it wise and some otherwise, to present to the Government and public for their edification. It stands to reason that when a member undertakes to write an essay for this or any other convention he will put into that essay his best thought and his ripest experience in the subject in hand. This is what we want, to give weight and substance to our report and to our association, and not only to give useful and permanent information to each other, but to the great boon of readers who are not present at our meetings.

As to the third point, that "the officers of an association should be changed quite frequently, just to infuse new blood into it," I cannot agree with that either. Indeed, it would be the ruin of most societies. When the right man is in the right place it is a great mistake to put him out just to make a change.

The experience of an official, added to painstaking and faithfulness, is an important consideration. Take, for example, the present secretary of this association. There can be little doubt that his long experience in that position enables him now to discharge its functions, not only much easier but much better than he could during his first years of service. Speaking for myself, I would want a much better reason for changing well-trying and faithful officials than merely for change or the introduction of "new blood."

The next paper or report read was one by F. M. Webster, of Ohio, on "Spraying with Arsenites vs. Bees," which was read to this Association by Professor James Fletcher, of Ottawa, and commented on by him. The substance of Prof. Webster's paper was that experiments he had made proved not only that "bees are liable to be poisoned by spraying the bloom of fruit trees," but that the larvae are also so liable.

Prof. Fletcher fully concurred in the conclusion reached by Prof. Webster from his experiments, which Prof. Fletcher said, "had been carried on with great care by a competent man," and which showed "that there is danger of killing bees with a mixture applied to kill other insects." The conclusion, therefore, was that it was "wrong to apply Paris green when trees are in blossom," not only because of the danger to bees, but the liability of injuring the fertilizing powers of the trees. Prof. Fletcher took the further ground that after