

We think the swarms should have been made to weigh an even number of pounds in each group. We recognize that the same amount of ground would not have been covered, yet the work would have been done in a more thorough manner, as far as undertaken. The variation in weight of swarms is an important factor and especially is this the case when the gain per lb. is taken into consideration. For instance a swarm weighing 5 lbs. may secure no more than required for immediate use, one weighing 6 lbs. would gain 3 lbs. per day, one weighing 7 lbs. gain 6 lbs. per day and so on. Again if we understand the experiment correctly, the supers were taken from the old colony and placed upon the new, the supers may therefore, as far as we know, have been in all stages, from untouched foundation in sections to nearly completed comb honey. Such a variation is not desirable when conducting an experiment, and we think it would be better to take untouched supers in every case. Again, it will be remembered, that Mr. Taylor uses the new Heddon hive, this has a chamber half the depth of the Langstroth frame. Mr. Taylor does not state if one or two of these chambers were used for brood. This may assist very much in accounting for some of the results with heavy swarms, and in fact in various ways give us a result somewhat different from what would prevail had a full depth Langstroth frame been used. If only one shallow body were used below the comb honey super, we would expect different results as to comb honey, than with a chamber below the depth of the Langstroth. Again it will be found that heavy swarms will remain in the hive better and work to better advantage with lots of room below, it is even advisable: sometimes, when they are hived, to put an empty body below the brood chamber. The whole experiment opens an interesting field, and Mr. Taylor expresses matters well when he says "many and varied experiments must be made in order to arrive at the exact truth in these matters. Let no one fear that apicultural experiment stations may be either too

numerous or too well equipped." When we recommended starters in our address upon the production of comb honey, we looked upon it largely from the standpoint of securing the best finished sections and we must confess we did not expect to find any material difference in the quantity of honey secured. If it can be shown that bees will do even as well upon sheets of foundation we shall welcome the news. The unreliability (as to drone and worker) of the comb built on starters would lead us to avoid the latter.

.

To follow the right path is not always the smoothest and most pleasant, but all things considered the best.

THE RIGHT PATH It is not manly to praise only when good is done and to remain silent when we should condemn. Is not this what some of us are doing. Brother York of the American Bee Journal is heroically doing battle with the apicultural experimental "ring" in Michigan and every fair minded person however delicate his position, should help him. The Michigan government is conducting experiments in apiculture and the one who is conducting their experiments acknowledges that he is selling the result of this costly work to one man. How any one can look upon this as fair and just we cannot realize. The money used is furnished by the people of the country and all have an equal right to the use of it. If one man had the monopoly to supply apicultural information to the United States it would be different, but there are many who are in this business, for instance in Canada every agricultural paper has a bee department, and nearly every weekly paper in the Dominion gives apicultural information from time to time, again there are the apicultural writers and lecturers, and last, but not least, bee-keepers generally, who have a right to this information; equal to any one else. In Canada the report of such work would have to go to the government first and through it to the public. or he published by the government in bulletin form from time to time. There is