

ceptions to the general rules. Take the two cases we have supposed, one man with a thousand colonies, another with one.

The 1000 colonies man cannot produce honey for nothing, that is clear. He must have something to buy his bread. The one-colony man attaches little or no value to his bees. They cost him nothing and in the event of a failure of the honey crop he counts upon no loss for he has bestowed no labor on his bees, no study or thought. If they give him a crop, it is so much clear gain. He divides with his neighbor or takes his honey in a pail to the nearest store, and accepts whatever price is offered, as he is not particular what he gets for that which has cost him nothing. He counts it about the same as the wild grapes which grow in his fence rows, and which anyone can have for the gathering. Looking at it in this light, as between the man with 1000 colonies and the man with one, does it not look as if the latter has the best of it in point of cheapness? Looking at it no farther than this, I do not wonder that some hold the view that everyone should be encouraged to keep bees and that to have honey plentiful and cheap, all that is necessary is to have a bee hive at every man's door.

But let us see what is the result of this happy-go-lucky state of affairs. Has not this system been tried? I think close observation will bear me out in saying that before the days of specialists in bee-keeping, when honey "cost nothing," not one family had honey to eat where three now have it. Please don't forget that the plan of having bees kept one or ten colonies in a place is exactly the system that was in vogue fifty years ago, and is no new thing. Is the system practiced as much now as then? Look around you and see. People are not apt to give up that which is profitable. If the man with one colony can raise honey for nothing, does he follow it up year after year? Very seldom. The fact is take a series of years and he cannot produce his honey as cheaply as he can buy it of the specialist, and the strongest proof is his own actions.

I have just been looking over a list of beekeepers of ten years ago, and of those who were specialists not one in ten has left the ranks. On the other hand I recall to mind those who were non-specialists living about me ten years ago, and not one in ten of them to-day owns a bee, although some of them had as many as twenty colonies. Putting these two facts together, do they not show that the specialist can produce honey more cheaply than others? Else why does he keep at it and others give it up? The fact is the latter consider it a matter of luck.

If walking along the road I find a silver dollar

and pick it up, it costs me nothing, but I would hardly argue from that, that finding silver dollars in the road is the cheapest way of getting them as a steady business.

Very strong proof then that the specialist can produce honey more cheaply than others is the simple fact that he persists in the business when others give it up. Now, why can he produce it more cheaply? Why can you buy your coats and pants at the clothiers' more cheaply than your wife can make them? Because the clothier has the proper appliances and knows his business. Just so with the specialist in any line. The man who makes a specialty of bee-keeping is provided with books and papers. He studies his business and is thus less liable to make disastrous mistakes. Keeping a large number of colonies he can afford to be supplied with the best implements and labor saving appliances. Above and beyond everything else however is the one reason that the specialist knows his business. Can you expect anything else in any line of business than that the man who gives his best thought and energies to that business will succeed better than he who knows nothing about it?

To take the middle part of the subject last, the specialist will produce honey in better shape, for the same reason that he can produce it more cheaply, simply because he has better facilities and because he *knows how*.

There was considerable discussion on these papers.

After some routine business was transacted the directors adjourned for the purpose of preparing their report to be submitted for the election of the officers for the new year.

In the absence of the President, Mr. J. E. Frith was called to the chair.

THE QUESTION DRAWER

Was then reopened. The first question being:—

DOLLAR QUEENS.

Does it pay to buy dollar queens for the purpose of getting new blood in your apiary?

R. Parker believed that it did pay to get new strains of the dollar class.

Wm. Hill had had some very good queens at \$4 and \$5, but latterly he found that he could get just as good dollar queens. His idea was that it altogether depended upon from whom they were purchased.

R. E. Smith thought that just as good strains could be procured from dollar