

for in Chicago. It will be a great pleasure to meet bee-keepers from foreign lands—many of whom, I have no doubt, will visit our shores at that time. I call your attention to this matter that you may, if you so desire, appoint a committee to determine the time of such convention, and publish proper notice thereof. If thought best to hold such a meeting in connection with the next gathering of this society, timely notice should be given that some of our friends across the water might arrange to be with us. A gathering of bee-keepers at that time might be of unusual interest to us.

In closing, allow me to thank you for the honor conferred by calling me to preside over this the twenty-third annual meeting of this society.

Among my predecessors are some of the foremost beekeepers of the country and the world. I am happy to be numbered with such an array of talent and worth. The beekeepers of America may well be proud of the pioneers of this industry. Such names as Langstroth and Quimby will ever make beekeeping a respectable calling.

FRANK BENTON, of Washington, in referring to the President's address, upon the subject of insects, beneficial and injurious, stated that the Department of Entomology made a study of the lives and histories of all insects, and gave an interesting account of the work of that Department. Mr. Benton thought that the Government should aid the general development of apiculture in the country.

Another member thought the Government could do much to aid beekeepers.

R. F. HOLTERMANN, of Brantford, stated that several county associations in Ontario had been looking into the necessity of preventing the production or importation of syrup stores in comb, and selling it as honey. The subject would come up at the O.B.A.'s Annual meeting with a view to get Dominion legislation in this direction.

A paper from Dr. C. C. Miller, Marengo, Ill., which, with the accompanying editorial remarks, taken from *Gleanings*, was read, upon grading honey:

### Grading.

#### A PROPOSED COMPROMISE.

DEAR ERNEST—Although exceedingly anxious that, before the convention at Washington, some system of grading should be effected that would be so nearly acceptable to all as to meet general acceptance,

yet I shrink from any attempt at formulating such a system. The plain truth is, I don't feel that I know enough for such a task. Yet I have made the attempt to do as requested. I can not apologize for the system I offer by saying it is hastily thrown together. It is nothing of the kind. It has been the subject of much care, and the hardest thought I am capable of giving. There is nothing original about it, except the string that ties it together. It is a mosaic, made up from all the systems that have been offered, modified somewhat by the discussions I have heard and read. If freely criticized in the right spirit, it is possible that something may be made out of it that shall be satisfactory, even if it be so modified as a result of the criticisms that nothing of the original draft can be recognized. But here is the system, having four grades, depending on appearance or condition independent of the source of honey, and four classes of honey.

FANCY. Combs straight, white, well-filled, firmly fastened to wood on all four sides; all cells sealed; no pollen, propolis, nor travel-stain.

No. 1.—Wood well scraped or entirely free from propolis; one side of the section sealed with white capping, free from pollen, and having all cells sealed except the line of cells next the wood; the other side white or but slightly discolored, with not more than two cells of pollen, and not more than ten cells unsealed beside the line of cells touching the wood; comb fastened to the wood on four sides.

No. 2.—Three-fourths of the total surface must be filled and sealed; wood well scraped of propolis.

No. 3.—Must weigh at least half as much as a full weight section.

There are the four grades.

For the classes of honey, I would suggest the four already in use, sufficiently understood from the names alone, namely: light, amber, dark, mixed.

You will see that there is nothing new in any of this. It is hardly probable that it will entirely suit any one. It does not suit me. I have not tried to give what would suit any one man or set of men. I have merely made an attempt to come as nearly as I could to what all might agree upon, each one making some concession for the general good. If some one has something better as a basis to start with, I shall be not only willing, but glad to see this thrown aside and the better taken in its place. But something must be taken as a basis. It will not do for each one to offer the system that exactly suits him. We'll not get on very fast in that way. If no better basis is offered than the one I have given, then let each one look it over and see, not what changes must be made to make the plan entirely acceptable, but, rather let him see what is the least change necessary to make him willing to agree to the system, taking into account what others as well as himself may desire.

I see I have made the impression that