

the Chapman honey plant. The report was in substance the same as that which has appeared from the pens of T. F. Bingham, N. W. McLain and Wm. R. Clarke, in the various bee journals. It was highly favorable, and gave reason to believe that the plant will prove a valuable addition to our honey-producing flora.

N. W. McLain, of the U. S. Apicultural Station, then read a paper on "Bee-keeping and Apiculture." Rev. W. F. Clarke thought the paper did not do justice to the great progress which had been made in apicultural improvement. There was much that was interesting and valuable in the paper, but it was open to criticism in regard to the point named. Comparisons unfavorable to bee-keepers had been made between them and dairymen. He (Mr. Clarke) believed there had been as much progress made in average honey production, as in average milk-yield. Mr. McLain had found fault with the title of Mr. Langstroth's book, "The hive and the honey-bee," as attaching too much importance to the hive. He did not agree with the essayist in this. Mr. Langstroth had given us a hive which enabled us to get at the queen and improve the bee. The hive was an important factor in the improvement of the bee, and we have seen the present season how a hive can lessen one-half the labors of the apiary. He had spoken too eulogistically of the hive at first, not that he had exaggerated its merits, but he really did not care to have every body know them. Its value would become generally known all too soon for the interest of those who were the first to adopt it. He was selfish enough to wish he might enjoy the secret for a time. Mr. McLain thought he had been somewhat misunderstood and was proceeding to make explanations, when it was moved and resolved that further discussion be postponed until after the reading of a paper by R. L. Taylor on "The coming Bee" which was the next thing on the docket. Mr. Taylor did not think the coming bee had yet arrived, but it was on the way, and we had every encouragement to work for its advent. He described the lines along which we should work for improvement. We should disregard purity of race, and endeavor to obtain what had been called a business bee. He thought bee-keepers should unite in establishing a breeding apiary on some island, or in the midst of a prairie where there were no other bees. Colonies that had shown the greatest energy in gathering honey and building comb should be sent to the breeding apiary, the inferior strains remorselessly exterminated, and only the best perpetuated.

After the reading of Mr. Taylor's paper, the

meeting was adjourned until the evening session.

The evening session opened with a paper on "Feeding bees for winter" by James McNeill, of Hudson, N.Y., which advocated sugar feeding. Then came a paper by Dr. A. B. Mason on the general subject of "Wintering Bees," which was a review of various methods of wintering. The question, "What are the qualities of the best honey-gatherers?" was then proposed for discussion, but there seemed no disposition to enter into it largely. One or two members made a few general remarks in regard to the subject when it was dropped. A question in regard to perforated honey boards was then asked, when Mr. R. L. Taylor described them and advocated their use. An intermission was then taken for music, social speeches and refreshments—a program for which had been provided by the ladies.

#### THIRD DAY.

The National Bee-Keepers' Union, an organization for the defence of bee-keeping against attack by law suits or otherwise held a session at 8.30, which continued until 9.30. A long discussion was had as to the best means of getting a larger membership. Some were in favor of reducing the membership fee to 50 cents, while others strongly urged the continuance of present rates, and even raising them. A vote was taken on 50 cents, \$1 and \$5, as the annual membership fee, \$1 was upheld by a large majority. After the adjournment of the Union, the manager, T. G. Newman, gave an address on the work of the Union, after which it was on motion resolved, that the work of the National Bee-keepers' Union is entitled to and should receive the support of bee-keepers.

The following gentleman were, on motion, made Honorary members:—

Prof. Millets, of the Michigan Agricultural College, in appreciation of his efforts on behalf of bee-keepers' postal rights.

Hon. Mr. Ross, Ontario Commissioner of Agriculture, in appreciation of his official and personal interest in the advancement of bee-keeping in Canada.

Prof. C. V. Riley, in appreciation of the apicultural station established as a branch of the Entomological department of the U. S. Government.

Dr. C. C. Miller moved, that a committee be appointed to enquire into the desirability and feasibility of securing legislation to protect bee-keepers. After some discussion, the resolution was passed, amended to a committee of three to be appointed by the chair, and to report at next annual meeting. Dr. C. C. Miller, J. N. Cotton,