

THE ONTARIO B. K. A.

Its Benefits—Good Work of the Department—Honey Crop Committee

Lack of space must be our excuse for not presenting to our readers the remarks of Mr. W. Couse at the last O.B.K.A. meeting in Toronto. The following is his address as Vice-President at that time. He is now our worthy President. We trust that what follows will stimulate more of our readers and others to become affiliated with the Ontario Association:

The President has mentioned the pleasurable part of meeting together year after year. It is a fact that there are a great many of us who have met together year after year, Mr. Chairman, and meeting as friends, and while everybody knows that we are not always in the best of moods, we really realize out of being present a great deal of profit and pleasure. I may say that I have seen many a good scrap, and I believe that it is a pleasure to a great many. I don't know that I ever saw one yet but there was something in it. People differ, and will differ, and sometimes get mad because you do not differ with them; but, after all, I believe you can have a good scrap and benefit by it; but I tell you there is one thing—it is wise to do it aboveboard, and I believe you will find that there is nothing in it in the majority of cases if you come at a person and have your scrap fair and square, instead of going around behind him and saying something. I think it wise when we have any troubles at all to give them out; it will bring out discussion; it will bring out perhaps something that is hidden, that you don't know anything about, and it will prove something has been said that should not have been said, and in that way we will all be benefitted by it.

The President has made reference to the crops. I felt for some years that our crop of honey was not extra good, but the trouble has been that we have been

one has failed with it I will just relate one case I found in particular. Mr. Beattie, a short distance out of Stratford, just at the commencement of the clover flow, 1907, shook 4 colonies according to McEvoy's plan, but, to make a sure job, starved them six days instead of four, then gave them foundation. I called to inspect his apiary July 9th, 1907. I found three of the four hives (which had been shaken about a month before) quite bad with foul brood. Now for the opposite. Mr. Jones, a short distance out of Port Elgin, shook a large number of colonies in 1906 according to the McEvoy method, but instead of leaving them four days, something took up his attention, and he left them altogether—did nothing with them after the first shake; just let them go. In 1907 I examined every one of those colonies carefully and could not find one cell of foul brood. For several years in Galt I was in the habit of getting many foul brood colonies, or bare bees from foul brood hives, and experimenting with them. I found two days quite long enough to starve the bees when everything was carried out to a dot; in fact, I have made a complete success of just shaking the bees once when shook on to starters. I have never shook direct on to foundation and let them go, so could not say how that would work; but if a .22 rifle will do the work of a cannon, why fire those big guns of McEvoy's, which take so much ammunition to load them? If J. B. Hall, myself and others can make a success of one shake, why cannot others? I have never advocated the single shaking. If the voice of the inspectors say starve four days, I will fall into line and use the same platform, whether I think it necessary or not. D. Chalmers, McEvoy and myself are the best of friends, so far as I know, but I have been just far enough through the mill that if some of those roosters tread too hard on my corns, I will see that they crow or come down off the perch.

Eden, Ont.

ESTION

[h] oole, Ont., one ne to task to m, simply be in some hives could knock a higher than single out all at I found on in 1907 which to McEvoy is absurd it is to because some