

cies of the case required such a construction (or misconstruction) from the author himself. If it really was meant as a harmless scientific squib, with no *malice prepense*, the question arises, How is it that the professor neglected to set the matter right when he found that everybody was taking his joke seriously, to the great detriment of an important industry, and the calumnious aspersion of honest honey-producers?

Another example of spurious science is now before me. The Medical Standard for June, 1889, contains a leading article on Embryology, by a learned New York doctor, in which we are gravely informed that "a worker bee is a highly organized creature, with a well developed brain, wonderful sense-organs, intricate muscular apparatus, and yet is an offspring of an unimpregnated queen bee." Now, this is all well put and quite true, except the last clause, which is just the opposite of the truth. Any apiarian specialist could have told the doctor that while it is true that the virgin queen bee lays eggs which produce drones or males, she never deposits eggs which produce females—that is, workers and queens—until after she is impregnated by the drone. Hence, the worker bee is not "an offspring of an unimpregnated queen bee."

While it would be obviously unfair and unreasonable to hold the Monthly morally responsible for the specimen of *wily* science and its results to which this article refers, it is, perhaps, not entirely free from blame in allowing the matter to rest uncorrected so long. I take the liberty of here suggesting to publishers of encyclopædias and scientific works the wisdom of first submitting doubtful points and dubious assertions, made by men outside their special departments, to practical men in such departments, whether the latter be learned or unlearned, for the knowledge of an unlearned man touching his own particular line of business (even the science of it) may exceed that of the scientist both in accuracy and extent. Such a course would often save the specialist from humiliation, and spare the public the infliction of some very queer science, which, not unfrequently, fails to dovetail with every-day facts.

#### Brant Beekeepers.

THE quarterly meeting of the Brant Association was held at the residence of Mr. Geo. Morris Hatchley, on the 10th April. President J. R. Howell in the chair with the following members present:

Miss Flanders, Mrs. Birkett, Miss Ash, Miss

Lampman, Miss Beatrice Beaton, Miss K. Poole, Mrs. Geo. Morris, Mrs. J. Morris, Mr. Flanders, Mr. Burket, Mr. Ash, Geo. Hutchinson, Geo. Agilsworth, T. King, T. Davis, T. McConkey, L. Boomer, E. Mott, B. Palmer, S. McCubbin, W. Phelps, Mr. Kelly, Geo. Nunis, J. Morris, W. Witts, S. Witts, T. Geddy, T. Entwistle, H. Robinson, E. Robinson, C. Yates, R. Shelington, T. Brown, T. Murray, C. Hamner, T. Hamner, D. Anguish, Sec.-Treas.

The minutes of the former meeting were read and confirmed.

The Act for the suppression of Foul Brood was read by the Secretary, and was new to many of those present. The benefits accruing from the passage of the act were explained by the Secretary. It was the opinion of the meeting that it would be productive of good, though all present thought that there should be some remuneration to those whose bees were destroyed by fire. Articles were read by:

W. Phelps, Mohawk, on Spring Management, and by D. Anguish, Brantford, on Cellar or Out Door Wintering. They will appear in next issue.

#### GENERAL BUSINESS.

Geo. Morris and T. Murray were appointed representatives to the Harley fair; J. R. Howell and D. Anguish, to the Brantford fair.

The meeting then adjourned, to meet at Brantford at the call of the Secretary.

D. ANGUISH,  
Sec.-Treas.

#### Kent Beekeepers.

THE above association has been organized, and has complied with the terms of affiliation with the Ontario Beekeepers Association.

The election of officers resulted as follows:

President, Alfred Coatsworth; Vice-President, J. A. Foster; Sec'y-Treasurer, R. F. Holtermann.

The representatives appointed for O. B. K. A. were as follows:—Harry Robinson, Mrs. John Culver.

It was moved, seconded and carried, that \$15 of the affiliation grant be expended in prizes at Chatham, Ont., and that the president and secretary make out a list of prizes to be offered for competition.

It was moved, seconded and carried, that only members of the Association. (Kent Beekeepers) who join by August 15th, be allowed to compete for the prizes offered. The membership fee was fixed at 25c. per annum.

The next meeting will be held the second week in August, the day and place to be fixed by the officers of the Association. A programme will be prepared for the occasion and beekeepers receive an invitation to be present at the meeting.

R. F. HOLTERMANN, Sec.

Romney, May 5, 90.