

nals, then continued in a meeting of the North American where certain changes were recommended and finally adopted by the Union, a decision being arrived at by means of a vote made by mail.

The object of the North American is to meet socially and discuss apianian topics for mutual improvement. The primary object the Union was to defend its members against unjust persecution, but its constitution has now been changed so that money may be used for any purpose thought advisable by the board. I see no reason why these two national societies should not join forces, making one grand organization endowed with the characteristics now possessed by both. There could be the grand rally each year in a convention the same as is now enjoyed by the North American, the same class of topics discussed, and, in addition, there could be the free face to face discussion regarding that class of issues with which the Union has to deal. I think that it would be well to retain the name, North American Bee-Keepers' Association. I would also suggest that there be a President, 1st and 2nd Vice Presidents, a Secretary and a Treasurer, and that these officers constitute the executive board. In addition to the duties that now devolve upon the Secretary of the North American, I would have him take up also those now performed by the General Manager of the Union. That is, if the two organizations were combined, I would have the combined duties of both executive officers performed by one man, and the society should have sufficient members so that the Secretary-Manager could devote a large share, if not the whole, of his time to the performance of these duties. It would seem that all of the bee keepers in this great and glorious country could keep one man profitably employed in thus looking after their interest.

There are many things, aside from those already done by the Union and North American, that might be done by such an organization with an efficient executive officer at its head and money in its treasury. The feature mentioned by Mr. Case is a case in point, viz., that of looking after and reporting swindlers. I don't know as the constitution of the present Union would need any change to allow of such work being done. Two or three times the Review has exposed some swindler, but this was not done until numerous complaints had been received, and considerable time elapses. To call a man a swindler because one man said so would often lead to unjust accusations. When an apparently just complaint is made the Union could make a thorough investigation, more thorough than one man could afford to make. As Mr. Case says, a

man would "brace up," and do the fair thing by his customers when he found that his unsatisfactory methods were likely to be published to the members of the North American. I frequently receive complaints of fraud, unfairness and unsatisfactory methods of conducting business, but before publishing anything of this character, a publisher must have absolute proof of the correctness of such statements. To secure such proof is often too much trouble and expense for one man to bear.

Perhaps something might be done in the way of helping bee keepers to secure better prices for their honey, or to market it in a more satisfactory manner. Fruit exchanges have helped the peach growers of New Jersey and the orange growers of California, and it is possible that something in this line might be done by honey producers if they were sufficiently organized. All such questions as these would, of course, come up in convention. — Bee-Keepers' Review.

Poison Sumach and Poison Ivy.

There is a difference in the general appearance of the plants, both as to stalks and foliage, by which the poisonous and the harmless varieties of the sumach can be distinguished from each other, writes Eben E. Rexford in a very valuable article on "Our Poisonous Plants," in the June Ladies' Home Journal. The former has light-colored stalks frequently blotched with white or gray, and the foliage is thin and firm in texture with a glossy surface, while the latter has a soft, thick leaf, a brown stalk, hairy in the early stages of the new growth, and is of much stronger habit, often becoming quite a tree. This variety bears fruit thickly covered with crimson hairs in spiky, terminal bunches, while the poisonous variety has berries of a greenish white—very similar in size and color to those of the poison ivy—in loose, pendent clusters, along the upper part of the branches. The harmless rhus is almost always found on the uplands and in open places, while the poisonous sort prefers moist ground and shade. The former takes on a most beautiful variegation in the fall, its pinnate, palmate foliage turning to red, scarlet and maroon of exceedingly rich and brilliant shades, while the latter becomes a pale yellow. This poisonous variety is a most dangerous plant. It is worse than the poison ivy by far. Many persons cannot pass near it without being affected, as if they had really handled it, strange as it may seem. It seems to be able to communicate its virulent qualities to the atmosphere which surrounds it.