

As foolish as this seems to a practical breeder, we see many examples of it. Such men say it doesn't pay to use pure blood. They forget this law, that the tendency is always to revert to the original type, and as the scrub is probably nearer than the short horn it don't take many generations for the traces of the latter to disappear.

Why does not the same law hold good in breeding bees? Even with the best races of bees in existence, one cross is not enough. New blood must be introduced to infuse new life and vigor. This should be kept up from year to year if the best results are looked for. Don't depend on hap-hazard crossing with the neighbor-bees, nor what is worse, the breeding in-and-in of your own, but bring from a distance your breeding queens. I believe this will be found to pay, whether working for honey or increase and whether breeding a pure race or otherwise. In the range of my own observation the men who have lost most heavily of bees have paid least attention to breeding.

EUGENE SECOR.

Forest City, Iowa.

From Gleanings.

BEE-KEEPING AS A LIFE BUSINESS.

“IT seems a pity he should settle down into nothing but a bee-keeper, when he might be successful in almost any line of business he should undertake.” Such expressions I have heard, when, so far as I could see, the only reasons for it were that it was thought the man might make more money at some other business than bee-keeping. I am aware that too much has been said of the bright side of bee-keeping in the way of urging every one into it, and I have protested against it; for in nine cases out of ten, the person who chooses bee-keeping as his life-business, *merely* for the money there is in it, will meet with disappointment. But for once I want to take the other side, and say something in the way of urging the choice of this business upon a certain class. Here is a young man about to settle down in life. His college course of study is perhaps finished (and I would urge upon every young man to get a collegiate education, whether he expects to spend his life in apiary, farm, counting-house or pulpit), and the question is, whether bee-keeping shall be his vocation. He has aptitude for the business, what little experience he has had in it has been successful, and he would really like to spend his life at it if he thought he could make as much money at it as at merchandise, albeit the confinement of a merchant's life is not to his taste. But the matter of money

stands first in consideration, and he decides in favor of mercantile life. My young friend you are making a mistake. In the first place, it is by no means certain that you will be one of the successful merchants. But suppose you are, and that you make double or ten times as much money as you could at bee-keeping. You go on at your business, looking forward to the time when you can retire and enjoy life. There are events that may hinder the realization of your expectations. You may not live long enough. If you do, you will find that your tastes have somewhat changed, and that the life to which you have for years looked forward with bright expectations is mainly a disappointment. On the other hand, if you follow your inclinations and adopt the pursuit of a bee-keeper, there is no necessity for looking forward to a certain time in the future for your enjoyment of life. You can take your enjoyment as you go—mixed, it is true, with pain and toil, but still a life of enjoyment. You have one important advantage over the merchant; your outdoor life gives you a physical vigor he can not enjoy. He has poorer food than you, even if he eats from the same dish, for he has not the same hunger to spice it. The mere fact of existence is a pleasure to a perfectly healthy animal, be he man or beast; and the man who eats his meals with a thorough relish is the better man for it, physically, mentally, and perhaps morally and spiritually.

HIGH VERSUS LOW SALARIES.

There is another view that is worth taking, and it applies to all callings—bee-keeping or what not. Compare two positions in life. A man in Chicago has a salary of \$2,000 and his brother in a country village, has one half as much, \$1,000. Which has the better place? Perhaps the Chicago man, perhaps not. Throwing aside all other considerations, and taking just a dollar-and-cent point of view, if the country man's annual expenses are \$600, and those of the city man's \$1,700 (and there may be that difference, even when each seems to be living equally well), the result will be that the country man will lay by one-third more annually than the city man, in which case the \$1,000 salary will be better than the \$2,000. Suppose however that the annual expenses in the city is \$1,500, and \$600 in the country. In this case \$500 is annually saved out of the \$2,000, and \$400 out of the \$1,000. Is the salary that clears the \$500 one-fourth better than the salary that clears the \$400? And it is to this particular point I want to call the especial attention of the young. Nine out of ten of the young will be dazzled by the larger salary; and when to this is added the larger annual saving, the question