

to use the extractor or other professional tools.

The other objection to the small bee-keeper is that as soon as he gets a little surplus honey he proceeds forthwith to slaughter it in the nearest market. And when by a streak of uncommon luck he happens to become the possessor of a few hundred pounds—an enormous crop—he fairly loses his head and gives it away for whatever price he can get. This, of course, demoralises the consumers and spoils the local market, for the time being, for the regular producers. The only remedies I can see for this are for the latter to either buy up the surplus of these small fry or patiently bide their time till the “two penny half-pennies” are all sold out, which will not be long, and then open up the market at a fair price. The producer who ships his honey in bulk to a foreign market will not of course be affected by these small keepers.

Bee-culture as an exclusive means of subsistence is undoubtedly precarious and uncertain except under the most favorable circumstances. The favorable circumstances are, special qualifications for the business, as enumerated above, and a good natural territory not already occupied. Under such circumstances it can be made to pay in dollars and cents. But it must be borne in mind that such favorable circumstances are the exception, not the rule. In connection with some branch of agriculture it carries less risk.

My conclusion, then, is this: that at the past, present, and prospective prices for the product of the apiary, only the comparatively few can make bee-culture as an exclusive business pay; that while bee-keeping within towns and cities is not to be encouraged, and in all probability will be legally excluded from their limits before long, yet in country places now unoccupied it is rather to be encouraged, on the lines however and with the limitations already set forth. As to who ought to engage in bee-keeping, and who may engage in it, these are questions which each individual has the natural right to decide for himself, so long as he keeps within both the moral and the civil law. When the latter excludes him from corporations he has no right to violate it, and when the former excludes him in honor from pre-occupied ground he has no moral right to violate that either. With these two exceptions anyone, I should say, has the right to put his money into the “bee business,” try it, and come out a richer or a wiser man, as the case may be.

ALLEN PRINGLE.

Selby, Ont., Jany. 7, '88.

The opinion of the meeting was that Mr. Pringle's paper was pretty nearly right. Nobody could prevent people

going into the bee-business who desired to do so.

W. F. Clarke thought that bee-keeping was something like matrimony. People could talk as they pleased against it but those who felt inclined would rush into it and they could not help it. It was a school of experience and some of the experience was pretty dearly bought.

F. Malcolm thought that the bee-papers were a good deal to blame for so many rushing into bee-keeping and he attributed the reason for this to the fact that the publishers of the bee-papers were supply dealers.

In defence of the bee journals Mr. Clarke thought that they had as good a right to praise up bee-keeping as any other journals treating of special subjects had a right to praise their particular industry, but he did not think that such was the case with bee-papers. He thought that they generally put the matter in pretty nearly the right light, as they published the failures as well as the successes.

Mr. Malcolm evidently did not take into consideration, when this statement was made, that in nine cases out of ten, those who rush into bee-keeping did so before they took a bee-paper, and the real reason was because of the success of their neighbors and not because of seeing the industry painted in glowing colors by bee-papers.—Ed.]

The following resolution was then moved by W. F. Clarke, and seconded by F. Malcolm:

Resolved, that while it is the inalienable right of everybody and anybody to go into bee-keeping the same as any other honest business, it is the sense of this meeting that it is unwise to do so without adequate knowledge and due qualification. Carried.

A STRIKING COMMITTEE.

The President appointed Messrs F. Malcolm, R. McKnight, W. Coleman, J. Alpaugh, A. G. Willows, A. Picket, W. Hislop and D. Chalmers, the President and Secretary as a committee to strike the standing committees which would be required. On resolution the committee was instructed to report at the evening session.

QUESTION DRAWER.

The drawer was in charge of Messrs. Emigh, Alpaugh and Ellis. The first