

Prof. Riley agreed with Prof. Wiley. Both thought Prof. Cook would find it difficult to substantiate his position.

A. I. Root wanted to know if any one could tell the difference between sugar fed to the bees and then extracted and sugar honey. Mr. Root stated they could.

Next followed Prof. Riley upon the subject, "What the Department of Agriculture has done and can do for Apiculture." [This paper has already been published in the C.B.J. p. 320, Jan. 15.—Ed. C.B.J.]

Prof. Riley, on the principle that we had better ask for what we can get than ask for more than we can get, thought a separate division for apiculture would not be granted.

The committee was reappointed with instruction, as described.

#### GOVERNMENT AID TO APICULTURE.

The committee to whom was referred the matter of Government aid to apiculture beg leave to report and advise that the beekeepers of the United States petition:—1st, That the section of Apiculture in the Division of Entomology, Department of Agriculture, be raised to an independent division; 2nd, That in connection therewith there be an experimental apiary established at Washington, having all the appointments necessary to a first-class apicultural experimental station; 3rd, That the appropriation for this division be sufficiently large, so that the work may not be embarrassed for lack of funds.

This is the least we can ask in justice to ourselves. That most important part of our business depends on the production of liquid honey is in great danger of being ruined by cheap sugar. The chief competition of liquid or strained honey in the manufacture is cane sugar; and the recent removal of the duty on it and the consequent lowering of prices has naturally lessened the demand for honey. We find that we will have to lower the cost of producing honey in order to meet this most unequal competition suddenly thrust upon us. Millions of money are

taken from the treasury to reimburse the producers of cane and maple sugar for the loss occasioned by the removal of the duty, and our legislators entirely forget the producers of honey, whose product is but sugar with the flavor of the flowers added. We do not ask a bounty, but we do ask the Government for all the assistance that scientific research and well directed experimental work can give us in cheapening the cost of production. This is but a moiety of what is granted the sugar men. Our industry is still in its infancy, and while many million pounds of honey are already produced, the business is capable of an expansion so great as to wholly eclipse the present production of sugar from the sugar cane. Your contiguous counties have produced in one season over four million pounds of honey, and this represents but a fractional part of what might have been gathered. Vast as our business may become, the natural benefits conferred by the honey bee on the agriculturalists of this country, in the fertilization of the flowers of fruits, grains, and seeds, will always surpass in value the value of the honey gathered by the bee.

The committee have named Washington as the place for the experimental yard, because it would be most convenient; also because of the longer season in which to experiment. There may be better locations for honey, but for many experimental purposes a poor location may be best. If for any purpose a better flow of honey is desired, such a location may be found a few miles out, and a part of the bees removed to it.

Should the convention decide to adopt this report it would undoubtedly be best to have a committee estimate the necessary expense, and immediately formulate a petition for circulation throughout the country, naming the amount of the appropriation desired and the charges called for, together with a few of the reasons why we demand help at this critical juncture.

T. H. ELWOOD,  
J. E. HEATHERINGTON,  
C. HERSCHRISER.