

A Short History of the Empire State Honey Producers' Association

by

Roger A. Morse
Associate Professor of Apiculture
Office of Apiculture
Department of Entomology
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY

November, 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
The Name of the Association	2
History, 1870-1965	2
Officers, Dates, and Locations of Meetings	13
Summer Picnics	18

APPENDIX

Original Constitution and By-Laws	19
Copy of Resolution - 1904	21
Moses Quinby	21
History of Extension Apiculture in New York	25
Proclamation by Governor Thomas E. Dewey	31
Beekeeper of the Year	32
Constitution and By-Laws - 1968.....	32
Bee Inspection in New York State.....	32

Preface

This year, 1968, beekeepers in the State of New York celebrate the founding of their organization, one hundred years ago. Much has changed in that time. The movable frame hive was invented by the Reverend L. L. Langstroth in 1851. Still, the new hive was not practical until men had devised comb foundation, extractors, smokers and systems of swarm control. This was done in the mid and late 1800's. Many of the inventions and ideas which led to the development of the commercial beekeeping industry in the United States took place in New York State.

White sweet clover was once abundant in the State; however, it was buckwheat, and the nectar it produced, which made financial successes of many of the beekeepers between 1880 and 1940. Rapid change is a characteristic of modern society. Today, only a few farmers grow buckwheat. The prosperity of the beekeeping industry is now based on the production of alfalfa for hay by New York State dairymen. Already there are indications that the dairy industry may not always be of prime importance in the State. If dairying becomes less important, or if dairymen switch to some other forage crop, the beekeeping industry may be drastically affected. Certain nectar plants are of consequence in small areas within the State. Goldenrod is found in many places and sometimes yields a surplus. Basswood is an erratic nectar producing plant of importance in some areas. Purple loosestrife, another important plant, yields some nectar in the Hudson Valley and in areas near the Barge Canal. In the northeastern part of the State, blue thistle is of prime consequence. Birdsfoot trefoil is grown throughout the State but appears to be of little value as a nectar producer. Wild thyme yields well in the Catskill Mountain area, but only if the shallow-rooted plants receive sufficient moisture.

The history of the Empire State Honey Producers' Association is a history of change -- change in part brought about by a changing technology and a changing agriculture. At times the

Association has had a voice in New York State politics because of its strength, at other times this voice has waned.

This short history is based largely on notes and meeting notices found in the bee journals. Some secretaries and reporters have given great detail about meetings; other either used media unknown to the writer, or wrote little about what took place. It is for these reasons that gaps appear in the notes which follow.

I am indebted to many of the active members of the Association for the information they have given me concerning our history. Of greatest consequence is the library at Cornell University in which one may find files, articles and notes which make it possible to write a history of this kind. I am especially grateful to the late Dr. E. F. Phillips, and to his successor, Dr. E. J. Dyce, who believed in the importance of recording and maintaining that which is written so that men who follow may know, and profit from that which has transpired.

Ithaca, New York

R.A.M.

The Name of the Association

The Empire State Honey Producers' Association was not founded under that name; in fact, in its one-hundred year history there have been six name changes. There was obvious discord in 1883 and 1885 and the Constitution was rewritten at that time. Probably there were constitutional changes at other times too, but this is not clear. The present name dates from only 1935; a simplified constitution was adopted in 1929 (see Appendix G) and is presumably the one under which we are now operating. At that time, it was agreed that no two consecutive annual meetings should be held in the same city. This question has apparently arisen several times and at various times a strong effort has been made to move the location of the winter meeting from one city to another.

The names under which the association has operated are as follows:

1870 - 71	New York State Beekeepers' Association
1872 - 85	Northeastern Bee-keepers' Association
1886 - 91	New York State Beekeepers' Association
1892 - 99	?
1900 - 21	New York State Association of Bee-Keepers' Societies
1922 - 33	Empire State Federation of Beekeepers' Cooperative Associations Inc.
1934	New York State Honey Producers' Association
1935 - date	Empire State Honey Producers' Association

1870

The meeting of the Northeastern Bee-keepers' Association held in Utica, September 27 and 28 was called a semi-annual meeting. Because of a lack of information to the contrary we must consider this to be the first meeting of the present Empire State Honey Producers' Association though that was not its name at the time. Moses Quinby, (see Appendix C), presiding, distributed papers containing the constitution (see Appendix A), and by-laws for the association.

The fact that a proposed constitution was ready for distribution indicates there had been one prior meeting, of at least a few men, to discuss the formation of a new association.

Appendix A is a copy of the constitution and by-laws adopted in 1870. It clearly includes the founding date of 1868; still, no bee journal carries a record of what happened in New York State that year. I found a typewritten copy of the first constitution and by-laws in our files at Cornell. I presume Dr. Phillips received them from some beekeeper in the State but there are no notes to indicate their source or accuracy.

Dr. E. F. Phillips writing in the American Bee Journal in November, 1938, states that he is familiar with the fact that the New York Association claimed it was started in 1868 by Moses Quinby; however, he (Phillips) could not find a record of a meeting prior to the 1870 meeting.

Robert Bickford of Seneca Falls spoke about the new association. Bickford was from Germany and outlined how meeting and associations were run in that country. Apparently several of his suggestions were adopted by the new association.

Other famous beekeepers present at the meeting included: King, Hetherington, Van Douzen and L. C. Root.

The honey extractor and comb foundation had been invented within the past ten years and much of the discussion centered around these ideas. One beekeeper asked, "Will a honey emptying machine prove worthwhile?" Quinby responded that he was trying it. A Mr. Allen reported that he has sold "drained honey for a higher price than he could get for box honey."

Another person asked, "What would be the advantage of artificial combs of material indestructible by worms?" Mr. Quinby exhibited a comb made of tin and sheet iron covered with beeswax. It contained some capped brood indicating, he thought, that the idea had merit. Another beekeeper reported he had designed a comb-making machine but that it would cost \$200. This man said he had enough bees already and they had "tolerably straight combs" and did not need more. The beekeepers agreed that making such a machine would not be "remunerative".

Mr. King remarked that honey should have three qualities: 1. It must be "healthful." 2. It should be "palatable." 3. "It should, when on the table, present a pleasing appearance."

The association dues were to be one dollar. One beekeeper said that was too much and that charging so much would hinder the growth of the organization. He said his thoughts were substantiated by the fact that many attending the meeting had not joined the association. Mr. Bickford said that in Germany the associations were free and if the group needed any money, men would put their hands in their pockets and "give liberally." Evidently the dues remained at one dollar for no further mention is made on the matter.

Swarming was discussed, but it is evident that beekeeping had not reached the point where everyone agreed he should prevent swarming. That subject was to be discussed at subsequent meetings, even down to the present.

Foulbrood was known, but we know from subsequent investigation that they did not differentiate between American and European foulbrood until well after the turn of the century. Mr. Quimby said foulbrood was not as bad in 1870 as it had been ten years earlier. (This was probably because Italian queens were just being introduced and they are more resistant to European foulbrood). Mr. Bickford said a simple remedy for foulbrood had been discovered and the materials were available from a drug store for a few cents. No mention is made of what the material was.

It was moved that a report of this convention be forwarded to various bee journals. The American Bee Journal, fortunately, printed the notes from which the above was taken; otherwise, we should be without a report of the beginnings of our association.

1871

The June, 1871 issue of American Bee Journal reports on what is called the "second annual meeting." The secretary was not present; this posed a problem because he had the only copy of the constitution. The dues remained at one dollar.

Again a wide variety of subjects were discussed including: queen introduction, making artificial swarms, smoking bees (Mr. Root remarked that bees did not like tobacco smoke), black bees versus Italian bees, worms (wax moths), side boxing (placing more sections along the side of those already started), fall and spring feeding, and preventing swarming. It was agreed that "success in beekeeping depends in furnishing plenty of surplus room, thereby keeping all the bees engaged in gathering honey." The association passed a resolution agreeing on this matter. Certainly this fact and recognition that it was so, laid the foundation for successful beekeeping in the Empire State.

The minutes regarding officers are not clear. The officers were elected early in the meeting and may have been those who conducted the second meeting; however, I have listed them as the men who presided at the third meeting of the association.

1873

Beekeepers attending the 1873 meeting discussed types of hives and many of those present told what type of equipment they were using. The following information (Table 1) is taken from the American Bee Journal which reported on the meeting. It is interesting that only two men reported they were using the Langstroth hive.

Table 1. Report of colonies and production by some beekeepers attending the 1873 meeting.

<u>Name & Address</u>	<u>Number of Stocks</u>		<u>Kind of Hive</u>	<u>Amount of Honey</u>		<u>Amt. of Wax</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
	<u>Spr</u>	<u>Fall</u>		<u>Box</u>	<u>Extr'd</u>		
M. H. Tennent Stanwix, Oneida Co.	37	42	Union Hive	1800		50	Frame Hive, 8 frms, 10 x 17
C. D. Jones Kirkwood, Broome Co.	12	25	King Hive	500	100	3	Frame Hive, 10 frms, 12 x 13
Solomon Vrooman Seward, Schoharie Co.	50	66	Non-Swarmer	3500	500	100	Frame Hive, 7 frms, 15 x 15
G. M. Doolittle Borodino, Onondaga Co.	29	58	Swarmer	1650	700	20	Frame Hive, 9 frms, 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ x 10 $\frac{3}{4}$
J. H. Nellis Canajoharie, Montgomery Co.	37	43	Non-Swarmer	1349	539	11	Frame Hive, 8 frms, 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 18
Quinby & Root St. Johnsville, Montgomery Co.	139	160	Non-Swarmer	3000	3000	75	Quinby Hive, 7 frms, 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 18 $\frac{1}{2}$
J. L. Scofield Chenango Bridge, Broome Co.	18	40	Langstroth	1800	600		10 frms, 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ x 17 $\frac{3}{4}$
John Vandervort Binghamton	2	16	Langstroth	Honey to winter			9 frms, 9 x 17 $\frac{3}{4}$
A. Baker Stittsville, Oneida Co.	20	24	Box Hive			12	Very dry season
G. B. Seeley Syracuse	18	25	Quinby	200	500		Non-Swarmer, 7 frms, 16 x 10 $\frac{1}{2}$
R. Bacon Verona, Oneida Co.	40	59	Variety	800	100		Estimated
E. W. Alexander Camden, Oneida Co.	90	76	Quinby	2300	800	70	7/8 frms, 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 16 $\frac{1}{2}$
A. H. Root Palmyra, Wayne Co.	12	18	Quinby	280	300		8 frms, 17 x 10 $\frac{1}{2}$
H. Brown Frankfort Hill, Herkimer Co.	12	16	Box	80		20	Frame Hive, 7 frms, 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 10 $\frac{1}{2}$
J. A. Burdick Smithville, Jefferson Co.	14	21	Sisson Hive	50	600		8 frms, 12 x 12
D. A. Shaw Oriskany, Oneida Co.	25	90	Box	30		25	
Issac Willmarth Deerfield Corners, Oneida Co.	56	54	Kidder	900			9 frms, 12 x 12
N. N. Betsinger Marcellus Falls, NY	60	98	Betsinger	6000			8 frms, 9 x 14 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dr. J. R. Pratt Manchester, Ontario Co.		30	Variety				Just commenced

1874

Census figures show honey production in New York State was 1, 469, 318 pounds in 1874. Production for five counties was as follows: Steuben, 109,317; Onondaga, 77,226; Ontario, 69,179; Otsego, 56,872; and Cayuga, 40,448. In 1869, New York State honey production was only 807,286 pounds. However in 1875, New York State produced 9,272,702 pounds of maple sugar and 2,400,023 gallons of maple syrup.

1877

The 7th annual meeting was held in the Temperance Hotel in Syracuse. It was moved and carried that, “no member be allowed to speak more than twice, and not longer than five minutes at a time.”

1875 - 1889

The Bee-keepers Magazine, started in 1878, covered meetings of the Northeastern Bee-keepers Association from 1875 through 1889 when the paper was sold. The editor throughout this later period was John Aspinwall.

The Bee Keepers Exchange, a journal published in Canajoharie from 1879 through July, 1883 was started by J. H. Nellis, an officer in the association. This journal too covered the meetings, often giving great detail about meetings and papers presented at meetings.

1878

Gleanings in Bee Culture quotes a Utica paper as saying that Captain Hetherington had 3000 colonies of bees. Apparently Hetherington refused to answer A. I. Root's letters asking if this was correct or not and Root said other beekeepers stated the true number was about 800 colonies. In the same year, Doolittle sold 20,000 pounds of honey but said that he produced only half of it himself; the rest he bought from neighboring beekeepers.

1880

W. L. Coggshall stated that in 1880 he had 115 colonies of bees in two apiaries. He ran 75 colonies in an outapiary for extracted honey and produced 6000 pounds of honey, increasing this number of colonies to 100. At the same time he kept 40 colonies in his home apiary for comb honey production and increased this group of colonies to 70. The principal crops were buckwheat and basswood, with Coggshall saying that warm nights were needed for a good honey flow.

1881

Part of a clipping from the Utica Morning Herald was reprinted in Gleanings in Bee Culture in 1881 and reports on the annual meeting of the Northeastern Bee-keepers' Association which met in Utica that year.

The major topic was wintering. Both Doolittle and House thought it a good idea to winter half the bees outdoors and half in the cellar. In a winter when bees would winter well outside, they would not do well inside and visa versa. It is obvious that winter losses were high at times and Doolittle reported losing 75 of 90 swarms he tried to winter outdoors one year.

Foundation had been available only a few years and was much discussed. It was agreed that foundation which was six months old was not as satisfactory as that which is new. Natural starter comb was still superior to foundation.

Italian queens were just becoming fashionable and most beekeepers still used black bees. In response to one person's query about the best time of the year to buy Italian queens to replace blacks, there was the following answer, “any time you have the money.”

1886

The American Rural Home, a Rochester newspaper, dated February 27, 1886, carried a detailed account of the three day, 17th annual meeting held in Rochester. The newspaper clipping was given me by Raymond Churchill of Watertown, now president of the association.

The paper stated that in 1886 the Association was known as the New York State Beekeepers Association, its name having changed a year earlier when it was known as the Northeastern Association (probably correctly the Northeastern Beekeeper's Association). The association has about 200 members.

Some of the questions discussed at the meeting included: "What is the best method of preventing afterswarms?"; "Does it pay to sow alsike clover for bees to gather honey from?"; and "Reversing hives, frames and sections". Several beekeepers were upset because honey was being used to make beer. One man commented that, "he did not believe in using the honey product to aid in hurrying men to the devil". Others said they didn't care how their product was used so long as it sold well.

Adulteration of honey with cheap glucose was obviously a problem in 1886. Comb honey was the major product with which these men were concerned and there was some discussion about the fact that one pound sections were generally better filled than the taller, two pound sections.

One beekeeper advised members of the association that they should all acquaint their neighbors with bees and beekeeping. Another argued against this thought, saying that beekeepers should protect themselves and their industry and not give away information. Another member commented that the price of honey was so low, and the supply so great, that a man would be doing another an injustice to teach him the art.

The era of establishing outyards was just starting in the 1880's. P. H. Ellwood, a well-known beekeeper from Starkville, was not present but his speech was read and excerpts were printed in the newspaper account. Ellwood said, "Those who have reached the top of the hill in bee business have generally taken a ride in some other business." He went on to say that a single apiary, however large (many contained several hundred colonies at the time) was not enough to provide a man with a good living. Establishing outyards was possible but it required men, horses, investment and meant that the beekeeper might frequently be away from home. Also important, continued Ellwood, was the fact that when a man died it was far better for him to leave his family a business other than beekeeping.

In addition to its regular officers, the association elected a vice-president from each of the several major honey producing counties in the state. There were over thirty vice-presidents. Presumably these men were to aid in getting more members at the county level.

The final resolution passed by the group was to have L. C. Root, of Mohawk, report at the next meeting on how to create a better demand for honey. Members of the association were urged to cooperate with him in this matter. Unfortunately we have no copy of what Mr. Root said or thought.

1887

The program for the 1887 meeting was printed in *Gleanings in Bee Culture*. The following topics were discussed: Alsike clover as a honey plant; rendering old comb into wax; extracting honey, its relative value to comb honey; cause of the late depression of the honey market; beekeeping by women as an occupation; scientific ventilation of bees in winter repositories; overstocking the honey market; separators (probably for comb honey); the advantages and disadvantages of patent rights to beekeepers; and the bee hive for the future.

Some of the people attending the meeting and leading discussions included; C. F. Muth (Ohio); L. C. Root; John Aspinwall; P. H. Ellwood; Capt. J. E. Hetherington; A. E. Manum; S. T. Pettit (Canada); G. M. Doolittle; and R. F. Holtermann (Canada).

1888

Part of the program for 1888 was reproduced in *Gleanings in Bee Culture*. From the scientific point of view perhaps one of the most interesting papers was that presented by Professor N. W. McLain of Aurora, Illinois. He was a United States Department of Agriculture

employee and had been hired only a few years earlier and was probably the first USDA worker on honey bees. McLain spoke on "Artificial fertilization". Presumably this concerned bees and it would have been most interesting to know what he said.

Several prominent men in beekeeping, who could not attend the meeting, sent essays which were read and then discussed. Dr. C. C. Miller and R. F. Holtermann sent papers in 1888. Julius Hoffman, of frame fame, led a discussion on comb honey management. The use of full sheets of foundation was discussed by G. M. Doolittle. Other topics included honey promotion, the cultivation of plants for honey production, the best bee, state fairs, and how to promote increased use of honey.

1891

The meeting in December of 1891 was apparently a joint one with the North American Bee-keepers' Association. There was also an Eastern New York Bee-keepers' Association which met with the group.

Frank Benton, then with the USDA, spoke on new races of bees. Other topics included: the Italian bee; the prevention of swarming; standardizing sections for comb honey production; rendering beeswax; and honey prices.

Persons attending the convention and traveling by train could obtain a round trip ticket for one and one-third the one-way fare; however, it was necessary for the secretary of the association to complete a certificate which was returned to the railroads. This reduced rate applied mostly to the larger railroads. Several hotels were listed in Albany for \$2.00 a night. One could stay in the Temperance House for \$1.00.

Extracting whole supers of combs at one time, that is, without removing the combs, was discussed at the convention. W. L. Coggshall stated he had thought about the idea but he didn't know how it might be done. He said, "Understand, I do not say it is practical, but some day something might come of it."

1892 - 1897

I can find no record of a state meeting being held in New York State between 1892 and 1897; associations were active in the eastern and western parts of the state and several county associations were very active. The United States Bee-keepers' Union held its national convention in Buffalo, August 24-26, 1897, but there is no indication of what organization they worked with within the state.

The New York Association of Bee-keepers' Societies held its first meeting on March 16, 1898. There is no question that it was a new association and had no basis in previous organizations. The meeting held on January 10, 1900, of this same organization is clearly called the third annual meeting. Yet, it appears that much later, things were changed again and this organization was considered the state organization and this meeting, which was then called the third annual meeting became the thirty first annual meeting of our present organization.

1895

W. F. Marks, writing in the Beekeepers' Review in June 1895, suggested that all county associations unite to form a state organization. Through a series of strong state associations he proposed a national organization. Lastly, he states that the present organization is not a success, indicating again that there was not state organization in New York in 1895.

1898

The following is copied from the 1898 American Bee Journal:

"New York State Association"

"In pursuance of a call issued by a committee from several beekeepers' societies, asking that delegates to sent to Geneva, N.Y., March 16, to organize a State bee-keeper's association,

the representatives from the different local societies met and decided to organize a society to be called "The New York State Association of Bee-Keepers' Societies."

"The following officers were elected for the ensuing year: W. F. Marks, President; F. S. Emens, Vice-President; and H. S. Howe, Secretary-Treasurer."

"The next meeting will be held at Geneva, N.Y., the second Wednesday in January, 1899.

"The active members are to be delegates from the county societies, but any bee-keeper will be made welcome at the meetings.

Harry S. Howe, Sec.-Treas."

1899

The annual meeting of the New York State Association of Bee-Keepers' Societies was held in Geneva with W. F. Marks presiding. The President addressed the association at length, pointing out that the Association had been organized less than ten months, but that it had accomplished several things in that period of time. The Bureau of Farmers' Institutes (apparently a state organization) realized, stated the President, "that the only practical way to reach the beekeeper is through meetings devoted wholly to apiculture." We might presume from this, that during the time I can find no meetings listed, 1892-1896, the Association may have been meeting with a larger agricultural group in the state.

The Bureau, announced the President, proposed to hold a series of meetings each winter and to pay the expenses of some speakers. This appears to be the extension-type work, something the Federal Government did not start until 1914.

Adulteration of honey was a major problem, as the Federal Pure Food and Drug laws were not passed until 1906. President Marks urged the Association to send a representative to Washington in February, 1899, to attend a pure food congress. Apparently, the association did so since Marks was elected as its delegate.

The Association passed a resolution, which was forwarded to Governor Roosevelt, asking for the passage of a foulbrood law patterned after that in Wisconsin. The resolution stated that "upon the recommendation of a majority vote of the members of the bee-keepers' societies of New York, the governor shall appoint for a term of two years a state inspector of apiaries" etc.

A Professor Lull of the Geneva Experiment Station talked to the Association briefly about the work of the Station and that fruit growers were being told not to spray their trees while they were in bloom.

Apis dorsata, the giant honey bee of the east, was being widely discussed in the bee journals. It was obviously not known then that this bee can not be kept in a hive and that it builds only a single honey comb, usually high in a tree. The Association passed a resolution which it sent to the U. S. Secretary of Agriculture, as well as the members of Congress from New York, asked that this bee be imported into the United States "with the least possible delay". Obviously this was not done. Our experience with this bee indicates it probably would not have survived in the country except in the sub-tropical parts.

Freight rates were also discussed. It was stated that the rates were unjust and higher than those for sugar syrups of the same value. Apparently too, rates for honey being shipped in the west were less than those for honey shipped in the east. Grading comb honey was discussed and the Association appointed a committee to prepare a system of grading based on photographs of the different grades.

1901

The thirty-second annual convention of the National Bee-keepers' Association was held in Buffalo, September 10-12. E. R. Root of Ohio was president; the meeting was attended by several well known beekeepers including Dr. C. C. Miller, Frank Benton, W. Z. Hutchinson, W. L. Cogshall, and Hershiser.

Inspection - 1901

Mr. N. D. West gave a report on bee inspection in New York State for the year 1901 at the annual meeting of the National Bee-keepers' Association, held that year in September in Buffalo. His statistical report was as follows:

Apiaries visited	633
Colonies examined	14,763
Colonies diseased	4,689
Colonies condemned	2,604
Colonies destroyed	214

In his report, West states that the worst disease was "black brood" and it had started in Slansville, Schoharie Co. some six or seven years earlier. At that time the Commissioner of Agriculture appointed Mr. Frank Boomhower as his agent for disease inspection with instructions to exterminate the disease from Schoharie Co. Boomhower burned many colonies but apiarists were upset over colony destruction. In 1899 the bee disease law was amended so that a beekeeper could have "a chance to cure his own bees." At that time four inspectors were appointed. Inspectors gave instruction in treating disease and the shaking method was widely used.

The inspectors for 1901 were: M. Stevens - Pennellville; Charles Stewart - Sammons ville; W. D. Wright - Altamont; N. D. West - Middleburgh.

1902

The annual address of the president of the association, W. F. Marks, was printed in American Bee Journal in July of 1902.

President Marks pointed out that the adulteration of honey was still a very serious affair. He urged beekeepers to support new legislation, pointing out that Senate Bill No. 196 had been defeated last year by "The baking powder manufacturers." The Connecticut Experiment Stations analyzed samples of honey in 1896 and 1898. Only seven of forty-eight samples analyzed in 1896 were pure honey and only five of thirty-seven samples were judged pure in 1898. Twenty-two samples in 1898 were of doubtful origin; many of the samples came from New York State.

It was stated that a speaker for the annual beekeepers' institutes was furnished through the U.S.D.A.'s Bureau of Farmers' Institutes. Apparently it was this fact which stimulated the many winter meetings.

1904

In 1904 Tompkins County was the record honey producing county in the state; the county produced 236,000 pounds of honey. W. L. Cogshall, the world's largest honey producer, had over 20 apiaries in the county.

1905

In 1905 there were a series of county conventions from January 9-19. Mr. H. H. Root attended these and wrote about them; the state hired one speaker, Mr. N. E. France, to attend and talk at each of these meetings. Root's report indicates honey prices and commission men were problems at that time, too.

1913

The 1913 meeting was held in Rochester on December 2 and 3. There was considerable discussion about granulated honey and the way in which it should be sold. Several suggested that solid honey be cut and sold like cheese. E. R. Root, of Ohio, stated that one could not cut granulated honey with a knife but that, like tallow and soap, it was easily cut with a taut wire.

Standards for golden queens were demanded by one beekeeper. The convention agreed that the workers from golden strains should be yellow all over except for the extreme tip of the body. In addition to the regular convention it was voted to hold a special meeting of the association in conjunction with Farmers' week at Cornell in February, 1914.

1915

At the 1915 meeting, publicity for honey was promoted. The association appointed a publicity committee which was to offer prizes of \$25, \$15 and several \$5 for snappy, comical, or captivating sketches on the subject of honey which might be used on postal cards. Mr. F. Greiner of Naples was in charge of the committee.

1921

In January of this year the American Bee Journal published a Directory of Beekeeping Officials in all the states and much information is given about New York State.

Beekeeping was taught in three state schools: The State School of Applied Agriculture on Long Island at Farmingdale; The Schoharie School of Agriculture in Cobleskill; and the School of Agriculture at Morrisville. George S. Rea was the Extension Specialist in Apiculture at Cornell but evidently no courses in beekeeping were taught at Cornell.

There were two permanent bee inspectors, Charles Stewart of Johnstown and W. D. Wright from Altamont. Another fourteen men worked during the summer of 1920.

There were twenty nine county associations in New York State at the time. In addition to the state association there was also an Adirondack Beekeepers' Association, the Eastern New York Beekeepers' Association and The Western New York Honey Producers' Association.

1922

The summer picnic of the Association was held at the home of N. L. Stevens, Venice Center with, according to the American Bee Journal, 500 beekeepers present. Mr. C. J. Baldrige outlined the objectives of the newly formed Empire State Honey Marketing Association; according to the report the Association would handle no honey in 1922 but they planned to do so the following year. Under the agreement between the beekeeper and the Association, beekeepers could maintain their local trade but were evidently required to deliver the rest of their honey to the Association.

The meeting was well attended by well-known persons in the beekeeping world including: Dr. E. F. Phillips (not then on the staff at Cornell), George S. Demuth, Associate Editor of Gleanings, E. W. Atkins of the G. B. Lewis Company, R. B. Willson, successor to George Rea as extension man at Cornell, and New York State Beekeepers, George B. Howe, D. L. Woodward and S. R. House.

1931

The summer meeting of the Association was held at Governor and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt's home in Hyde Park. According to the announcement in the American Bee Journal, it was Mrs. Roosevelt who was the beekeeper. Among the speakers were Dr. Phillips, A. C. Gould, B. A. Slocum and Dr. G. A. Rousch, the latter a well-known German researcher killed in the Second World War.

1940

Programs for most of the meetings of the Association since 1940 are in our files at Cornell; it is interesting that Dr. Phillips, while he collected all the literature he could find on bees and beekeeping, failed to make a collection of programs from the state meetings.

The Second World War had a strong effect on meetings held during that time. Discussions pertaining to the Federal war regulations, as they pertained to beekeeping, took place at nearly each meeting. At least once, perhaps twice, the summer picnic was cancelled because of war, but winter meetings continued.

1942

C. W. Sadd who later purchased Honey-Butter Products Inc. of Ithaca, spoke as a representative of the Cooperative G. L. F. in 1942. The program also included an agricultural economist from Cornell. A round table discussion entitled, *Maximum Colony Honey Production as a War Measure*, was participated in by A. C. Gould, Roy French, Leroy C. Keet, W. E.

Lyman, George Rasmussen and Ray Wilcox. Dr. E. J. Dyce led a round table discussion entitled, *Central Honey House Equipment and Management as a War Measure*, that same year.

1946

Professor E. F. Phillips was honored upon his retirement “for his outstanding service to the beekeeping industry” at the meeting in December, 1946. Out-of-state speakers that year included Hubert H. Root, President of the A. I. Root Co., Professor E. J. Anderson of Pennsylvania State College, James I. Hambleton, Senior Apiculturist with the USDA, Harold J. Clay, Special Commodities Branch, Production and Marketing Division of the UDSA (Clay spoke on current government regulations), George H. Rea, then Traveling Secretary for the National Federation of Beekeepers’ Associations, Professor W. E. Dunham from Ohio, Newman I. Lyle, Vice-President, Sioux Honey Association, and E. G. Carr and Paul Holcombe both from New Jersey. Dr. Phillips spoke about sulfa drugs for disease control, no doubt thoroughly condemning the idea.

1950

Howard Myers of Ransomville was toast master at the meeting in November, 1950. To the best of my knowledge he has held that post to the present time, and perhaps, a few years prior to 1950.

1951

Marketing proved to be a post-war problem. R. B. Willson of R. B. Willson Inc., New York City, and Burel Lane, representing the Fingerlakes Honey Producers’ Cooperative in Groton, both discussed the marketing question, while E. A. Hogarth from Tara, Ontario talked about what beekeepers in Canada were doing to promote honey. Marvin Webster from the USDA Production and Marketing Administration led a round table on the same subject; he discussed also the current government honey program. Professor Frank R. Shaw lectured on honey labels, how they might be improved, and the importance of proper color combinations. Charles Mraz, from Middlebury, Vermont addressed the same convention on methods of keeping production costs low.

1952

At the 1952 meeting, the New York State Bureau of Business Promotion of the State Department of Commerce initiated a honey promotion program in cooperation with the Association. The campaign lasted from June 1, 1953 to March 1, 1954, a period of nine months. This new venture initiated two new practices by the Association, that of electing a beekeeper of the year (see Appendix F) and a honey queen. The first innovation has lasted down to the present time with a new beekeeper of the year being selected each year. The choice of a honey queen was enthusiastically undertaken for several years but was finally dropped a few years ago. However a honey queen was elected again in 1967. Both actions gave the Association an opportunity for honey promotion and publicity not heretofore available.

Harold Andrew, then Manager of the Fingerlakes Honey Producers’ Association was chairman of the committee.

In a committee report the following accomplishments were listed: recipe information was sent to all radio and television stations in the state; 76 radio stations in the state received two additional releases; a general release was sent to 1,056 newspapers in the state; both AP and UP used special wire stories on the honey queen and beekeeper of the year; photographs of both the beekeeper of the year and the honey queen were sent to all daily newspapers which had photo engraving plants; Governor Thomas E. Dewey proclaimed New York State Honey Week (see Appendix E); special recipe material was sent to all radio, television and newspaper food editors; and New York State honey was included in a packet of foods from every state in the Union on the then new, Royal Dutch Airlines.

Obviously the program met with considerable support from state beekeepers; however, it was not continued in all aspects.

1954

Dr. Phillips has discussed the problems which might arise as a result of the discovery of DDT when he spoke at the January, 1946 meeting. The question became more important as the New York State Conservation Department undertook more extensive pesticide applications in the early 1950's. Several beekeepers spoke about their problems at the April 1954 meeting and the Conservation Department sent its representative, C. J. Yops, to outline their program for the forthcoming year.

Honey promotion methods were also very much in the minds of beekeepers that year. Harriet Grace of the American Honey Institute spoke to the Association, as did a food editor from an Albany paper, and a representative of the New York State Department of Commerce.

At the December, 1954 meeting, royal jelly was just gaining prominence as another hive product; R. B. Willson spoke about the latest developments. Raymond Bentley of Ithaca gave a talk on methods of producing royal jelly in greater quantity.

1956

The Miller Bill, a recently passed piece of Federal legislation, which was one of the first attempts to control the use of pesticides in the country, was discussed by Professor E. J. Dyce. At the time it was hoped that the bill might encourage greater use of insect control methods other than the use of pesticides.

1957

Donald F. Green Jr, showed a film on the operations at the Chazy Orchards, Chazy, New York. This orchard, the largest planting of McIntosh apples in the world, is of special interest because of the pollination problems which arose there in the early years. Solid blocks of McIntosh had been planted in the beginning but it was soon learned that bees and pollination were needed. Under current management, the operation includes several hundred colonies of bees operated by Chazy Orchards.

1958

In this year a special attempt was made to invite beginners and hobbyists to a special Saturday afternoon session following the regular meeting. Harold Merrell of Wolcott and Everett Clark of New Hartford led the discussion. Few hobbyists attended the session but it is interesting to note that the commercial beekeepers stayed to hear the discussions on the fundamental principals of beekeeping.

1959

The insecticide Sevin, a product of the Union Carbide Corporation, was just being introduced on a large scale in this year. Preliminary tests has shown this was a hazardous material insofar as honey bees were concerned but experience in the next few years showed that the predictions in 1959, if anything, underestimated the impact this material would have on the industry. It was not until a few years later that the State began to compensate beekeepers for losses sustained because of the use of this material in the control of gypsy moth, especially in eastern New York State. Almost every year since 1959 this chemical has been discussed in talks before the Association.

1961

Propionic anhydride was introduced in this year and at this time and during the next few years the industry was to make an attempt to discontinue the use of carbolic acid for removing supers of honey. Benzaldehyde, a better repellent, was not to be discovered until a year later and the use of propionic anhydride was short-lived insofar as most beekeepers were concerned.

1963

Income tax laws as they related to beekeepers were discussed by an Agricultural Economist at this meeting. Following this talk, Harold Merrell led a round table discussion on the subject. The Assistant Commissioner of Agriculture, Daniel M. Dalrymple, also attended the

meeting speaking on the Department's role in the industry. William Sumnick led a discussion on methods of removing bees from honey supers. The subject was quite lively with several opinions expressed on the new materials which were being used.

1965

In 1941 there had been a joint meeting of several organizations in Niagara Falls, New York and Niagara Falls, Canada. In this year, 1965, the Empire State Honey Producer's Association and the Ontario Beekeepers' Association held a joint meeting in the Sheraton-Brock Hotel on the Canadian side, at Niagara Falls. The idea of a joint meeting arose from the fact the Dr. E. J. Dyce, Professor of Apiculture at Cornell and former Professor and Head of the Department of Apiculture at Guelph, was about to retire. Since he had spent his career in New York and Ontario, it was appropriate that beekeepers from the state and province should honor him for his long and faithful service to the industry. This was done in the ballroom of the hotel with several speakers and F. R. Armstrong of Canada as the Master of Ceremonies.

The meeting also provided an opportunity for beekeepers from the two areas to compare the events of the day in their respective territories. The apiary inspectors from the two areas, P. W. Burke from Ontario and Burel Lane from New York, gave their reports, one after the other. Research on both sides of the line was likewise discussed. Victor Mesley of Canada spoke about the Canadian Beekeepers' Council while S. E. McGregor spoke about the research and problems in the United States.

Table 2. Officers, Dates & Locations of Meetings - Empire State Honey Producers' Association

<u>Date</u>	<u>Meeting No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>President</u>	<u>Vice-President</u>	<u>Secretary/ Treasurer</u>
Sept. 27-28, 1870	1	State Fair, Utica	Moses Quinby, St. Johnsville		H.A. King
Mar. 15-16, 1871	2	Agricultural rooms, Albany	M. Quinby		
Feb. 5-6, 1873	3	Butterfield House, Utica	M. Quinby	C.C. Van Deusen Sprout Brooke	J.H. Nellis, Canajoharie J.E. Hetherington, Cherry Valley
Feb. 4-5, 1874	4	Utica	M. Quinby	R. Bacon, Verona	J.H. Nellis J.E. Hetherington
Feb. 3-4, 1875	5	Butterfield House, Utica	M. Quinby	S. Alexander, Camden	J.H. Nellis J.E. Hetherington
Feb. 2-3, 1876	6	Stanwix Hall, Rome	J.E. Hetherington, Cherry Valley		J.H. Nellis
Feb. 7-9, 1877	7	Temperance Hotel, Syracuse	R. Bacon, Verona	J.L. Scofield, Chenango Bridge	J.H. Nellis L.C. Root,
Feb. 6-8, 1878	8	City Hall, Syracuse	P.H. Ellwood, Starkville	G.M. Doolittle, Borodino	J.H. Nellis R. Bacon, Verona
Mar. 11-13, 1879	9	City Hall, Syracuse	L.C. Root, Mohawk	G.M. Doolittle	J.H. Nellis R. Bacon
Feb. 11-13, 1880	10	City Hall, Utica	L.C. Root	W.E. Clark, Oneida Co.	G.W. House, Fayetteville R. Bacon
Feb. 2-4, 1881	11	City Hall, Utica	L.C. Root	W.E. Clark	G.W. House R. Bacon

Jan. 25-27, 1882	12	City Hall, Utica	A.H. Marks, Baldwinsville	G.M. Doolittle	G.W. House R. Bacon
Jan. 9-11, 1883	13	City Hall, Syracuse	W.E. Clark, Oriskany	L.E. St. John, Greene	G.W. House R. Bacon
There is no record of the 14 th annual meeting in the early days. All other meetings were numbered. It might be assumed that the Association made the correction to account for a meeting held in 1886.					
Jan. 22-24, 1884	15	City Hall, Syracuse	W.E. Clark	C.G. Dickenson, South Oxford	G.W. House R. Bacon
Jan. 21-23, 1885	16	City Hall, Syracuse	L.C. Root, Mohawk	C.G. Dickenson	G.W. House R. Bacon
Feb. 16-18, 1886	17	Circuit Court, Rochester	L.C. Root	C.G. Dickenson	Frank C. Benedict, Perry Center
Jan. 11-13, 1887	18	Agricultural Hall, Albany	W.E. Clark	C.G. Dickenson	G.H. Knickerbocker, Pine Plains L.L. Scofield, Chenango Bridge
Jan. 17-19, 1888	19	Bagg's Hotel, Utica	W.E. Clark	Ira Barber, De Kalb Junction	G.H. Knickerbocker I.L. Scofield
Dec. 11-13, 1889	20	City Hall, Syracuse	W.E. Clark	P.H. Ellwood, Starkville	G.H. Knickerbocker I.L. Scofield
Feb. 2-7, 1890	21	Supreme Court Room, Rochester	P.H. Ellwood, Starkville	I.L. Scofield, Chenango Bridge	G.H. Knickerbocker G.H. Knickerbocker
Jan. 22-24, 1891	22	Agricultural Hall, Albany	P.H. Ellwood	I.L. Scofield	G.H. Knickerbocker Thomas Pierce, Pro Tem, Gansevort
Dec. 8-11, 1891	23	Agricultural Hall, Albany	P.H. Ellwood	I.L. Scofield	G.H. Knickerbocker Thomas Pierce
1892	24				
1893	25				
1894	26				
1895	27				
1896	28				
Aug. 24-26, 1897		United States Beekeepers' Union - Buffalo			
Mar. 16, 1898	29	Geneva	W.F. Marks, Chapinville	F.S. Emens, Fayette	Harry S. Howe, West Groton
Jan. 11, 1899	30	Kirkwood Hotel, Geneva	W.F. Marks	F.S. Emens	Harry S. Howe, Ithaca
Jan. 10, 1900	31	Kirkwood Hotel, Geneva	W.F. Marks	F.S. Emens	C.B. Howard, Romulus
Jan. 9, 1901	32	Kirkwood Hotel, Geneva	W.F. Marks	N.L. Stevens	C.B. Howard
Feb. 5, 1902	33	Kirkwood Hotel, Geneva	W.F. Marks		C.B. Howard

Mar. 10, 1903	34	City Hall, Syracuse	W.F. Marks		C.B. Howard
Jan. 15, 1904	35	City Hall, Syracuse	W.F. Marks		C.B. Howard
Jan. 18, 1905	36	City Hall, Watertown	W.F. Marks		C.B. Howard
Dec. 18-19, 1905	37	Geneva	W.F. Marks		C.B. Howard
Dec. 18, 1906	38	Geneva	W.F. Marks, Clifton Springs		C.B. Howard
Dec. 18-19, 1907	39	Amsterdam	W.F. Marks	Charles Stewart	C.B. Howard
1908	40	Gouverneur			
1909	41				
Dec. 12-13, 1910	42	Geneva	Charles Stewart, Johnstown		
Jan. 30-31, 1912	43	Syracuse			Irving Kenyon, Camillus
Dec. 17-19, 1912	44	Rochester			
Dec. 2-3, 1913	45	Rochester	George B. Howe		Irving Kenyon
Dec. 1-2, 1914	46	Syracuse	George B. Howe	John T. Green	Irving Kenyon
Dec. 7-8, 1915	47	Court House, Syracuse			Irving Kenyon
Dec. 5-6, 1916	48	Canandaigua	C.B. Howard, Geneva	S.D. House	F. Greiner, Naples
Dec. 4-5, 1917	49	Syracuse	S.S. Stabler, Salisbury		F. Greiner
Dec. 3-4, 1918	50	Hotel Statler, Buffalo			F. Greiner
Feb. 4-5, 1920	51	Joseph Slocum College of Agr., Syracuse	O.L. Hershisier, Kenmore		J.H. Cunningham, Syracuse
Dec. 1-3, 1920	52	Syracuse			J.H. Cunningham
1921	53				J.H. Cunningham
Dec. 12-14, 1922	54	Joseph Slocum College of Agr., Syracuse	George B. Howe, Sackets Harbor		O.W. Bedell, Earlville
Dec. 5-6, 1923	55	Syracuse	George B. Howe	Leon E. Hall, Tribes Hill	R.B. Willson, Ithaca
Dec. 2-3, 1924	56	Joseph Slocum College of Agr., Syracuse	H.E. Gray, Fort Edward	S.D. House, Camillus	L.E. Hall, Tribes Hill

Dec. 8-10, 1925	57	Joseph Slocum College of Agr., Syracuse	H.E. Gray	C.S. Rowe, Kingston	L.E. Hall
Dec. 14-16, 1926	58	Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse	H.E. Gray	C.S. Rowe	F.M. Babcock, Fredonia
Dec. 6-8, 1927	59	YWCA and Court House, Syracuse	A. Gordon Dye, Rochester	C.S. Rowe	F.M. Babcock
Dec. 6-8, 1928	60	Syracuse			F.M. Babcock
Dec. 10-11, 1929	61	YWCA, Syracuse			B.A. Slocum, Ithaca
1930	62		Howard Myers, Ransomville	B.B. Coggshall, Groton	E.T. Cary, Syracuse
1931	63				E.T. Cary
Jan. 20-21, 1933	64	Mizpah Hotel, Syracuse			E.T. Cary
Jan. 20-21, 1934	65	Mizpah Hotel, Syracuse			E.T. Cary
Dec. 7-8, 1934	66	Mizpah Hotel, Syracuse	B.B. Coggshall, Groton		E.T. Cary
Dec. 12-13, 1935	67	Mizpah Hotel, Syracuse	Leroy C. Keet, Watertown		E.T. Cary
Dec. 4-5, 1936	68	Onondaga Hotel, Syracuse	Leroy C. Keet		E.T. Cary
Dec. 3-4, 1937	69	Hotel Ten Eyck, Albany	E.F. Phillips, Ithaca	Fred Lesser	E.T. Cary
Feb. 14-16, 1939	70	Comstock Hall, Cornell Univ., Ithaca			E.T. Cary
Feb. 12-14, 1940	71	Comstock Hall, Cornell Univ., Ithaca	W.L. Coggshall, Ithaca		E.T. Cary
Dec. 6-7, 1940	72	Comstock Hall, Cornell Univ., Ithaca	George H. Rea, Ithaca	Burel Lane, Trumansburg	E.T. Cary
Nov. 11-14, 1941	73	Hotel Niagara, Niagara Falls	George H. Rea	Burel Lane	E.T. Cary
Dec. 10-11, 1942	74	Onondaga Hotel, Syracuse	Burel Lane, Trumansburg		E.T. Cary
Dec. 3-4, 1943	75	Onondaga Hotel, Syracuse			E.T. Cary
Dec. 8-9, 1944	76	Onondaga Hotel, Syracuse	George Rasmussen, Chazy		E.T. Cary
Jan. 25-26, 1946	77	Onondaga Hotel, Syracuse	John Rulison, Amsterdam		E.T. Cary

Dec. 6-7, 1946	78	Onondaga Hotel, Syracuse	John Rulison		E.T. Cary
Dec. 5-6, 1947	79	Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse	Harold Merrell, Wolcott		E.T. Cary
Dec. 3-4, 1948	80	Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse	Howard J. Norton Limerick		E.T. Cary
Nov. 10-12, 1949	81	Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse	Howard J. Norton		E.T. Cary
Nov. 24-25, 1950	82	Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse	George Norris, Stafford		E.T. Cary
1951	83	Bibbons Hall, Ithaca	G. Walthousen Schenectady	George Stone, Niagara Falls	Mary R. Cary, Syracuse
Mar. 20-21, 1953	84	Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse	G. Walthousen	George Stone	Mary R. Cary
Apr. 2-3, 1954	85	Hotel Ten Eyck, Albany	George Stone, Niagara Falls	Earl Westfall, Howes Cave	Mary R. Cary
Dec. 3-4, 1954	86	Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse	Earl Westfall, Howes Cave	C.C. Newton, Denmark	Mary R. Cary
Dec. 9-10, 1955	87	Van Curler Hotel, Schenectady	Clair Newton, Watertown	Harold Merrell, Wolcott	Mary R. Cary
Dec. 7-8, 1956	88	Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse	Harold Merrell, Wolcott	F.A. Babcock, Fredonia	Mary Cary Trippe
Dec. 6-7, 1957	89	Onondaga Hotel, Syracuse	F.A. Babcock, Fredonia	Howard Webb, Port Crane	Mary Cary Trippe
Dec. 5-6, 1958	90	Onondaga Hotel, Syracuse	Howard Webb, Port Crane	Everett Clark, New Hartford	Mary Cary Trippe
Dec. 4-5, 1959	91	Onondaga Hotel, Syracuse	Everett Clark, New Hartford	Harry Gable, Romulus	Mary Cary Trippe
Dec. 2-3, 1960	92	Onondaga Hotel, Syracuse	Everett Clark	Harry Gable	Mary Cary Trippe
Dec. 15-16 1961	93	Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse	Harry Gable, Romulus	R. Churchill, Watertown	Mary Cary Trippe
Dec. 14-15, 1962	94	Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse	Harry Gable	R. Churchill	Mary Cary Trippe
Dec. 13-14, 1963	95	Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse	Norman Sharp, Fishers	R. Churchill	Mary Cary Trippe
Dec. 11-12, 1964	96	Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse	Norman Sharp	R. Churchill	Paul Byers, Baldwinsville
Dec. 7-8, 1965	97	Sheraton-Brock Motel, Niagara Falls, Ontario	R. Churchill, Watertown	W.E. Sumnick, Gardiner	Paul Byers
Dec. 9-10, 1966	98	Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse	R. Churchill	W.E. Sumnick	Paul Byers
Jan., 1968	99	Niagara Falls	R. Churchill	W.E. Sumnick	Paul Byers

Summer Picnics

Everyone enjoys a picnic and beekeepers are no exception. Summer picnics, even though they are attended by wives and children, usually attract more beekeepers than do winter meetings. The summer meetings have been held in state parks and at beekeeper's homes and apiaries. History records, and my own experience agrees, that beekeepers prefer to meet at or near apiaries or honey houses, for the best attendance takes place under these circumstances. Perhaps this is a point to be kept in mind by future officers.

Records concerning summer meetings are not common. For the most part, these notes were made from entries in the bee journals and meeting notices. It is obvious that not all secretaries sent meeting notices to the journals, for, for many years we have no records of what took place, or where. The first summer picnic, for which I was able to find a record, took place at the home apiary of S. D. House of Camillus, in 1917. No doubt there were earlier summer meetings; someday information concerning them may come to light.

Table 3. Record of Summer Picnics - Empire State Honey Producers' Association

<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Host or Park</u>
Aug. 3, 1917	Camillus	Apiary of S.D. House
Aug. 2, 1918	Hayt Corners	Summer home of C.B. Howard
Aug. 1, 1919	Newark	Farm apiary of Dero Taylor
Aug. 6, 1920	Groton	Home apiary of Archie Coggshall
Aug. 5, 1921	Delanson	Alexander's Apiary
Aug. 4, 1922	Venice Center	Apiary of N.L. Stevens
Aug. 3, 1923	Mottville	Apiary of J.F. Miller
Aug. 7, 1925	Theresa	Apiary of A.A. French
Aug. 6, 1926	Colden	Home apiary of Emil W. Gutekunst
Aug. 5, 1927	Prattsville	Apiary of J.B. Merwin
Aug. 20, 1928	Trumansburg	Lane's home and apiary
Aug. 2, 1929	Ransomville	Apiary of Adams and Myers
Aug. 8, 1930	Fort Plain	Home of L.J. Elwood
Aug. 15, 1931	Hyde Park	Estate of Governor Franklin D. Roosevelt
Aug. 11, 1934	Berne	White Sulfur Springs House
Aug. 10, 1935	Seneca Falls	Cayuga State Park
Aug. 15, 1936	Chaumont Bay	Long Point State Park
Aug. 14, 1937	Venice Center	Apiary of N.L. Stevens
Aug. 13, 1938	Chazy	Chazy Orchards
Aug. 12, 1939	Sodus	Sodus Fruit Farm
Aug. 17, 1940	Ransomville	Apiary of Adams and Myers
Aug. 16, 1941	Trumansburg	Taughannock State Park
Aug. 15, 1942	Syracuse	Elmwood State Park
1943, 1944	Summer meeting cancelled because of war	
Aug. 11, 1945	Syracuse	Elmwood State Park
Aug. 10, 1946	Trumansburg	Taughannock State Park
Aug. 9, 1947	Syracuse	Elmwood State Park
Aug. 14, 1948	Cape Vincent	Cedar Point State Park
Aug. 13, 1949	Schenectady	Apiary of George Walthousen
Aug. 12, 1950	Trumansburg	Taughannock State Park
Aug. 16, 1952	Schenectady	Apiary of George Walthousen

Aug. 14, 1953	Rochester	Genesee Valley State Park
Aug. 14, 1954	Schenectady	Apiary of George Walthousen
Aug. 13, 1955	Auburn	Emerson Park
Aug. 11, 1956	Auburn	Emerson Park
Aug. 10, 1957	Schenectady	Apiary of George Walthousen
Aug. 16, 1958	Burrville	Burrville Fire Barn
Aug. 6-8, 1959	Ithaca	Joint meeting with the Eastern Apicultural Society
Aug. 20, 1960	Hunter	Home & Apiary of M.P. Traphagen
Aug. 11, 1962	Auburn	Emerson Foundation Park
Aug. 10, 1963	Canandaigua	Roseland Park
Aug. 2, 1964	Niagara Falls	Whirlpool State Park
1965	Schenectady	Apiary of George Walthousen
1966	Ithaca	Enfield State Park
July 29, 1967	Schenectady	Apiary of George Walthousen

APPENDIX A

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS of the New York State Bee-Keepers' Association

Founded by M. Quinby in 1868

CONSTITUTION

Adopted March 10, 1870

ARTICLE 1. This Association shall be known as the New York State Bee-Keepers' Association founded by Moses Quinby in 1868.

ARTICLE 2. Each county or district convention hereafter held in any part of the State shall be entitled to three delegates to the State society.

ARTICLE 3. The object of this Association shall be the promotion of scientific bee-culture, by forming a strong bond of union among bee-keepers, and to this end, the time during the sessions of the Association shall not be consumed in exhibiting but, laying aside all conflicting interests, all subjects for discussion shall be brought before the convention at the proper time, by the business committee, their decision, however, being subject to the usual appeal to the Association.

ARTICLE 4. The officers of this Association shall consist of a President, Vice-President, Secretary and Treasurer, who shall constitute the Executive Committee, and whose duties shall be those usually assigned to such officers, and their term of office shall be one year, or until their successors shall be elected. An honorary Vice-President shall be appointed from each county in the State.

ARTICLE 5. By signing this constitution and paying the Treasurer the sum of one-half dollar annually, any gentleman may become a member of the Association, also that names once enrolled be retained unless they shall refuse or neglect after due notice to pay their assessment.

ARTICLE 6. Ladies interested in bee-culture may become members by signing the constitution.

ARTICLE 7. The regular meetings of this Association shall be held alternately at Rochester, Albany, Utica, and Syracuse, but shall be held no two years in succession at the same place.

ARTICLE 8. Special meetings may be called by the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE 9. The officers of the Association shall constitute a committee to select subjects for discussion and appoint members to deliver addresses and read essays, and the same shall be published with the call for the next annual meeting.

ARTICLE 10. This constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote at any regular meeting.

BY-LAWS

Adopted March 14, 1872

ARTICLE 1. The officers of this Association shall be elected by ballot.

ARTICLE 2. It shall be the duty of the President to call and preserve order in all meetings of the Association; to call for all reports of officers and standing committees; to put to vote all motions regularly seconded; to decide upon all questions of order, according with parliamentary usage; to count the votes at all elections; to supply all vacancies in office; and at the expiration of his office, to deliver an address before the Association.

ARTICLE 3. It shall be the duty of the Vice-President, in the absence of the President, to perform the duties of that office.

ARTICLE 4. It shall be the duty of the Secretary to call the names of all the acting members of the Association at the opening of each regular meeting, and to mark all delinquents; to report all proceedings of the Association and record the same, when approved, in the Secretary's book of the Association; to conduct all correspondence of the Association, and to file and preserve all papers belonging to the same; to take and record the name and address of every person who becomes a member of the Association, and transfer the moneys received for initiation to the Treasurer, after taking his receipt for the same; to make out and publish annually, as far as practicable, a statistical table showing the number of stocks owned, the kind of hive used, the amount of honey and wax produced, together with what other information may be deemed beneficial, of each member of the Association; and to give notice of all regular meetings of the Association in the Agricultural and Bee-Journals, which are available in the district covered by this Association, at least four weeks before the time of the meeting.

ARTICLE 5. It shall be the duty of the Treasurer to receive from the Secretary the funds of the Association, and give his receipt for the same; to pay them out upon the order of the executive committee, and to render a written report of all receipts and expenditures of the Association at each regular meeting.

ARTICLE 6. The Secretary shall receive \$10.00 each year for his services, and shall have power to choose an assistant Secretary if he wishes.

ARTICLE 7. The Association shall be governed in the main by the following order of business:

- Called to order.
- Calling the Roll.
- Secretary's report.
- Treasurer's report.
- Report of standing committees.
- President's address.
- Receiving of members.
- Election of Officers.
- Miscellaneous business.
- Discussion.
- Adjournment.

ARTICLE 8. The Executive Committee of this Association shall cause the constitution and by-laws to be printed in appropriate form, and every person joining the Association shall be entitled to a copy of the same.

ARTICLE 9. These by-laws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of all members present at any regular meeting of the Association.

APPENDIX B

COPY OF RESOLUTIONS - 1904

Resolutions of thanks were passed to those who had taken part in the program, and to those who had come from a distance. Also the following:

Whereas, We believe the exhibition of the working apiary, in connection with exhibits of the product of apiculture at our last New York State Fair, was beneficial, and of great value in instructing and educating the public in methods of securing pure honey; therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the New York State Bee-Keepers' Association, in convention assembled at Syracuse, Jan. 15, 1904, that the exhibition of such a working apiary at the annual State Fair be continued; and we hereby ask the New York State Fair Committee to make proper and adequate provisions for such exhibition at the next and following State Fairs; and

Resolved, That the secretary of this Association be and is hereby directed to forward a copy of these resolutions to the secretary of the State Fair Committee.

Whereas, The Secretary of Agriculture, in his last report to the President, strongly urged the transformation and development of the Division of Entomology of the United States Department of Agriculture into a bureau; and

Whereas, It is the sense of the bee-keepers, of whom there are over 700,000 in the United States, that the apicultural industry does not and never has received recognition from the general government; therefore;

Resolved, That the New York State Association of Bee-Keepers' Societies in convention assembled, most heartily approves of the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, that the Division of Entomology be transformed into a bureau, and that we respectfully, but earnestly, request the representatives of the State of New York in Congress to support and use their best endeavors to secure the desired change.

Resolved, That the secretary of this Association be and hereby is directed to forward copies of these resolutions to the Representatives of the State of New York in Congress, and to the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the State and House.

H. S. Ferry,
Orel Hershisser,
Geo. B. Howe

APPENDIX C

MOSES QUINBY

Part I--Early Life

E. F. Phillips

Every well-informed beekeeper in New York State has heard of Moses Quinby and knows that he was a pioneer in honey production. Information of that sort is about all that I had about this interesting man up to about three years ago. I knew that he had made one of the first honey extractors on this continent, that he had invented a smoker for subduing bees, and that he

devised the first practical knife for removing cappings from honey combs to prepare for extracting the honey. I had located this extractor and brought it to Ithaca, and I had his own personal smoker and the uncapping knife that he had used. But when it came to information about the kind of man Moses Quinby was, I remained as ignorant as any other beeman. Quinby did a lot of writing, but in all that I had read I was unable to detect any place in which he revealed anything about himself.

A couple of years ago Wilbur Cross, then custodian of the regional history collection at Cornell, called me on the phone to ask if I had ever heard of Moses Quinby. I reported having his extractor, uncapping knife and smoker, and since that indicated that I had heard of the man, Cross told me to hang up and that he would come right up to my office. On arrival he handed me a crayon portrait of Quinby, and I told him where he had obtained it, since there was only one in existence. Having hit the jackpot with the portrait, Cross handed me a small book and asked if I knew where that came from. It was a small diary of Quinby and a real find.

The diary was the record of a trip taken by this Greene County boy at the age of 21 years, when he went from his home in Greene County all the way to central Ohio, by river boat to Albany, by railroad to Schenectady, by Erie canal boat to Buffalo, by lake boat to Cleveland, and again by canal boat to Massillon, Ohio. This little diary began to reveal the man, and it led me to undertake some real searching for further information about him.

It is useless to go into minute details here, but before I finished I had located a lot of old family letters written by his mother, by his wife and some by Moses Quinby himself. I had records of a social community of which he was a part, and finally I visited the spots where he had lived, located the home sites, and learned locally much about him and about conditions in those areas when he lived in them. It all adds up to a story of early life in New York State that is of interest to beekeepers, and might be of interest to others.

Moses Quinby was born of Quaker parents in Westchester County, NY, in 1810. His grandfather, also named Moses, migrated to Green County in 1820 and bought a farm, and a few years later his father William also went there with his family of small children. Moses was then twelve years old, and it is not stretching the imagination to suggest the thrill to this boy as they drove over the crude woodland roads toward their new home. From the port town of Coxsackie they went west to the village of Swill Street, where they turned northward to the Pazzi Lampman saw mill, in a valley stilled called Honey Hollow. You will not be able to find Swill Street on any map, and perhaps the village was never so officially designated, but later it became Jacksonville and is now Urlton. It was once called Swill Street because of a local distillery, and we may imagine that careless operation resulted in odors that inspired the local name.

When Moses was sixteen, Samuel Underhill and two brothers came to the community and proposed the formation of a communist colony. This was of course not at all like present-day communism but was the sort of thing then rather common in this country, a plan under which people of limited means tried to improve their economic lot by combining forces. They formed the Forestville Commonwealth in May, 1826, and the tract of land occupied by the community included the William Quinby farm. Father William was not a member of the Commonwealth but his son John was. The community lasted until October, 1827, at which time three members acting as trustees for the Community sold their land, one of the purchasers being John Quinby and another John Norbury, the future father-in-law of Moses Quinby. A year and a half may seem a short time for the existence of such a community, but it was actually longer than most of them lasted.

Another member of the Commonwealth was Henry C. Fosdick, a former member of the Haverstraw community and later a founder of a community at Kendell, Ohio. Henry married Tamar Quinby, a sister of William and aunt of Moses. This brings us back to the diary.

When Moses was just of age, he took the trip mentioned earlier. The destination was Kendall, now included within the city limits of Massillon, Ohio, where Henry and Fosdick were

living, so the trip was to visit his aunt and uncle. He reports many details of the journey, and whenever there is evidence of conditions at that time from other sources, the accuracy of Moses' descriptions is revealing. He tells of the salt evaporators at Syracuse, the aqueduct over the Genesee River at Rochester, the elaborate locks at Lockport and other things which can be obtained from records of the times. The thing of present interest to us is the enthusiasm of the young man on his first trip from home, with eyes and ears open, and probably with his mouth closed, for he was never talkative.

MOSES QUINBY

Part II--Later Life

A year after his return from the journey to the then far West, Moses married Martha Norbury, a neighbor girl, and they set up housekeeping in the Quinby homestead. Here Moses increased his holdings of bees, developed apiaries all about the countryside and became the largest beekeeper in a region in which almost every farmer then had some bees. The area declined in importance for bees, because of a serious regression of the soil, so in 1853, Moses and Martha with their two children, Elizabeth and John, migrated to Montgomery County, to a vastly better beekeeping region. Here Moses stayed until he died in 1875, survived many years by Martha who did not die until over ninety years of age.

Enough for a hasty sketch of the life and work of Moses Quinby, but at this point the fun began. Going to Greene County to hunt out local details, it was possible to identify the location of his saw and turning mill, of his house, long since burned down, of the childhood home of Martha Norbury and the boundaries of the Forestville Commonwealth. But the best find of all was the building called the South House of the Commonwealth. After digging into records for a few days, the accuracy of the whole story seemed to rest on locating the South House. Maps revealed nothing and inquiries from supposedly well-informed local people brought the information that no building existed or had ever existed at the place that seemed the right location for the South House. But when I went to the spot and began searching through a dense second-growth woods, there stood the house, unmistakably the right one, from its age, its appearance, its architecture and from all the records later detected. Not only was the house standing but it was actually occupied, not by a native but by summer people from Long Island who had bought it as a camping spot and hunting lodge. I should express my thanks to Mrs. Sellers for her help, as I am sure she would express her thanks to me if she had the opportunity, for putting her on the track of the history of the old house that she had insisted on buying.

Before leaving the Swill Street area, it seems proper to mention that when first cleared this was apparently a thrifty farming area, but a hard pan formed at the base of the plow, the region ran down, and today in at least a square mile including the former Quinby and Commonwealth properties, there is no standing house and no agriculture except the cutting of hay in seasons of adequate and timely rainfall. Land that sold at \$75 an acre a century ago is rather worthless now. To see the stone fences piled up by the earlier settlers and the present worthlessness of the soil, one is not encouraged to spend time on the land. The real lesson of course is that soil is a vital thing in agriculture, and without good soil, much labor and sweat may be wasted.

The next trip in a search for Quinby material was to Montgomery County. Here I was helped by an old map in which one of the black dots was marked "M. Quinby." The difficulty was, however, that a beekeeper who was supposed to know had told me that Quinby had lived in another part of the County. It took only a few hours with the county land records to show that the map was right, so out I went to the spot. Here luck was with me, or I must live right, for almost at once I met a man who was marvelously versed in local history and who knew beyond a doubt that Quinby had lived at the base of the hill below his home. When I asked how he knew, he told me that he and his brother as young boys moved into the same house shortly after Quinby's death. The house is gone and another house now stands on the same foundations, but my

informant knew the old house so well that he could draw me a floor plan, with all the minutia of the water supply, the early refrigeration and all the other details. A chance find in the recorded deed caused me to ask about the water supply, since it was specified that half the water from the spring in the orchard was to go to the residence of Christian Klock next door. Klock was the former owner of the property, and the spring was so abundant and so valuable that he reserved half for himself when the property was sold. Later Quinby bargained away half of his share of the water to the Nellis family on the other side, in return for their removal of a barn which shut off his view of the valley.

My informant, who is a Nellis himself, took me over the property, showed me the location of the apiary, of the honey house, of the terraced vineyards and the orchards, and especially the ancient cemetery on the property, use of which was also restricted. Here the first church of the area had been built and in the church yard were buried many of the earliest settlers and some of their Indian friends. The church building is gone, but the congregation is maintained in a new structure in the town nearby.

After getting far more details about the Quinby days at St. Johnsville than there is time to relate, by chance I unearthed another line of interest. Right on the property, later owned by Moses Quinby, was fought an important but small battle of the Revolution, the Battle of Klock's Fields. On one of the invasions from Canada of troops under the military leadership of Sir William Johnson and the Indian Joseph Brant, the army entered the Mohawk Valley from the south down Schoharie Creek. They then turned westward, and meanwhile word of the invasion had reached Troy from which point Continental troops were sent to repel the invasion. Col. Van Rensselaer and his troops almost caught up with them near Fonda, but then for some mysterious reason slowed down their progress. That evening just as darkness was coming on, outpost scouts on the hill spotted the Indians under Brant in a recess in the hill where they were in ambush to await the Continental troops. There not being time to send word to the troops advancing up the valley road, they fired on the Indians and thus gave the needed warning. Now alerted, the Continental troops and the scouts from up on the hill attacked together and drove the Indians out of their hiding place. But by now it was too dark to fight, so the Continental troops withdrew to camp for the night back down the valley for a few miles. On their return the next morning, the enemy had fled and the invasion was at an end. Almost every bit of the fighting of that small but important battle was on the property that Quinby later owned. Maybe he knew about this, but if so he was not interested, for he was a Quaker and was opposed to war.

If one wishes to go further back in history, there is still a better tale on the Quinby property. Before the last glacier a side valley opened into the Mohawk Valley just where the later Quinby homestead was situated. A morainal dump shut off this valley and formed a shelf on which the church and churchyard were located. But the stream thus cut off went underground, to seek the surface in the grand spring in the orchard. This was the abundant source of the water supply for the three neighboring houses, and it furnished water for two pounds that Quinby built, one as a source of water power for his turning mill and the upper one as a fish pond. The water was piped into the house, and summer and winter a considerable stream flowed into a water trough in the kitchen. One end of this trough was enclosed in a cupboard, and the temperature of the water all year was low enough so that milk and butter could be kept in good condition by immersion in the trough. All this the Quinby family owed to the fact that thirty thousand years or so before their appearance in the Mohawk Valley, Nature had built them a spring. In the days of Moses Quinby the glaciation of the state was just beginning to be understood, and he probably never heard of anything of the sort. If he thought about it at all he probably thought the whole area had once been created just about as it was then. The record of these events is not recorded in the Court House at Fonda, but it is written in the face of earth, for all to read who understands the language.

So far, what has been said tells something of where Moses Quinby lived, but still it does not reveal what sort of man he was. Such material comes from other sources. He was a great

chess player, and night after night at St. Johnsville he went to the toll house in front of neighbor Nellis' home where he and his cronies played their favorite game. He was something of a musician, for in one letter his wife Martha says that while she writes she can scarcely think, for Moses and a friend are in the next room, playing their banjos and singing Old Dan Tucker. But another letter gives us more about his musical abilities, for again his wife records that it is a beautiful Sabbath evening, the sun is just setting and everything is calm and peaceful. Moses is in the next room and the door is shut. She can just hear him, for he is playing his flute.

He was a devout man and strict in his adherence to his faith. It was his conviction that if God permitted one to make a discovery or an invention, it was a duty to reveal everything to others and to make its use entirely free, in recompense for the ability to make the discovery. He detested patents and ardently fought the patent hive vendors of that day. When he invented the bee smoker and the uncapping knife, he did not patent them but revealed all details in his writings.

None of his descendants remain. His daughter Elizabeth married Lyman C. Root, also a noted beekeeper, and they had two daughters, neither of whom married. Son John married before studying theology and after graduation he became pastor of a church in Massachusetts which he served well over thirty years, his only pastorate. John died without children, and so the Quinby race is run.

Moses Quinby was a strict man, and a solid citizen. He had his human side and was unquestionably a fine neighbor but he was rather straight laced and perhaps not too much fun. But for entire reliability he would be hard to beat. Those who studied beekeeping under him without exception became his devoted admirers and unquestioning disciples. Those who profited by his discoveries and his writings honor him. He was benefactor to all present day beekeepers and it is a privilege in some degree to try to paint a picture of a good man to whom hundreds and thousands of fine people are indebted.

Maybe no such tale as this should close without a moral, and there is one to this story. It is, that if you have lived in an area, there is a record about you which you cannot hide. Records of real estate transactions, of wills and witnesses to wills, and even an occasional appointment of a guardian may tell much to later searchers after information. So if there is a shady spot on one's record, he should try to keep it from showing up in a court record, unless he wants some future amateur historian to spot the story. Moses Quinby had nothing to hide, and probably he would have been utterly amazed if he had been told that anybody would ever want to get information about him. He was that sort of modest man.

APPENDIX D

History of Extension Apiculture in New York

by

Dr. E. F. Phillips or George Rea

Date Unknown, About 1940

Extension work in Apiculture began in the United States on October 1, 1915, under the direction of E. F. Phillips, who was then in charge of apiculture for the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology, Washington, D.C. Mr. E. G. Carr was at that time sent to North Carolina on temporary appointment. After making a partial survey of beekeeping in the state, his appointment terminated on January 31, 1916. The first permanent appointment began in September, 1916, when George H. Rea, then State Bee Inspector in Pennsylvania, was made Special Field Agent in North Carolina.

Numerous requests from New York State beekeepers for help from the college resulted in A. R. Mann, Dean and Director of Extension, securing aid through the Federal Cooperative Extension plan.

The work began when David Running was appointed by the Bureau of Entomology as Special Field Agent with headquarters in the New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University. His appointment began on December 17, 1917, and terminated by his resignation on January 25, 1918. George H. Rea was then sent to New York beginning February 15, 1918, and continuing until he resigned on November 30, 1921, to accept a similar position in Pennsylvania. On June 16, 1922, Robert B. Willson was appointed Extension Instructor in Apiculture until July 1, 1924 when his title changed to Extension Specialist in Apiculture. He resigned July 31, 1926. On October 1, 1926, George H. Rea returned with the title of Extension Assistant Professor of Apiculture until March 31, 1928, when he resigned because of illness. B. A. Slocum was then appointed Extension Instructor in Apiculture on a part-time basis until December 31, 1931. On January 1, 1932, George H. Rea returned to the position of Extension Assistant Professor of Apiculture, which position he still holds.

At first, many visits were made to assist the beekeepers with individual problems about which they had asked and to determine beekeeping problems in general. Since sound beekeeping practice depends largely on regional differences in the time of the honey flows, early surveys were made to obtain information about the honey flows, how the beekeepers were then managing their bees, and what was being done to control bee diseases. The cooperation of the beekeepers was always sought, and from the beginning right down through the history of this work, the cooperation of the central Extension Office in the college, of the County Agents, and of 4-H Club Agents has always been used. With the occasional exception of a fact-finding trip, the work is always scheduled by the central Extension Office through the cooperation of the specialist, the agent and the beekeepers.

In the early days, two destructive bee diseases were prevalent. It was necessary to place emphasis upon the control of these diseases at once. European foulbrood was epidemic in some sections of the state and was rapidly destroying the beekeeping industry. Since the control of this disease is a matter of replacing the old hybrid bee stock with Italian stock and better wintering of bees, special emphasis was placed on this type of work. No regulatory work is necessary for the eradication of European foulbrood, and though the education of the beekeepers of the state in the past twenty years, this disease has almost disappeared.

American foulbrood is more difficult to control. Its treatment requires the total destruction of the bees and combs and disinfection of the equipment. It attacks any kind of bees and colonies. Because many beekeepers failed to control this disease, it spread rapidly to the apiaries of the other beekeepers. Because of this feature the control of American foulbrood had to depend upon both educational and regulatory work.

From the beginning, friendly relations were established and maintained with the state bee inspection forces. This has worked out beneficially to all concerned. While the educational work caused the beekeepers to realize that European foulbrood could be eradicated by better beekeeping and that American foulbrood could be controlled within the apiary, it still was necessary to have systematic inspection of all colonies and rigid enforcement of regulations to control this disease by communities.

In some counties where the ravages of American foulbrood had about destroyed the beekeeping industry, cooperation of the beekeepers with the educational and regulatory agencies has practically eradicated the disease and the beekeepers have taken on new courage and are reestablishing beekeeping.

From the first, the commercial beekeepers misunderstood the purpose of the extension work. Some of them opposed it actively, while others were obviously indifferent. While active opposition has ceased, yet the indifferent attitude and lack of cooperation are still found on the part of some. These beekeepers feared that field work would result in many new beekeepers and further depression of what they believed were already congested honey markets. In contrast to this belief, it is worth noting that there are now only about one half as many beekeepers in the

state as there were twenty years ago and a great reduction in the numbers of colonies of bees. The reduction in colonies is not in proportion to the reduction in the number of beekeepers because many beekeepers have greatly increased their colonies. There probably are about seventy-five per cent as many colonies now as there were twenty years ago, while the annual honey crop remains about the same. There never has been any propaganda to start a lot of new beekeepers as was presupposed by some. Teaching has always been on a conservative basis and conducted on carefully planned programs. Whether they know it or not, beekeepers in general have benefited by field teaching which has resulted in better beekeeping and greater returns per colony of bees.

In contrast to the general reduction of numbers of beekeepers and colonies of bees over a period of years, there was a sharp increase in beekeeping during the 1st World War. In common with all kinds of products, honey prices soared, resulting in thousands of persons going into beekeeping without adequate knowledge of its problems. The vast majority of these ill-advised projects ended disastrously when the crash came after the war. Another result of high honey prices during the war was the organization of numerous small beekeepers' associations. By 1920 there were thirty county and regional associations and one state association. The state association and six regional associations existed before the World War. Because of the lack of leadership, the great reduction in beekeeping, the sharp decline in honey prices, and the general lack of necessity for their existence, most of these associations disappeared. At present there are ten associations, including the Empire State Honey Producers' Association. These remaining associations seem to have reasons for their existence and are functioning with annual meetings and field days.

The work progressed with experience and knowledge gained while doing it. From the first, along with surveys and visits, many method demonstrations were given. Later it was found desirable to include result demonstrations and to establish demonstration apiaries where a definite program of management could be pursued. Demonstration apiaries now exist in all parts of the state and have resulted in marked improvement in beekeeping practices. Five years of data taken from these apiaries show an increase of about fifty per cent greater honey production from the demonstration colonies over the check colonies, while many of the demonstration colonies have produced more than twice that amount of honey. Field days with demonstrations, discussions, and picnicking; discussion groups; schools of one or more days; winter meetings for discussion and business; visits to apiaries and orchards where bees are used for pollination and demonstrations in the apiaries are some of the ways of doing the extension job in the field.

Eight state-wide beekeeping schools or short courses were held in the New York State School of Agriculture at Cornell University in the years 1919, 1920, 1921, 1923, 1925, 1926, 1927 and 1929. These schools met with favor on the part of the beekeepers and were well attended. The schools were discontinued because of the financial depression. The faculty of these schools was composed of persons noted in beekeeping from other states, from the United States Bureau of Entomology and Cornell University. The Short Course from February 24 to March 1, 1919, was the first of its kind in the East. It was preceded in the United States by only three similar schools in California in 1918. These early schools were conducted by E. F. Phillips, then in charge of Apiculture for the United States Bureau of Entomology, Washington, D.C., and his assistant, George S. Demuth. The success of all these schools depended largely on the careful planning of these two men and their teaching ability.

Immediately following the 1st World War, among the efforts to rehabilitate the disabled soldiers, facilities for education in agriculture were offered to them by the Federal Government. Beekeeping was offered to disabled soldiers in the State Schools of Agriculture at Cobleskill and Delhi. The Extension Specialist in Apiculture was called upon to assist and several trips were made to these schools for this purpose. During that time and later, several one- and two-day schools for beekeepers were conducted in several districts including Alfred University.

Late in the summer of 1919, beekeepers began to report that after the white honey had been harvested, weather conditions were such that the late honey flows had practically failed. Further reports and observations in September revealed the fact that the bees had not secured sufficient stores for the winter. Since syrup made from granulated sugar is the only substitute for honey as the winter food for honeybees, the beekeeping industry faced disaster from wholesale starvation of the bees before spring unless sugar feeding could be done. Because of economic conditions following the World War, the sugar supply for the nation was notoriously short and prices prohibitive. Dealers and grocers declared their inability to supply sugar for feeding bees even when the beekeepers insisted. The United States Sugar Equalization Board had control of the sugar supply and its distribution. Sugar of various grades and qualities was being doled out to consumers in small packages by the various stores and prices were several times higher than normally.

Credit for an idea which worked and saved the commercial beekeeping industry in central New York and in several other sections of the state goes to Mr. Archie L. Coggshall, a commercial beekeeper then owning several hundred colonies of bees. His suggestion was that an appeal be made directly to the United States Sugar Equalization Board, setting forth the importance of the beekeeping industry in honey production and in the still more important matter of farm crop production because of the importance of the honeybee in pollination. After the Extension Specialist had written several letters to the United States Sugar Equalization Board without results, a trip to New York for a conference with the Board was decided upon. After securing letters of authorization from the Dean of the College of Agriculture and from the New York State Food Administrator, the Extension Specialist accompanied by Mr. N. L. Stevens, who was then the most extensive beekeeper in the state, made the trip.

In the waiting room of the office of the Board in Wall Street were seated literally dozens of representatives of all kinds of interests seeking audience with the Chairman of the Board. Our credentials secured an immediate conference, to the astonishment of some in the waiting room.

From the first we met resistance to our plea, although our stories about honeybees and their economic importance were listened to patiently. It was pointed out to us that sugar was so scarce that only small quantities at high prices were being allowed to consumers. Many wholesaler dealers in the land had not secured sufficient sugar to fill orders dating back as far as the previous spring. Our attention was called to the number of persons waiting outside and seeking conferences, some of whom had been there a long time.

When it seemed that our mission had failed, we began to emphasize the point that if the bees starved, it would be a terrific blow not only to the beekeepers and the fruit growers but to agriculture in general. We told true stories of instances where the presence of honeybees and their services in pollination had resulted in crops of seed and fruit. These stories of the usefulness of honeybees finally saved the day for us. We were granted the sugar provided it could be secured from the several refining companies. At the suggestion of one of the members of the Board we visited the office of the American Sugar Refining Company where we again were granted an immediate conference. This conference proved to be almost an exact repetition of the one with the American Sugar Equalization Board. After leaving the American Sugar Refining Company office, we again visited the Equalization Board office and arranged for the distribution of the sugar through the dealers of the various sugar refining companies in the larger cities of the state.

These conferences occurred on Saturday, and in both offices we were told that it would be necessary to ship the sugar early the next week or it could not be done at all. We hurried home, and on Sunday stenographic help was secured and the good news with certain instructions was dispatched to all county agricultural agents and to many prominent beekeepers. On Monday, points of distribution where the sugar was to be received, who was to receive it, and a plan for certifying the beekeepers who were to have the sugar was telegraphed to the American Sugar Equalization Board.

The plan was to supply each county agricultural agent with blank cards to be filled in by the beekeepers and presented by them to the dealers in the presence of the county agent. On the presentation of the evidence of need of sugar for bee feeding, the dealers checked out the sugar. In all, after much hard work on the part of all who were involved, about 250,000 pounds of sugar was distributed to the beekeepers.

The first written effort in beekeeping from this college was the publication in October, 1918 of Farm Bulletin, 138, "Beginnings in Beekeeping" by W. P. Alexander. This bulletin raised a storm of protest from commercial beekeepers because of their antagonism to teaching beginners in beekeeping and the bulletin was soon discontinued. In October, 1919, a series of beekeeping lessons began as part of the Cornell Reading Course for the Farm. This series was continued until 1923 when R. B. Willson prepared a Farm Study Course in Beekeeping of thirteen lessons and ten practical exercises which is still in use.

During 1918, 1919, and early 1920, the names and addresses of hundreds of beekeepers were card-indexed. Information partly originating at Washington and partly from here was sent to this list of names on occasion under the franking privilege. The first record of service letter to beekeepers originating entirely from the college was to the beekeepers of Wyoming County on the control of European foulbrood under date of June 26, 1918. In October, 1918, a letter on wintering bees was sent to the entire state list and to the various counties for Farm Bureau News. Special articles for Farm Bureau News and letters to the list of beekeepers were sent as occasion demanded until October, 1923, when the service letter, Beekeeping News, began to be published regularly each month. This service letter still continues. During the last two years it has not been published each month but is seasonal or on occasion.

R. B. Willson began broadcasting over the radio in 1924. That year he gave six radio talks. Since that time, the radio has been used rather irregularly and yet is a recognized part of the publicity and teaching work.

The specialist is frequently called upon for talks to various civic clubs, Women's clubs, garden clubs, schools, and conventions. All of the specialists have filled such engagements but in the last six years there has been an especially large number of them.

Beekeeping for Orchard Pollination

At the beginning of the extension work, the fruit growers had a general idea that bees were beneficial to the fruit crops. Many of the fruit growers kept small numbers of colonies, while others encouraged commercial honey producers to establish apiaries in their orchards. The beekeepers found this unprofitable from the standpoint of honey production and showed little interest. While orchard areas increased, honeybees in those areas rapidly decreased because of the ravages of bee diseases, because of the fact that in intensively cultivated orchards the bees often starved from lack of nectar bearing plants, and because the bees were killed by poisonous sprays applied to the trees.

Fruit crops were often disappointing, and the fruit growers appealed to Cornell for assistance. In 1931 a cooperative project between the departments of Pomology and Entomology revealed the fact that wild insects were not present in sufficient numbers for effective pollination in many orchards and the introduction of honeybees seemed to be the solution. Not only were beneficial insects lacking but in some orchards it was necessary for the fruit growers to provide compatible varieties for cross pollination. Since keeping bees permanently in the intensive orchard areas was unsatisfactory, the demand for rented bees grew rapidly until in 1938 approximately 15,000 colonies of bees were rented by the fruit growers from commercial beekeepers. In many cases the fruit crops were doubled, while in some orchards the increase was ten times that of previous crops.

In January, 1930, bulletin 190, "Honeybees for the Orchard", by E. F. Phillips was issued. The purpose of the bulletin was to assist fruit growers and beekeepers with the problems in supplying bees for pollination purposes.

4-H or Junior Project

The first record of 4-H Club beekeeping in New York is found in 1920 when eighteen members were reported as enrolled. During the period including 1920 to 1929, several of the 4-H Club Agents enrolled as members in the project but without supervision of the specialist.

In his monthly report for June, 1930, B. A. Slocum states: "At present there are three members in this project in this (Oswego) county and two members in Livingston County. This is a new project in this state this year." From this small beginning, the 4-H Club work in beekeeping was put on an organized basis and grew until in 1938 the project was carried on in twelve counties with a membership of about sixty. Some work has been done at intervals in eight other counties. The time which the specialist may give to this work has been the limiting factor in its development. At first, attempts were made to organize beekeeping clubs but this was found to be impractical because the projects have been few and scattered in each county. The nature of beekeeping is such that few undertake it and they are usually miles apart. The specialist, with the club agent, attempts to visit each project twice each season, spring and fall, to give instructions in management.

Several one-day schools were held but with little success because of the difficulty in bringing the members together. In 1938 a two-day regional school was held at the New York State School of Agriculture at Cobleskill and a one-day regional school at the Apiculture Office in the New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University. The school at Cobleskill was poorly attended because the club agents in several counties in that area failed to bring the club members to the school. The school at Cornell was successful. All of the club agents with one exception brought the members and remained with them through the day.

A 4-H Club outline, as a guide for activities in the project and a record sheet, is provided for each member. Since a live interest in bees and a knowledge of bee behavior is necessary to success in beekeeping, the Farm Study Course in beekeeping is required in this project. Some succeed, while others fail, but on the whole those boys and girls who have learned and cared for their bees have found it profitable.

Appendix D - Addendum

By Roger A. Morse

Mr. George H. Rea continued as extension specialist in apiculture until his retirement in 1942. At that time, Dr. E. J. Dyce, then manager of the Fingerlakes Honey Producers Cooperative, was appointed to the staff at Cornell. At about that same time he was elected Field Secretary for the Empire State Honey Producers' Association, a position he held until his retirement, and a position I have held since that date.

The position of Field Secretary was created to allow the extension specialist at Cornell to assist the officers in their sundry duties. During the past two decades it has been policy to hold an annual fall meeting of the Board of Directors, at which time the program for the winter meeting is prepared. The Secretary and Field Secretary, working together, invite the guest speakers and the final copy of the program is prepared in the Office of Apiculture at Cornell. The program for the annual summer meeting is prepared by the Secretary, with Cornell providing some of the speakers and material for discussion.

When Dr. E. F. Phillips retired in 1947, Dr. Dyce assumed all responsibility for the teaching, research, and extension work at the University. Dr. W. L. Coggshall was appointed Assistant Professor of Apiculture in 1949. He undertook a small portion of the extension work and matters pertaining to the Association. Dr. Coggshall, then Associate Professor, resigned in 1957 to enter private business. I was appointed to the University staff in that same year with twenty-five per cent of my time devoted to extension duties, while seventy-five percent of Dr. Dyce's time was spent in this area.

While there are fewer than one hundred men in New York State who own more than three hundred colonies of bees, there are between ten and fifteen thousand hobby and semi-commercial beekeepers with one to many colonies. A considerable amount of time is devoted to answering letters from these people in which a great variety of questions are raised. At the present time, local bee clubs are active in several counties including Schenectady, Broome, Cortland, Suffolk, Rockland, Monroe and Orange; The Western New York Honey Producers' Association has members from two counties in that area. Essex County, where bees are rented for birdsfoot trefoil pollination, has no association but meetings are held occasionally in the county agricultural buildings there. It has been our policy to provide one, and sometimes two speakers a year, for each of these associations.

In addition, each year the college distributes copies of two bulletins, one a general information bulletin on bees and the other having to do with wintering honey bees in New York State. About thirty mimeographs on various aspects of apiculture are available to answer certain questions in greater detail.

The correspondence course in beekeeping, started by Dr. Phillips, continues to be very popular. The course is given almost no publicity but at any one time there are usually about fifty people enrolled in the twelve lesson, three practical exercise course.

The Dyce process, for making a finely granulated honey, having been discovered in the University laboratories, is of interest to a number of people around the world. Almost every week there is a request for information concerning the manufacture of this product; these requests come from producers both large and small.

The Office of Apiculture, continuing a tradition of interest in international agriculture at the college, corresponds and sends information to beekeepers on all continents. Many of the current topics and problems are discussed in articles prepared for the several bee journals, a tradition started by Dr. Phillips and continued by Dr. Dyce and myself.

APPENDIX E

State of New York

Executive Chamber

Albany

Thomas E. Dewey
Governor

STATEMENT

The more than 10,000 beekeepers of New York State represent a little known but very important part of the agricultural industry of the State. Yet they make an essential contribution to more than forty leading New York State crops, whose yield has been increased and improved by scientific bee pollination. They will observe the period from October 25th to October 31st, 1953 as New York State Honey Week.

The use of the honey bee in the pollination of fruit orchards and field crops is, of course, in addition to the value of the bee in the production of honey as a food. Increasing recognition is being given to honey for its high energy and special food values.

The beekeepers of the State are currently engaged with those of other states in a nationwide project to encourage the expanded use of honey as a food, as a means of stimulating the growth of their essential industry. In furtherance of that objective, and because of the basic importance of the industry to our economy it should have strong support from the people of New York.

Signed: Thomas E. Dewey

October 14, 1953

APPENDIX F

Beekeeper of the Year

1953	B. B. Coggshall	Groton
1954	Harold Merrell	Wolcott
1955	Howard N. Meyers	Ransomville
1956	Lavern Depew	Auburn
1957	Howard Norton	Limerick
1958	George Walthousen	Schenectady
1959	Earl Westfall	Howes Cave
1961	H. B. Webb	Port Crane
1962	C. C. Newton	Watertown
1963	J. Earle Mann	Lockport
1964	Claude Stevens	Venice Center
1966	Archie L. Coggshall	Ithaca

APPENDIX G

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF THE EMPIRE STATE HONEY PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION

PROBABLY ADOPTED IN 1929

ARTICLE I - NAME - This association shall be known as The Empire State Honey Producers' Association.

ARTICLE II - OBJECTS - The object of this Association is to promote and protect the interests of beekeepers that, for varied reasons, are beyond the scope of the local associations.

ARTICLE III - MEMBERSHIP AND DUES - Membership in this Association shall be open to any one interested in beekeeping, who wishes to support the objects of the Association. The yearly dues shall be \$5.00.

ARTICLE IV - OFFICERS AND DUTIES - The officers shall be a President, Vice-President, and Secretary-Treasurer, whose duties shall be those usually allotted to such officers. These officers are to be nominated at the summer meeting and elected at the annual meeting.

ARTICLE V - DIRECTORS AND DUTIES - A Board of Directors, one from each section of the state (north, east, west, south, finger lakes, northeast and central) shall be nominated and elected like the above officers. Their duties shall be to foster the interests of the Association to their section. They are subject to the call of the President to transact the business of the Association during the interim between meetings of the Association.

APPENDIX H

Bee Inspection in New York State

The history of bee inspection in New York State is not well known, especially as regards to the earlier days. References to inspection and to some of the problems, which occurred in the late 1800's and early 1900's are made on pages 2, 8, 9, and 10.

It is obvious, from reading the literature, that beekeepers and researchers did not differentiate between American foulbrood and European foulbrood until several years after the

turn of the century. Dr. Arnold P. Sturtevant, a bacteriologist working under the direction of Dr. E. F. Phillips in the United States Department of Agriculture, studied the major bee diseases and wrote several papers on the subject in the 1910's and 1920's. He must be credited with making the discoveries which led to a rational approach to control of American foulbrood, the worst of the bee diseases.

American foulbrood was rampant in New York State in the 1920's. European foulbrood, which had caused the industry much difficulty earlier, was under reasonable control because most beekeepers were then using Italian queens which produce bees which are more or less resistant to the causative organism.

In New York State, Mr. A. C. Gould, must be credited with demonstrating how American foulbrood can be controlled through a rigid inspection system. He served as State Apiary Inspector with the Department of Agriculture and Markets from 1928 until his retirement in 1965.

When Mr. Gould assumed responsibility for bee disease inspection, the record (Table 4) shows that well over six per cent of the colonies in the State were infected with this disease. Gould advocated burning infected colonies, and after ten years, reduced the degree of infection to slightly more than one per cent. The Second World War resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of hobby beekeepers and in fewer inspectors being available to check colonies. As a result, the number of infected colonies increased and in 1946 nearly four per cent of the colonies in the State which were inspected were infected with American foulbrood. In effect, it was necessary to repeat the same type of program which was operational in the 1930's. By 1958 the disease level in the State was less than one per cent, the lowest incidence of disease ever recorded in the State. Since that date the degree of infection has remained about the same, being either slightly lower, or slightly higher, than one per cent.

In discussing this matter with Mr. Gould, it was his opinion that it would probably be impossible to reduce the level of infection to much less than one per cent without greatly increasing the number of inspectors, and this would probably not be practical. There is a large turn-over of hobby beekeepers in the State. It is not difficult to find equipment which has been totally abandoned in some out-of-the-way apiary, or to find new enthusiasts who are using equipment which had been stored in an attic or barn for one or several decades. Old and abandoned equipment frequently harbors the disease which may remain alive in the spore stage for 30 or more years. At the same time, a number of colonies of bees are moved in and out of the State each year and there is a fair amount of migratory beekeeping within the State both for pollination and honey production.

Some beekeepers within the State have resorted to the use of drugs to control disease. Both the State Apiary Inspector and the staff at the College of Agriculture have recommended that we continue a burning program and that drugs not be used to control American foulbrood. However, for many reasons, many persons have not seen fit to do so.

The Empire State Honey Producers' Association has been a strong supporter of the inspection program over the years. Many of its members have been apiary inspectors. There have been times when the inspection force has needed the support of the organization because of political changes and attempted budget cuts. In such cases the beekeepers have usually asked for assistance from the state horticultural society since a healthy beekeeping industry is important so that bees may be available for pollination.

Mr. Burel Lane, himself a commercial beekeeper, succeeded Mr. Gould as Chief Apiary Inspector in 1965 and has continued to implement the policies established by him. The record of bee inspection since 1929 is attached (Table 4).

Table 4. American Foulbrood (A.F.B.) in New York State, 1929-1966

Year	No. Colony Inspections			Incidence of A.F.B.			Treatment	
	First	Second	Total	Colonies	%*	Apiaries	Destroyed	Shaken**
1929	32,501	6,572	39,073	2,583	6.61	400	1,180	1,403
1930	48,541	9,415	57,956	4,122	7.11	861	2,268	1,854
1931	83,962	11,996	95,958	6,846	7.13	1,450	3,902	1,164
1932	78,008	14,932	92,940	4,678	5.03	1,236	2,573	1,310
1933	88,962	12,752	101,332	5,128	5.06	1,273	3,179	1,128
1934	70,203	4,817	75,020	2,578	3.44	765	1,521	361
1935	84,188	11,106	95,294	3,903	4.10	1,006	2,209	1,276
1936	90,039	20,442	110,481	3,986	3.61	1,098	2,549	881
1937	99,990	23,962	123,952	4,067	3.28	1,157	2,573	1,113
1938	99,554	28,208	127,762	3,506	2.74	1,070	2,348	959
1939	115,831	28,129	143,960	1,988	1.35	785	1,546	341
1940	103,254	24,505	127,759	2,251	1.76	767	1,742	384
1941	98,109	23,408	121,517	1,527	1.26	649	1,245	175
1942	95,008	19,390	114,398	1,473	1.29	596	1,185	183
1943	71,752	9,229	80,981	876	1.07	411	673	116
1944	49,616	4,908	54,524	1,265	2.32	360	985	137
1945	29,398	1,321	30,719	1,044	3.40	319	727	113
1946	54,339	4,798	59,137	2,329	3.94	616	1,764	365
1947	55,157	11,831	66,988	1,476	2.20	483	1,126	153
1948	76,553	8,970	85,523	2,557	2.99	674	2,015	377
1949	93,472	16,884	110,357	2,521	2.28	762	2,024	398
1950	84,006	14,282	98,288	1,877	1.91	696	1,564	199
1951	77,308	11,843	89,151	1,262	1.42	530	1,193	52
1952	76,633	9,654	86,287	1,292	1.50	512	1,192	60
1953	71,924	9,275	81,199	1,590	1.96	537	1,468	104
1954	79,655	9,372	89,027	1,978	2.22	685	1,778	174
1955	77,308	7,964	85,098	1,221	1.43	503	1,145	27
1956	76,601	10,275	86,876	1,003	1.15	488	956	16
1957	65,636	5,649	71,285	854	1.20	384	739	83
1958	72,322	9,339	81,661	795	0.97	377	774	7
1959	70,241	8,789	79,030	721	0.91	339	649	58
1960	69,020	8,403	77,423	851	1.10	329	793	41
1961	74,220	9,941	84,161	1,094	1.30	419	965	33
1962	79,769	12,657	92,426	914	0.99	457	856	49
1963	76,401	10,559	86,960	702	0.81	363	691	6
1964	76,540	9,327	85,867	761	0.87	333	728	31
1965	74,687	8,029	82,716	879	1.06	405	865	14
1966	74,793	9,239	84,032	872	1.04	376	857	15

* based on the total number of colony inspections.

** colonies were shaken on to foundation and put into new or clean supers; infected combs were burned, and the heavy wood disinfected.