

anything which I have said I do not wish to reflect on the plan of our inspector for curing foul brood, as I believe it is as good as any other that I have heard of; but I will say that if I were trying it again I would be inclined to repeat or give them the second dose of starters, which, I think, would make it doubly sure.

The season which has just passed has been a very successful one with me. I have taken 65 pounds per colony and more than doubled my stock of bees.

Let me say, in conclusion, to any young man intending to make a bee-keeper of himself, learn your business from a reliable and intelligent apiarist. Some may say that experience is the best teacher, but remember (as Josh says) the tuition fee is rather high. It cost me about \$2,000, or rather, I should say, I would have been about \$2,000 richer to-day if I had never had foul brood in my apiary. Let me advise all to become acquainted with foul brood so as to be aware of its first approach to your apiary. But get acquainted in the cheapest way possible. Let me say, finally, that if this should meet the eye of some brother bee-keeper who may have passed through a similar experience that I wish for him, as for myself, that in the happy days which are to come we may have an unclouded sky in connection with our apicultural experience.

Fraternally yours,

A. LAING.

Ponsonby, Ont.

More About Well-Ripened Honey.

THE Montreal *Witness* of the 26th contains a criticism by Prof. W. F. Clarke, of 'Lindenbank,' Guelph, of Mr. Holtermann's article in our last issue, under the caption of "Well-Ripened Honey." Singularly enough, Mr. Clarke's communication has been treated by the *Witness* people pretty much as our honey is sometimes treated at our village fairs, by being placed in departments to which it does not belong. In so composite a journal as the *Witness* which, to quote Mr. Clarke, is not only a bee journal, but "a newspaper, a political, temperance, religious, agricultural, horticultural, apicultural and live stock journal," so grave a mistake as to put apicultural topics under its "agricultural" head is somewhat of an anomaly. The following are Mr. Clarke's remarks (after quoting Mr. Holtermann at length):—

"The article referred to in the above communication appeared in the Montreal *Witness* of August 10, and was re-published in the CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL of September 15. On criti-

cally re-perusing it I cannot see that I have "done the producers of extracted honey and bee keepers generally an injury," except it be in the remark made toward the close to the effect that "now the market is flooded with adulterated honey." In speaking thus I had in view the entire honey market of this continent. I was not, like Mr. Holtermann, "speaking of Canada" exclusively, but of the United States as well. Mr. Holtermann is careful to qualify what he says by confining his reference to this country. He scrupulously avoids expressing any opinion in regard to his "United States brethren," not because he does not like them, nor because he considers the bee-keepers of that country less honest, but evidently because he does not wish to offend them by plain speaking. He knows as well as I do that the adulteration of honey in the United States has been such a crying evil that it has been discussed *ad nauseam* at bee-keepers' conventions, and steps taken to correct the abuse by legislation on the subject. Taking the Canadian market alone into consideration, I do not think it would be correct to say that it is "flooded" with adulterated honey, but although Mr. Holtermann has "yet to find" a clear case of adulterated honey in this country, he has found some doubtful cases. This is quite evident from what he says on the subject in the CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL of September 1, where he complains with justice that "a honey rich in flavor and well ripened is becoming the exception rather than the rule." He tells us that hundreds of samples of honey are brought under his notice in the course of his business operations. He complains that much of it is "too thin," and correctly says, "if the thickness is not there, you need not look for the rich honey flavor, and a well ripened honey, *be it even buckwheat, is really better than a thin clover, thistle or basswood honey.*" (The italics are mine). Mr. Holtermann proceeds:

"But what is the result of placing so much inferior first-class honey on the market? The consumer does not find it so much superior to cheaper sweets, such as syrups, and he is lost as a consumer of honey. Now, this subject is worthy of our very serious consideration. I feel we are drifting in the direction of serious error; we must improve quality, and allow quantity to regulate itself, or we shall be financial losers."

In the paragraph just quoted, Mr. Holtermann uses the phrase "inferior first-class honey," and I confess I am at a loss to understand how an article can be both "inferior" and "first-class." It appears, however, that there is more or less "inferior" honey, and "very thin" honey, even on the Canadian market. In order to improve