

of such shown especially by some Scotch beekeepers; but rigidly enforcing the rule as to the analysis of honey exhibited and disqualifications of those exhibiting has effectually put a stop to the fraud. We now never have any such combs shown, and have not for many years.

There would be no difficulty in detecting sugar fed combs even if the bees were partly fed with honey.

Formerly, where the polariscope was only used for determining the rotation to the right or to the left, and in this way detecting glucose, it was difficult to determine the cane sugar in honey. But now that dialysis before polarization is resorted to there is no difficulty in detecting the quantity of sugar given to bees to store in combs with the utmost certainty.

In conclusion I would urge you to leave no stone unturned to prevent this attempt to introduce adulteration, which I think would not fail to have most disastrous consequences on the industry of beekeeping.

Yours, etc.

THOS. WM. COWAN.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

SUGAR HONEY CONTROVERSY.

Is not this so-called "sugar honey" subject assuming definite form—specific shape? Mr. W. Z. Hutchinson, the champion of unfortunate sugar syrup counterfeits, says on page 563, C.B.J.: "Let every one who has a disposition to thus write, go to work and prove that sugar fed to bees does not become changed into honey, just the same as the cane sugar in nectar is changed into honey. Let them prove this, and all this wordy and unpleasant discussion will be at an end."

Well, we all like to see a man define his position and then stick to his text. That course has at least the appearance of honest conviction, and is commendable. But will Mr. Hutchinson frankly own his hasty and damaging mistake, when the proof he demands is forthcoming? For one, I trust he will—I trust he will. Well, now for the proof; it is.—Both Professors, Riley and Wasey of the Department of Agriculture, at Washington, D. C., (the former Professor of Entomology, and the latter, Professor of Chemistry), insist that the so-called "sugar honey" is not

honey. Further proof will be found in a very valuable letter sent me by Mr. T. W. Cowan, F.G.S., F.R.M.S., etc., a copy of which I have sent to your JOURNAL. If Mr. Hutchinson seeks more proof he is requested to read Mr. Cowan's most valuable article on page 161 of *Gleanings* for the current year.

Now, I believe that I am safe in saying that there is no higher authority in America or in Europe than those I have given on the question under discussion; and if Mr. Hutchinson fails to take their testimony as proof—the proof that he demands—then I shall be forced to conclude that he is neither open to conviction nor willing to receive testimony, and that he does not see the truth, simply because he will not.

S. T. PETTIT.

P.S.—Obviously, Mr. Hutchinson must either hasten to correct as far as possible that stupendous mistake, or say that he does not believe the evidence given; there can be no alternative. Any other course will be only adding insult to injury. But if he insists that he does not believe the evidence, what then? Surely he will not; he cannot say that.

S. T. P.

Belmont, March 10th, 1893.

SUGAR HONEY.

The following paper on this *quæstio vexata* was read at the recent Minnesota State Beekeepers' Association, by which the recommendations contained in the paper were also adopted. A very strong feeling exists throughout the whole State on the subject, and the beekeepers in that section seem determined to put an end to the business as speedily as possible.

SUGAR HONEY.

By C. THEILMANN.

I am on the programme for items of interest by our secretary, and have selected the subject of sugar honey, although almost anything about bees and their product is interesting to me and to all active and successful beekeepers of my acquaintance;