

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

A CORRECTION, AN ADMONITION,
AND SO FORTH.

In last JOURNAL, in speaking of the duty on honey going from Canada into the United States, I said, "On comb honey there is, so far as I can learn, no duty." I have since ascertained that there is a duty on comb honey. Prof. Cook was my authority for intimating that there was no duty. Before the article in reply to Mr. Corneil was written, I wrote Prof. Cook asking definite information as to the duty on honey. He answered that on extracted honey there was a duty of twenty cents per gallon, but on comb honey none. Since last JOURNAL Mr. McKnight has written me that duty is collected on comb honey going from Canada into the United States "on the basis of eleven pounds to the gallon," which would be 19/11 cents per pound duty on comb honey. Mr. McKnight says he knows this to be a fact from experience.

THE SUGAR HONEY ENTERPRISE.

I set out to make a correction, and give an admonition. The one was easy, the other is not so easy. The readers of the C.B.J. are already aware that our enterprising apiarian friends across the line (some of them at any rate) are proposing to make a new departure in the honey business. Our American cousins think they can "beat all creation" in most things, and so they can. The thing is literally and figuratively true.

When I was a boy, about forty years ago, I heard a great deal of talk among the older heads about certain "Basswood hams" which were shipped across Lake Ontario from Uncle Sam's Dominions to Kingston (which was our nearest market then), and disposed of to some of the unsophisticated denizens of the "Limestone City," and the people round about. They were sold as the "ginoine sugar cured." I also heard of nutmegs made of the same material. That was commercial enterprise, for you! Whether or not the luckless Canadian paid duty on the "hams" and

"nutmegs," in addition to the other charges, I cannot say. At any rate, expensive as the food was, he failed to thrive on it. His stomach, though equal to the proverbial saw dust and tennpenny nails, drew the line at the Yankee hams.

Now, I do not undertake to say that the honey, so called, which it is proposed to manufacture across the border in "poor seasons," would be no better for a heathen's stomach, or a Christian's stomach, than the aforesaid hams; for we have the testimony of Prof. Cook and his students, and the editor of the *Review*, and brother Doolittle (and they are all honorable men), that it is just superb in taste, color, æsthetic beauty, and all that; and that it would bother a professional, apiarian, epicurean expert to distinguish the "counterfeit presentment" from the true metal. What I do undertake, however, to say is this:—that while these, our brethren, these, "our friends, the enemy" (in a fair way of becoming so) have an undoubted right, a natural right, to discuss the subject in their journals to their heart's content, and to experiment *ad infinitum*, and to make as much of the stuff as they like, they have no right, either natural or moral, to call it honey or sell it as honey. Every producer of honest honey anywhere has a say here. The definition of honey, which the world has and has had for a long time, will do for the present; and the article itself will do very well. I am for genuine progress every time. But there may be progress without improvement. Going to the sugar barrel instead of to the flowers for honey is a kind of progress in which I would "make haste slowly," and in which I would advise others to do the same. My admonition, therefore, is to our American friends to "call a halt;" and to Canadian bee keepers to "let it alone severely."

THE ANNUAL MEETING.

This is drawing near, and it is to be hoped will be well attended. Each meeting ought to be an improvement on past ones. I hope to meet as many of the intending exhibitors there as possible. It has been suggested to me by an exhibitor