

deal to do with the depression in the honey market. The foe is in our own house. The manner in which the bee business has been carried on in the past has brought distrust upon the products of the apiary. The world about us are not fools. They are wise in their way. They have no faith in modern honey, and the fault is our own. Every bee journal is full of "sugar to feed bees." This sugar feeding is steadily and surely ruining the honey trade. I have before me the *New York Weekly Witness*, and to show you how the outsiders look at it from their stand point, I give an extract from an editorial in that widely circulated paper.

ADULTERATED HONEY.

"Some remarks made in our issue of September 3rd last on this subject have raised the ire of quite a number of bee-men, and we have received and are still receiving some very angry letters, remonstrating with us on the sweeping charges which they say are therein made against all bee-keepers.

"We had no intention of blaming all bee-keepers, as more honorable men than the great majority of them are not to be found in any business, and we confess we were misled by reading articles in other journals, in saying that comb is manufactured for the bees to put honey in, as it is only the foundation for the comb in the section-boxes (which is made out of pure wax) on which the bees build their combs. So that unless you get a mouthful of this foundation, or the bees have been fed on glucose or sugar syrup which is seldom the case except for Wintering the bees, we believe section combs are generally pure both in wax and honey.

It is an old saying that "without fire there can be no smoke," and unless there is a considerable amount of truth in the statements published about adulteration, we do not see why they are so extensively circulated, and why the bee-keepers should feel so sore on the subject; and we do not see any difference between man adulterating the honey or causing the bees to do so by feeding them on what is not and never can be pure honey, like what is extracted from flowers. That it is done in some cases, though probably only to a limited extent, is undoubted.

The above though intended to be conciliatory, in fact contains dark suspicions, even of section comb honey. Can you blame the writer for his distrust, when he sees bee-periodicals advising sugar syrup as the best feed for bees? I do not blame him, he at least has grounds for his doubts as to the purity of even comb honey. However much these things may hurt, we have ourselves to blame for it all. A few years ago *Gleanings* pressed glucose into the apiaries of the country as the cheapest bee feed that could be had. It was disguised under the meaningless name of "grape sugar" and hundreds bought without knowing what it was. Years have passed, and this glucose business comes back to drag down the

honey market, and to hang like a black pall over the bee interests of the country. It will be seen that the *Witness* links together, "glucose or sugar syrup" and justly says, "we do not see any difference between a man adulterating the honey or causing the bees to do so by feeding them on what is not, and never can be pure honey like what is extracted from flowers."

The wholesale sugar feeding going on in the apiaries of the country though less reprehensible than the glucose fraud, is as surely undermining the honey trade in the large cities, in fact everywhere except in the home markets of the apiaries. Does any body doubt that "lots" of sugar syrup goes into the market mixed with honey? I have none. If you winter your bees on syrup and there is any of it left in the brood combs when the early honey harvest commences, it will go into the surplus department as sure as fate. I do not make mere assertions, I know whereof I affirm. Every fall that gives our bees a flow of honey, the following season a portion of my white honey crop is injured as to color, though not as to quality, by the bees carrying the yellow fall honey into the surplus apartments and mixing it with the new white honey. "Without fire there can be no smoke." Yes, that is true, and this building up of the sugar market, at the expense of the honey trade, and "feeding bees on pure syrup" is the place from whence the smoke issues. Perhaps I will be asked "what I am going to do about it." Well, perhaps I will not be able to do much without the co-operation of others, but as for myself I shall feed my bees on pure honey, and if I do not have it at home I will buy it from those who have it for sale, and thus keep inside of the honey trade. Let all bee-keepers do likewise and there will be less complaint about the honey market, and the U. S. chemist will not be under the necessity of classing the honey on the market as "apparently pure." Aside from the glucose vendors nothing has contributed so much to the present condition of things as has the shallow "pollen theory." Not that many well informed apriarists have been captivated by a "theory" that is absurd on its face, but because it has brought into use sugar as a bee feed on the grounds of cheapness more than anything else. We were told with great confidence that the "pollen theory" was to be settled at the Detroit convention. It was settled by Barber and Hall, and finally nailed to the wall by Rev. W. F. Clark. Some years ago I proved by actual facts that bee diarrhoea in my locality was the result of continued low temperature—i. e. it is a climatic trouble. Now, it is admitted that "bees don't eat pollen in a high temperature." Eh? Well, things will come around strangely enough sometimes.