

have taken the course that we have done in order to gain notoriety. He never would have used that expression had he known the amount of moral courage and backbone that it requires to let that article into the REVIEW when I knew that it would call forth adverse criticism. To be true to your convictions, in the face of public opinion, is not so easy as it appears.

To my surprise, when the article appeared, every one misconstrued its spirit. All seemed to think that Hasty and the REVIEW were advising the feeding of sugar and the selling of it for floral honey, with the intent to deceive. Nothing was further from our purpose. Your correspondent, Friend Deadman, evidently still holds similar views, as he says, "the public must soon know it." There has been no intention or intimation whatever of trying to keep the knowledge from the public. He further says that the public will "object to paying such prices as he (Hutchinson) estimates the product will be sold for." Because in the experiment that I made last summer, the feeding of seven dollars and fifty cents worth of honey sugar resulted in honey that, if sold at fifteen cents a pound, would bring twenty dollars, everybody seems to jump to the conclusion that that is all that the honey cost. They forget the bees, the feeders, the labor. Sugar honey will always cost the same as floral honey, plus the cost of the sugar and the labor and expense of the feeding. In a good season there would be no excuse for its production, but in a poor season the raising of sugar honey by an expert at feeding back, would be far better than having no crop, providing there were no objections to its production.

I published the criticisms that came in, and, to my surprise, such men as Wm. F. Clarke, G. M. Doolittle, C. W. Dayton, and others came to my support. A bitter discussion seemed about to follow. I asked my readers their opinions as to allowing it to go on. There was a division of opinion; but I decided that it would be better to drop it until the matter could be thought of calmly.

In a few months Prof. Cook published

the result of some analysis of honey that had been made, and some tests that he had made with sugar honey by placing it before a class of students, his wife and others. All these authorities had been unable to detect the difference between sugar honey and floral honey. It seemed to be a good time to decide upon what honey really is. I asked Prof. Cook to write an article headed "What is Honey?" It appeared in the October REVIEW. To my surprise it was a defence of the Hasty view of the matter. Once more the subject was fully started. It seemed better to me to allow it to go on and have some kind of a decision arrived at. I wish that all interested in the matter could have the November REVIEW and see the views of such men as Doolittle, Miller, Taylor, and others. Both sides of the matter are fairly presented in a masterly way. The December REVIEW may contain one or two articles bearing on the subject, and possibly an Editorial reference to the topic, and then the subject will be dropped in the REVIEW, for the present, at least, as all discussion now must be of a purely speculative nature, as there is a lack of experience on many points, and other important subjects are pressing forward for discussion.

THE REVIEW and its correspondents have not and do not advocate the production and sale of sugar-honey. It has simply been suggested that the matter receive discussion and experimentation with a view to deciding in regard to the feasibility, advisability and desirability of such a departure. The only real difference now between the REVIEW and the other journals that have expressed themselves on this point is that they decide that the subject will not even admit of consideration. The editor of the REVIEW desires most sincerely, and some of his readers little know how hard he works, to make the REVIEW what it claims to be, "Devoted to the interests of honey producers." And if it is taking a wrong course, no one is more desirous than its Editor to change that course, and it is to this end that it courts all honest criticism and gives it most careful consideration.

W. Z. HUTCHINSON.

Flint, Mich., Dec. 5, 1892.