

seven or eight high, and placing a saucer with three or four ounces of the bisulphide inside a rim on the top, and covering all with a hive cover. The stuff is cheap—is sold ordinarily at 10c a pound—so that there should not be much temptation to adulterate it.—Ed.]

Shipping Different Grades of Honey to Different Dealers.

In a recent issue of "Gleanings," Mr. Doolittle, in one of his "talks," goes on to tell how it is best to ship "No. 1" comb honey to one dealer and "fancy" to another. The inference is that when the two grades are not side and side, the difference is so slight that as much will be obtained for No. 1 as for the fancy. Dr. Miller calls attention to how ridiculous the proposition is when we consider that each dealer will have both grades present in his warehouse, received from other bee-keepers, so the two grades will have to sell on their merits, just the same as though Mr. D. had shipped all to one man. When reading the article, at the time, could not see what Mr. Doolittle was driving at, and, as he has not as yet replied to Dr. Miller, am as much in the dark as ever.

Does the Use of Comb Foundation Come Under the Head of Adulteration?

In the "American Bee-keeper" for August Mr. Greiner comes out boldly and classifies the use of comb foundation in sections as "adulteration" by inference, just about as bad as sugar feeding. This is a stunner in itself, but, to cap the climax, just listen to the approval of such doctrine by no less a person, than Arthur C. Miller, associate editor of the "Bee-keeper." Under the heading of "Evils Resulting From Sugar Feeding and Kindred Practices," he says: "It will mean more or less of a revolution in methods of comb honey production to dispense with foundation, etc." Sure, friend

Miller, there will be a big "scrap" before these conditions are brought about and somehow I don't believe it will happen in our generation. Wonder if neither Mr. Miller or Mr. Greiner use even a little bit of foundation in their sections? If they do so, they come under the ban, by their own argument, just as much as the full-sheet fellow. As J. E. Johnson says in September "Bee-keeper," "using full sheets, as per Dr. Miller's plan, would be deserving of capital punishment; while using starters, say one inch square, would entitle one to about 30 days in jail." While we are in sympathy with Mr. Miller's campaign against sugar-feeding, are inclined to think that he is unconsciously growing too pessimistic and inclined to look for evil in places where the masses are not even "suspicious."

Is Sweet Clover a Weed?

If there is any one thing more than another that arouses Editor Root's enthusiasm, it is when some correspondent comes along booming sweet clover as a honey plant. In a foot-note to a recent article in "Gleanings," in which the writer claims that in his locality stock eat sweet clover as freely as alfalfa, Mr. Root says, in reference to laws in force in different States classing sweet clover as a noxious weed: "The time will come, of course, when these laws will be repealed, but not until bee-keepers bestir themselves a little more actively than they have been doing." Wonder if "the time will come?" Just a bit doubtful, unless sentiment over the border is quite a little different to what it is here regarding sweet clover. In Ontario, at least, believe that sweet clover has proven of no benefit to the bee-keepers, to speak of, and at the same time is a weed of the first order when it once gets a start in cultivated land. We heard Mr. J. B. Hall once say that it had been a curse to him in two ways—