

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

THE POSITION OF THE REVIEW ON THE SUGAR-HONEY QUESTION.

EDITOR CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL:—I have once or twice seen slight references in the C. B. J. to the effect that the REVIEW was advising beekeepers to feed sugar syrup to bees and sell the result as honey. These references have heretofore been too slight to call for any explanation; but the article by Mr. Deadman in the last issue is too out spoken and too misleading (although probably not intentionally so) to pass unnoticed. Hence I beg the privilege of stating to your readers the *exact* position taken by the REVIEW on this subject.

First, allow me to give a very brief synopsis of the case. One year ago the REVIEW took up the special topic of "What shall Beekeepers do if the Poor Seasons keep on coming?" When it came E. E. Hasty's turn to speak, he said, "If the poor seasons keep on coming we *may* be obliged to feed sugar to have it made into honey." He then went on to show why honey was used. It was for its beauty, palatableness and food value. He then showed that the popular notion that bees "make" honey is, to a certain extent, true. The nectar of flowers is almost wholly cane sugar, which the secretions of the bees change to glucose or honey. From this he argued that it mattered not from whence the bees secured their cane sugar, the result would be the same honey. When I first read this, I think I was as much surprised as any of the brethren. I could scarcely believe my eyes. Hitherto any thing of this kind was called adulteration. I tried in my mind to see how I could combat and overthrow the views of Mr. Hasty. I tried and tried, and could not answer them in a manner satisfactory to myself. By the way, there has been very little attempt to show that Mr. Hasty is incorrect in his views; there has been a sort of holy horror, or else a sort of exasperation, that he should have *thought* of such a thing. I remembered how, when I had been feeding sugar for winter stores, I had been so attracted by the

delicious look of the well-filled white combs that I had cut out small pieces and tasted them only to be surprised that the taste was so exactly like that of honey that, had I not known the source, I would have pronounced it honey. I then called to mind the good things that had met with the most bitter opposition when first introduced. I remembered that there was once a great hue and cry similar to the one now being raised, differing only in degree, because some beekeepers were using foundation in their sections. The objections to its use read somewhat as follows: "Some people are not clean in their methods of wax rendering. The old combs are allowed to stand until they are inhabited with disgusting worms, and fouled with the excrements of the inhabitants. The whole mass is then stewed up together and the wax squeezed out. Who wants to eat this stuff? Ugh! That is the kind of opposition that the users of foundation had to encounter. Then there was the talk about its being artificial. It was not the work of the bees; It would be a *fraud* to sell it without informing the purchaser; it would fill the consumer's mouth with wax, his soul with disgust, and the market for honey would be ruined. Where is the beekeeper now who does not use foundation in his sections? Few and far between. I knew that what Mr. Hasty advocated would be looked upon, at least at first, as the rankest kind of heresy; but I remembered that in the dark ages men were tortured for the very views that are now popular. I thought of all these things, and decided that the REVIEW should continue as it had begun, allow everybody to be heard so long as the saying was done decently and in order. I thought that the time might come when sugar-honey would be a legitimate product of the apiary in those locations where the hand of the "white woman" (of whom our Hasty friend writes so picturesquely in a late issue of the C. B. J.) had swept away the natural sources of honey.

I thought of all these things, and then the article went into the REVIEW. A correspondent recently wrote that he thinks, that Prof. Cook and myself must