

moisture is charged to a damp cellar. Then, this exercise gives them an appetite, and they eat, and too much eating causes them to soil their combs, which is the natural result when they have to stay in the hive. It is not dysentary, but is offensive, as the natural result of long accumulation, as would be anything else of like nature under like circumstances. A word might be said here in favor of the pollen theory, although it would by no means be practical to remove the pollen; yet the fact remains, that had they nothing but honey, this would cause heat when eaten and then evaporate, and the combs would not be soiled, while pollen is solid and can't evaporate through the pores of the bees.

While I am a believer in the pollen theory, I do not believe in its practical application, but believe the whole difficulty can be overcome by having your cellar warm, and giving your colonies plenty of upward ventilation.

JOHN F. GATES.

Ovid, Erie Co., Pa.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

WHY MR. PRINGLE'S ARTICLE WAS NOT PUBLISHED.

By W. Z. HUTCHINSON.

I have always read Mr. Pringle's articles with pleasure and profit. At the Walkerton convention I had hoped to have the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with the gentleman. All of those present spoke with regret that Mr. Pringle was not able to be present. It is evident that he is a leader and a favorite in Canada. Having such an impression of the man, I was surprised that he should send to the C.B.J. an article that he had previously sent to the *Review*, and allow it to be published in such a way as to give the impression that I was not willing to give him a hearing. Perhaps Mr. Pringle has no intention of giving any such an impression; but if a copy of my reply to Mr. Pringle could also be given, it seems to me that it would show that he has no more cause for

complaint than is the case with a large number of other correspondents. Here is a copy of the letter I wrote Mr. Pringle, when he wrote inquiring in regard to his manuscript:—

Flint, Mich., Jan. 2, 1893.

Allen Pringle, Selby, Ont.

FRIEND P.—Your card of the 28th also is here. When your article came I had more matter accepted for the December *Review* than I could possibly use, and I was behind and working hard to get things in shape so that I could go to the convention at Washington, and I did not even take time to read your article. When I read your card I at once turned to your article and read that. It is well written, and I should be glad to use it, but I have decided that there can be no good in further discussing this sugar honey matter at present. I have a great mass of articles on both sides of the subject, but they are all theoretical, and I think nothing more, or very little more, will appear in the *Review* at present upon the subject—perhaps never. It will depend upon future developments. I expect to attend your coming convention, and hope to have the pleasure of meeting you there. Thanking you for your kindness in writing, I am,

Yours, etc.,

W. Z. HUTCHINSON.

Now, it seems to me that Mr. Pringle had no cause for complaint. Had I printed his article, it would have been impossible for me to have consistently stopped the discussion, as dozens of others could have said:—"You published his article, why don't you publish mine?" I think even Mr. Pringle must see the position. He must see that it was not from a lack of courage nor of backbone, nor fear of friendly criticism. If Mr. Pringle has read the *Review* for the past year, he must know that it has published articles containing criticisms much more severe than those that he sent.

I see that quite a number still have a disposition to discuss sugar honey. I have said so much on the subject that perhaps it would be better if I kept still, but may I be allowed a suggestion? Let every one who has a disposition to thus write, go to work and prove that sugar fed to bees does not become changed into honey, just the same as the cane sugar in nectar is changed into honey. Let them prove this, and all this wordy and unpleasant discussion will be at an end.

Flint, Mich., Feb. 19, 1893