

we have as often answered through our columns, the queries asked by correspondents of the B.B.J. Compare our replies given in the past with the replies given by journalists in the mother land:

"A friend of mine having bought two hundred weight of sugar, &c., the settings from golden syrup, and only having one stock of bees, wished me to buy some at a penny per pound but I prefer to have your advice on the subject first—Would it be in any way suitable for bee food, as I have eleven stocks all in bar frame hives, which will probably require feeding in spring, but do not believe in giving my bees rubbish.—A. DELBRIDGE, Parracombe."

"REPLY.—You will find it pays better to buy good sugar for bees than using cheap substitutes. The granulated portion of the golden syrup will contain too much treacle to be wholesome food for bees."

"Will you kindly answer the following question in your next number. Is the nectar or secretion of the flower which the bee collects of the same chemical composition as honey? Or is the nectar converted into honey by the bee by some process or by mixing it with another secretion of its own?—F.W.P."

"REPLY.—The nectar from flowers as gathered by the bee undergoes chemical changes before it is converted into honey. By means of a secretion produced by the salivary glands the cane sugar of nectar is converted into grape sugar of honey. Coagulated albumen is also found in honey, whereas it is not present in nectar. Moreover, formic acid is added to honey and acts as a powerful preservative."

Our old friend <sup>\*\*</sup>Mr. Benton, was unable to attend the Albany meeting as his letter given below, and which was crowded out of our last issue, shows:

PRESIDENT ELWOOD,

Dear Sir,—I very much regret that a serious illness makes it unsafe for me to think of going to Albany. My authorization as a delegate to represent the Department of Agriculture in the proceedings of the Association was made out and signed by the Secretary of Agriculture last week, and I had all other arrangements made to arrive in Albany to day. I am, of course, greatly disappointed, and it certainly is vexatious, after having been able to work all the year, to be sick at this particular juncture. However, there may be some Providence in the matter.

My essay was not finished when I was taken ill. I am sorry for this, as well as that I cannot be there to confer in reference to the discussion set down for 3:30 p.m. Thursday, which, by the way, I am quite surprised to see in the programme. But it is a good idea, since union on the part of the Association in regard to the work to be undertaken will surely result in benefit.

As the appropriation for this purpose is not large, and expenditures had been authorized at Lansing previous to my appointment, experimental work has not been undertaken here, this season especially, as the weather was well advanced when I came here. But besides correspondence, planning work, etc., my time had

been utilized in making transactions and some general work for the division. The views of the Association in regard to the work to be undertaken, will doubtless be received with great consideration.

FRANK BENTON.

\* \*

At the North American Bee-Keepers' Convention held at Albany, the size of sections was discussed after an essay read by Dr. C. C. Miller on the subject. As we manufactured lately for the Bee-Keepers of Ontario, and at one time extensively for the British market, the discussion to us is of greater importance than to the majority of our customers, whom we once served. We would like the opinion of our readers on size of sections and also their opinion on what size of sizes ought to be a standard. We clip the following from *Gleanings*.

Dr. C. C. Miller in an essay discussed the desirability and feasibility of having two sizes as standard. They necessarily cost the supply-dealer more, and therefore indirectly the bee-keeper. It would be desirable, he thought, to have only one standard, but in the present condition of things, that seemed impossible. He rather objected to 1½ sections for one of the standards, because they hold less than a pound, and because the consumer buys it for an ostensible pound package, when it was not. He did not wish to be a party in any such business. In connection with the essay were read two letters, one from W. T. Falconer, and the other from the G. B. Lewis Manufacturing Co. Both held the ground that it was desirable to have a standard if it could be adopted. The 1½x2½x4½ comes as near as any thing to being a standard; but besides these there are dozens of other sizes which they are obliged to keep in stock.

A number of commission men were present, and objected to the point made by the doctor on small-size or under-weight sections. The "under-weights" were accepted readily. Consumers would ask, "How much is honey a pound?" The reply would be, for instance, "Eighteen cents." The consumer would call for a section. When the change was made out he would be charged only 16 cents; but let there be an over-weight section, and there would be complaint. Commission men seemed to prefer larger and thinner combs, of a trifle under a pound, and this is one reason why, perhaps, a 4½x4½ section seven to the foot has been coming into prominence. H. R. Wright showed his under-weight tall section, a trifle taller than wide. The display was a little better, he said, and consumers readily took it.

\* \*

The same question was discussed at the California State Convention, as the minutes of that meeting reported by the American Bee Journal shows:

"What sized sections do you prefer?" was next asked.

Mr. Root said he was the first to introduce the 1-pound section, and was denounced by