

holding my views on sugar honey, I might wilfully suppress a part of the Washington report. He then goes on to say that if I should do so and so, then certain punishments ought to be meted out to me. Knowing me, as friend Holtermann says he does, I am the more surprised at this insinuation. If a man is to be tried, condemned and kicked out for crimes that he may commit I fear the time will soon come when there will be no one left to do the "kicking out." Fortunately, my make up is such that I care more for the truth and right than I do for which one is right. By the way, Prof. Wiley did not say at Washington that the chemist could determine the difference between sugar honey and floral honey. He said that *invert sugar* (not sugar honey) at a certain temperature was optically neuter, while pure floral honey was not, and he hoped that this characteristic would yet enable chemists to distinguish between the two substances. Let us have the truth though the heavens fall. Any one who has any doubts on this subject can look up the matter for himself in the report of the Washington convention, where Prof. Wiley gives his views in black and white written by his own hand. There is some difference between hoping to perform a certain act and its final accomplishment. When some chemist does finally succeed in detecting the difference between sugar honey and floral honey I will be just as ready to report the fact as is friend Holtermann.

I beg pardon for this digression. All that I cared particularly to say was that I have probably made mistakes in my past life, and, if so, I must bear the consequences, and I shall try and bear them like a man; but I must enter a protest against the loading upon my shoulders of errors that I may, can or might commit in the future.

But friend Holtermann does not strike a man behind his back and then dodge behind a *nom de plume*; having written, he planks down his "John Hancock," and thereby does much to atone for trying to work up a feeling against a man for the sins that he *might* commit.

Flint, Mich., March, 13.

March 23, 1893.

Since the above was written the C. B. J. for March 15th has come to hand. In it I find that my old friend, Pettit, asks me to take the opinions of scientific men as proof that bees do not change sugar into honey. Profs. Wiley and Riley both disagreed with Prof. Cook in his definition of honey. They thought that one characteristic should be that it came from the flowers. Professor Wiley's chemical analysis failed to point out the difference between sugar and floral honey. This fact Mr. Pettit would have me overlook, and take the Professor's *opinion* instead. A professional man's opinion is not proof. Mr. Cowan I look upon as a learned and scientific beekeeper, but my confidence in him as an authority is just a trifle shaken when he says in *Gleanings* that honey contains no cane sugar at all. That it sometimes contains as much as ten per cent. of cane sugar is so well known that I cannot see how Mr. Cowan could make such an assertion. Perhaps he did not mean to have this expression taken literally. Perhaps he meant that honey is *usually* quite free from cane sugar.

When there is *absolute* scientific proof that bees do not change cane sugar into honey, I shall be as willing to admit it as will any one: but don't ask me to accept mere opinion and assertion as *proof*.

W. Z. H.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

SERIES OF DISCOURAGEMENTS.

MR. EDITOR.—You will see by the following that my experience in beekeeping for the last five years is not very bright. I started in May, 1888, in the town of Niagara, with thirty colonies. Product, honey nil, increase, ten colonies. Sold all and went to Toronto. 1889.—Bought one colony; honey, fifty pounds; increase, two by division. Helped Mr. McArthur that season with fair success. 1890.—Three colonies; honey, four hundred pounds; increase, three. Managed an out apiary of fifty colonies at Dixie, for Mr. McArthur. Honey, eight thousand pounds; increase, ten colonies. 1891.—Started