

W. C. Frazer's system suits me better than all the rest. That is hardly true, as will be seen from the system I have attempted; but I like his idea of having a system of grading which does not involve the honey itself, leaving that as a separate classification. Others had the same idea, but did not bring it out so clearly, or, at least, it did not strike me so.

The names of the grades are simple. They are easily understood both by the producer and consumer. And I don't know why the consumer shouldn't fully understand just what they mean. There will never be a great overstock, I fancy, of honey classed as *fancy*. Perhaps it is drawing the lines rather tightly to say: "All cells sealed." Possibly a certain number of cells next the wood ought to be allowed unsealed. I think very few have been in the habit of sorting out their best honey into this grade; but the man who puts several tons on a large market could select a number of crates for which an extra price could be obtained, and that without lowering the price of his No. 1 honey.

The No. 1 contains the bulk of a good beekeeper's crop, and on that account it is the most important of all. The only beekeeper with whom I have had a chance to talk the matter over, objects to my putting down "ten cells" as the limit allowed unsealed on the poorer side of a No. 1 section. But it seems to me that, so far as possible, every thing should be very exact. If such a phrase as "only a few cells" should be used, then some would understand that to mean three, and some fifty. If ten isn't the right number then make it five, twenty, or whatever is thought best; but don't leave it indefinite. The term "slightly discolored" is indefinite, and on that account objectionable, but I don't see how to better it easily.

In No. 2 not more than one-fourth of the total surface must be left unfilled and unsealed. Possibly it is not necessary to say three-fourths of the surface must be filled and sealed, for it will hardly be sealed without being filled. As to the remaining fourth, it may be filled and not sealed, or there may be empty comb or entire vacancy to the amount of one-fourth of the section. Of course, the unsealed part might be on one or both sides. That is, one side might be all filled and sealed, and the other side half sealed, or each side might be three-fourths sealed, or one side may have anywhere from the half to the whole of it sealed, only so that there shall be enough sealed on the other side so that the sealing on both sides taken together shall be as much as three-fourths of the total surface of both sides added together.

The difficulty of adopting a system of

grading that shall be satisfactory to all, is greater than at first anticipated, so that I do not wonder that some have little faith that any one system can be agreed upon. I think that all agree that the ground of the difficulty lies in the fact that different localities raise different kinds of honey and each locality wants a system of grading that shall throw no discredit upon the honey raised in that locality. If I am rightly informed, the York State men have no difficulty in agreeing upon a system that suits them; so can the California men; so can the Mississippi Valley men. Now suppose white clover is the only kind of honey raised all over. There would probably be no great difficulty in settling upon a system acceptable to all. No. 1 white clover would easily be the same in York State or in Western Illinois; and then suppose that, all over the land, a second crop should be obtained from Spanish needles. Would not all agree that a No. 1 Spanish-needle section should be just the same as No. 1 white-clover section, except that one was filled with white-clover honey and the other with Spanish-needle? and the same way if all the different sources of honey ruled in every location. Now, if I am correct in this then there ought to be no more difficulty in agreeing upon the grades, as things now exist; and then the only thing to add is, to say what kind of honey is contained—light, amber, dark, or mixed. If any one objects that light, amber, etc., are not distinctive enough, then there need be no difficulty at any time in specifying particularly any one class of honey. Indeed, I should expect that, in time at least, some few particular kinds of honey would come prominently to the front, and that possibly in some markets No. 1 Spanish needle might be quoted higher than No. 1 light. But the great thing is, to agree upon the grades, to be alike applied to all kinds of honey, and I have some hope that we may reach that.

Marengo, Ill.

C. C. MILLER.

[We are heartily in sympathy with the doctor in his effort to get a system of grading that will insure some probability of adoption at the North American at Washington. While his plan, as he suggests, is not original with himself, it embodies the idea of simplicity, and, at the same time, elasticity for different locations and different kinds of honey, in a way that is better, perhaps, than any thing else that has been proposed. There is possibly one criticism that will be made; and that is, that the different grades should be *lettered* rather than *numbered*. After all, we do not know that we would insist on that point too strongly, because the No. 2 grade is, in reality, No. 2 honey.]