

he is not a "religionist." Dr. Thom is both. It is impossible for any man who is not a "religionist," to enter into or judge the feelings of another who is a "religionist." Dr. Thom and I do not belong to the same religious denomination but the tie that binds us together as fellow-bee-keepers is very slender compared with that which unites us as fellow-christians. There is as we firmly believe, a sacredness and a perpetuity about the latter, which throws the former completely out of comparison.

But I must say with equal frankness, that I think the worthy Doctor's strictures are too severe. I do not for a moment suppose that friend Pringle ought to stir up a discussion, still less that he meant to hold up to ridicule the religious beliefs of other "brethren," but that he dropped the remark in perfect good faith and innocence, not doubting for a moment but that it would be assented to readily on all hands. I think too, that the allusion to Col. Ingersoll is rather contemptuous, and calculated to wound the feelings of one who sympathizes with his views, and is an admirer of the man, which I believe is the case with friend Pringle.

So I wave my flag of truce making bold to say that friend Pringle readily withdraws the offensive statement, explaining that he meant no mischief by it; and that friend Thom withdraws the stinging part of his criticism, and the fling at agnostics. I think this is a fair and impartial settlement of the difficulty. Its occurrence is a little unfortunate, but "accidents will happen in the best regulated families," and as Dr. Thom wisely remarks:—"Readers need not expect perfection in any bee journal, or in any of its contributors." On the whole, the CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL has been a pattern to its contemporaries in the kind and courteous spirit it has manifested, but editing, as the Scotch are wont to say, is a "kittle beesiness."

WM. F. CLARKE.

Guelph, May 31, 1886.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

UNFAIRNESS, ETC.

ORDINARILY I have done with taking notice of splenetic replies to my articles, but the so-called reply to myself of Mr. W. Z. Hutchinson, puts me so completely in a false position that a brief explanation is a matter of simple justice. I dislike personalities and am never guilty of indulging in them, except so far as may be necessary to explain the point I am attempting to make out. So far as the article to which Mr. H. refers is in any wise personal as regards Mr. Heddon, I can assure Mr. H. that the quotations made therein are absolutely cor-

rect, and taken directly from Mr. Heddon's own published works. Mr. Heddon has claimed, and that too of a quite recent date, that in the "pollen theory" lies the whole success of wintering; that temperature was an incident only, and its effect only indirect. Does not Mr. W. Z. H. remember the somewhat heated discussion between Mr. Heddon and Mr. Demaree, in which Mr. D. claimed that temperature was *the* point, and Mr. H. denied it *in toto*? He can't well have forgotten it, for he took a hand in it himself.

So far as the "pollen theory" goes, I care very little who accepts or rejects it. The strongest argument I have ever seen in favor of it is the opinion of Prof. Cook "that it is scientific"; but Prof. Cook also is of the opinion that "air is not needed by a colony in a normal condition," and the strength of either claim may be judged by the intelligent public by comparison with the other.

As to Mr. W. Z. H.'s complaint that I only quoted a portion of Mr. Heddon's book, I presume that Mr. Heddon himself will thank me for not quoting the whole work, for had I done so, it must have injured its sale very greatly, as each of the thousands of readers of C. B. J. would have no need to try what was published in its columns. Mr. W. Z. H. says "it is a mystery to him, how *any one* could write as Mr. Pond does, after reading Mr. Heddon's book." In reply I simply ask him if I made a simple misquotation? What I did write was for the purpose of endeavoring to show that many things other than the presence or absence of pollen were and are required to solve the wintering problem; how far I was successful in the attempt, the public must judge. That the pollen theory is untenable I fully believe; it is not a late conviction either, as Mr. W. Z. H. desires to show, neither have the grounds of that conviction been lately "entered upon," as I gave my views on that subject at once and immediately after Mr. Heddon changed his position in regard to the matter, and whether my position is correct or not, it will require something more than the mere assertion of Mr. W. Z. H. to show.

My position is, and always has been, that pure natural stores, both honey and pollen, are the proper food for our bees, because they are natural; and that with right conditions we can carry them through the longest and severest winters without loss by disease. Who will give us the rule by which we shall know what the right conditions are?

J. E. POND, JR.

Foxboro, Mass., May, 1886.

We think the pollen theory has been pretty