

thing *sub rosa*—ah, me!—oh, my! Well, I know that any of the three bee journals that I take couldn't print the Hasty article and have it kept out of the newspapers; but the *Review* being in their own family among themselves, perhaps will give less publicity to it. The "Review" says the Hasty article is heresy, but three lines further he says heretical ideas are usually advanced ideas, shocking as they sometimes are, and as editor of the "Review," he feels like allowing free speech, heresy is error. Now, does Mr. Hutchinson mean to say that he is a heretic, and means to let every heresiarch expound their ideas in his journal—upholding errors and spoiling our markets—advocating and quietly pushing forward adulteration of honey as a business; if he doesn't mean this, let him stand on the side of right, and frown with contempt upon every heretic or upholder of wrong as an editor should do—leading people right instead of letting himself drift with those who wish to do wrong. Lastly, the "Review" says: "We little know what may come in the future." No, you are right; and if all bee-men had such backs as yours, it would come altogether too soon. Your remarks are mysterious, and sound like adulteration. Do you mean to say the day is coming when men will make sugar for fun, and get the bees to store it in combs, and call it honey, when thousands of tons of pure honey go to waste every year for want of bees to gather it? If you do, then I say that every editor's chair should be filled by a man possessing back bone enough to give such shrinking pusillanimity, such fool-hardy, ruinous manifestos as that which Messrs. Hutchison, Hasty & Co. have just delivered their quietus.

Ever honest man should abhor even the appearance of such evil. Some will rob in open daylight, but I despise a sneak who gets money by deception. The imagination cannot conceive a more pitiable specimen of humanity—a more contemptible piece of human flesh in the shape of man than the one, be he who he may, that in the face and eyes of thousands of honest beekeepers that have worked those many weary years to bring their profession up to a true standard of honesty and perfection, will, for paltry gain, or selfish ambition, sow the seeds of distrust, discord and ruin. I can scarcely leave the subject, it seems so terrible; but words are not adequate to express my abhorrence of people of such low degree. Feeding bees sugar, and selling this same sugar (for we know it remains sugar, if we know anything) for honey. A-i-n-t-i-t-n-i-c-e, grand, glowing, and peculiar aspirations? What a "Review!" Say, don't speak to me in the "Review"—I don't take it. If any

one wants to ask my forgiveness, do so in the C.B.J., which is the leading journal in Canada, or in the A.B.K., or A.B.J., which are the leading journals in the United States.

JOHN F. GATES.

Ovid, Erie Co., Pa.

Now, we think if you had taken the "Review," and read all the good things that Mr. Henderson has written in it, and knew him as well as we do, you would know that he is not only honest in his intentions, but is doing his best according to his judgment, in the interest of beekeepers, and we do not think that he would dream of being guilty of palming off sugar stored in combs for comb honey; but it is the opinion of some that people should be thoroughly posted in all points whether in their favor or not. We hope the article referred to will not get circulated through our newspapers, as we are fully convinced that anything that will cause distrust among our consumers will be injurious to us; and while we are convinced there is much less adulteration than is usually imagined, perhaps if we do not say too much about it, or at least speak of it in a way so that it will not be copied in our newspapers, it will be to our interest.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL,

Spraying Fruit Trees.

AT the last annual meeting of the O.B.K.A. in London the question of spraying fruit trees with poison while in bloom was discussed; and as honey bees were being poisoned in some places in large numbers by such spraying, it was thought that prohibitory legislation ought to be sought by the Association, and obtained if possible. A Committee was accordingly appointed, composed of the writer, Mr. F. A. Gemmell, and Mr. E. D. Smith, of Winona, to look after the desired legislation. The readers of the C.B.J., especially those of them who have suffered in their bee-yards from this cause, would, no doubt, be glad to hear what has been done in the matter.

As Chairman of the Committee, I first put myself in communication with the Entomologists to ascertain whether there was any objection from a scientific or entomological standpoint to the legal prohibition of spraying fruit trees with poison while in bloom. I first addressed Prof. Fletcher, of the Experimental Farm at Ottawa, official entomologist for the Dominion, who replied that he knew of no objection from an entomological standpoint, to