

to induce early swarming." It is true that in the heath districts of North Germany stimulative spring feeding is largely practised, *Stampf honing*, that is, honey obtained from crushed combs, and therefore containing much pollen, being used and well recognised as the best for this purpose. But I was referring to Carniolan bees, and the practices in Carniola (Austria) itself, so that it should read:—"In Carniola beekeepers feed in the spring to induce early swarming."

It was a mistake, I think, to credit me (p. 355) with saying that "Cyprians gather much propolis," for I only meant to indicate that they gather more than Carniolans. In reality, I do not think they fool away any more time with their glue-pots than do Italians.

The Tunisian bees mentioned in the next paragraph, on page 355, were the ones referred to as the daubers of propolis; and instead of "beating anything Mr. Benton ever saw for comb honey," as Friend Holtermann has put it, "they beat anything I ever saw for daubing propolis over their comb honey, and over sections, frames, etc.," and this is one reason why, in the next sentence I stated that "their introduction would be very bad for comb honey producers." Instead of saying:—"Tunisian bees are from Tripoli," I said, they are found in Northern Africa, from Tripoli westward. In temper they are, says the report, "just as bad as Cyprians." I believe I said ten times as bad as Cyprians.

I was not a little chagrined to see in the CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL for November 15, 1892, page 249, ideas attributed to me which are twisted out of all resemblance to their original form. I promised myself that I would correct them, but a favorable opportunity has not presented itself until now. I am reported as saying at the Chicago meeting of the Illinois State Beekeepers' Association, "that beekeepers need not look for new discoveries of any consequence in regard to other and better races of bees than those now possessed," and that personally I "thought *apis dorsata*

would be no acquisition even if it could be acclimated." At the Illinois convention I had nothing to say about foreign races of bees except in reply to questions directed to me personally. And I made *no statement whatever* to the effect "that we may not look for new discoveries in regard to other and better races of bees than those now possessed." Indeed I believe I am quite as hopeful of progress in this line as is any one in the world. And I am sure I would be the last person to advocate the experiment of procuring and testing *apis dorsata* if I did not think there was considerable prospect of its being a valuable acquisition.

FRANK BENTON.

Washington, D.C., Feb. 24, 1893.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

HUTCHINSON'S HASTY TAFFY.

Hasty indeed was the action of my old friend, Hutchinson, when he published that article in regard to the feeding sugar syrup to produce an article equal to honey. How any one can call such an article honey, I understand not. From the earliest days we have understood that honey is nectar gathered by bees and stored in combs, undergoing various processes until, when ready to be sealed, it becomes honey. That, first and always, it must have its source from flowers has not only been recognized by beekeepers, but every one has conceded this. We have had controversies as to whether it was digested nectar or not. True, but we have always felt sure that it was at least nectar first. I myself have for many years felt, not that it was digested nectar, but nectar which had undergone partially one stage towards digestion, and which had been partially evaporated. The "most unkindest cut of all" our worst enemy has ever given us, has not for a moment deprived us of that definition of honey. What, then, shall we call this product? Let no one ever pollute his pen, his voice, or even his mind by calling it or thinking of it as honey. Rather call hog and beef fat, butter; rather call cotton seed oil,