

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

ITEMS OF INTEREST.

I HAVE used a feeder this last season which in my estimation puts everything else into the shade. Last fall our bees were light of money. We fed the home apiary in the usual way, letting the bees seal syrup in the comb.

The out apiary was light of honey too, so I tried the feeders, you might say with a vengeance. On about 40 hives I placed feeders, each containing about 5lbs. of syrup made of honey and best granulated sugar. I put feeders on hives when I packed them in clamp (all our bees were in clamp last year.) By the first of March some of the feeders were empty and some had very little taken out of them. I go over this apiary every two or three weeks and fill empty feeders.

This apiary is in much better condition than the home one. In the latter is one hive I marked last fall as doubtful of coming through the winter. About first of March I placed one of these feeders on this hive, holding about five lbs. of syrup, and refilled it about a week ago. It is now one of the best hives in the yard.

The qualities of the feeder are, its durability, cheapness and easy manipulation, apparently causing no more excitement than when bees are taking food from the comb in their natural state, consequently there is a much less consumption of feed, no inciting to robbing, no loss of heat. It might be termed the perfect feeder, and it is just the thing to supply hives with water or thin syrup, that have plenty of honey in the comb. If hives were supplied with water and syrup in these feeders I think it would prevent spring dwindling to a great extent.

It has been the preaching of bright lights in the fraternity that bees cannot be fed liquid food in winter without disaster. I say it is all humbug, for I have proved it so.

One more item of interest, although out of the line of bees and honey, it is nevertheless worth thousands of dollars to the country. It is a remedy to prevent blackknot in plum and cherry trees.

This was not discovered with the determination to find out but you might say by accident. It is the opinion of nearly every one that it is an insect that causes blackknot. This is a mistake, but it is a fungus that saps the very life of the tree. The remedy has been under my notice for the past ten or eleven years. As curing a tree after it has been affected with the knot is somewhat like curing consumption in the human family I am experimenting on a

young tree at present. It is vigorous and full of life (it is a cherry) and I am in hopes of curing it. Will know in a year or two if spared to live.

WM. BUEGLASS,

Drumbo, Ont.

Will you kindly give us a detailed description of this feeder.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

THE OLD HEN FOREVER!

“WHICH was the first—the hen or the egg?” Brother Jones must solve this tough problem before he introduces the hen and chickens into the bee yard. If he says the hen was first, then we ask him where she came from, if not from an egg; and if he says the egg was first, then we ask him where the egg came from without the hen's assistance? There must be no quibbling or dodging here. This is a preliminary poultry puzzle, problem, or proposition which must be squarely met and disposed of at the outset before less important matters in the art of chicken-raising are gone into. The two apiarian editors and the new poultry editor, with their heads close together, ought to be equal to anything in this line—no matter how eggs-traordinary.

With this new departure doubtless lots of our apiarists will soon be in the same boat with the rotund Teuton who found that the “poultry peesness mit the pee peesness was more brofidable as anyding.” And this is a favorable season to strike in, just about Easter time. We would also like to know just how many eggs this trio of editors put themselves outside of last Sunday morning. They were, no doubt, under the circumstances, mindful to set a wholesome eggs-ample as to how much “hen fruit” might be devoured without any serious disturbance of the epigastric region.

So much for the hen. Now, how about the rooster? Is he to find a place amongst the bees? And if so, will his ornithological derivation and genesis be forthcoming from ye afore-said editors? It seems to me (I may be wrong though) that it would be about as difficult to get a rooster without an egg as a hen, for the axiom that “the greater includes the less” ought to hold here.

I think it was Josh Billings who said he loved a rooster for two things—the crow that was in him and the spurs that were on him to back up the crow with. At any rate, the rooster part of a hennery establishment is not to be sneezed at, and don't you forget it, ye editors.