

enterprise. The result has not been quite satisfactory.

Mr. Hutchinson evidently feels that he is in a dilemma—if not exactly “between the devil and the deep sea,” between the devil (sugar-honey) and a host of belligerent scribes—and he makes “a suggestion,” actually inviting the very discussion which he is at the same time trying to choke off. He advises every one who wants to write on the subject of “sugar honey” to “go to work and prove that sugar fed to bees does not become changed into honey, just the same as the cane sugar in nectar is changed into honey.” I am a little surprised to see the usually keen and astute editor of the *Review* falling into such a logical absurdity as this. I take it as evidence of a bad case. He wants us to prove “that the sugar fed to bees does not become changed into honey”! Now, “mein freuit,” no man is bound by the rules of logic to prove a *negative*; the affirmative must make out its case. The *onus probandi* rests on your shoulders, Messrs. Hasty, Cook and Hutchinson! When you affirm that sugar fed to bees is changed into honey it is your business to prove that it is, which I think you have not yet done, and which I think you never will do. Do not call upon us to do what you are bound by all the rules of logic to do yourselves.

Selby, Ont.

ALLEN PRINGLE.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.
UNITING SWARMS TO PREVENT
INCREASE.

It does not look much like swarming here at present, as we have over two feet of snow on the level, and more coming; but it is better to be prepared for swarming before the bees are ready to swarm.

During the summer of 1891, I hived a second swarm on empty frames and they filled their hive about three-quarters full of comb and had honey enough to winter on; but during the spring of 1892 I fed them some, and by swarming time they had their combs full of brood, and were filling up the remainder of the hive with comb.

I thought I would try and unite my first

second swarm of 1892 with them, and see what they would do.

On June the 20th I got a second swarm, and hived them in an empty box, and the next morning I smoked the '91 second swarm at the entrance, and dumped the '92 second swarm in front of the hive, and drove them in with smoke and put on a super of 24 sections. In two weeks they had that filled with nice white clover honey. If I had added another super in time I would have secured two, perhaps three supers of honey from them; but a neighbor wanted to buy a swarm of me, so I let them be, and on July 14th, twenty-three days after I united the second swarm (about three pounds of bees) with them, they cast a swarm weighing over seven pounds. Now, if two small swarms will do that well, why will not two large swarms do better.

This year I am going to try it. When hive No. 1 swarms I will hive them in a new hive, and when No. 2 swarms, hive them in any clean box, and the same evening or (better) next morning, smoke No. 1 (old colony) and unite the swarm of No. 2 with them, and when No. 3 swarms unite them the same way, either with the old colonies of No. 1 or, No. 2, etc.

Last year I united two second swarms; from some I got twenty-four pounds of honey in sections, and they had over thirty-five pounds to winter on. The above may well satisfy the swarming impulse and also prevent increase without outting queen cells. Always put on an empty super with starters of foundation in the sections.

On the old colonies that the swarms are united with, I am going to try the above plan, and will report my success or failure to the C. B. J. next fall.

I put my bees in the cellar last fall on the 12th November. A few of them have diarrhea, but the rest are comparatively quiet.

I like the stand the CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL takes on this sugar-honey business.

Yours, etc.,

JOHN M. SEILER.

Chauhassen, Minn., March 1st, 1893.