

new outlets for the product. The reasons why less comb honey has been produced than extracted are many. Let me give a few which I believe to be leading ones: It requires more experience, our methods of producing it have been such that it has been unnecessarily difficult to procure a first class article, and the result has been a large percentage of unsaleable honey, and much that is not satisfactory to the customer to handle. For some time I have felt that the best and cheapest way to produce comb honey might be by the separator. Last year's experience with running about thirty colonies for comb honey convinced me of this, and if any additional testimony would be necessary I received it in abundance from extensive bee-keepers when I attended the Annual Meeting of the N. American Bee-Keepers' Association at Albany, N. Y., last December.

With the system without separators there is no method by which you can safely take out half the sections when completed, and move together the other half to be completed. Bulging combs we know prevent. The finished sections are more readily injured by the inexperienced retailer, and this defect is an argument against the handling of it by some retailers. By using separators one can remove finished sections, and as there are no bulging combs, crowd the filled sections together, and finish the crate with more partially filled sections from other supers, or put the nearest completed sections in the most favorable position for completion, and empty to finish the crate. Appearance is a great deal in comb honey, and the importance of removing every section when complete cannot be over-estimated, especially when honey is coming in slowly. I am not advocating doing this when the flow is good, though I advocate being in a position to do it when necessary. If we could only estimate the amount of money lost to bee-keepers and the country by having excellent honey in bad state for market, the figures would startle us. We have all seen honey brought to market in the crates from the hives, brace combs and propolis never removed, and the sections built in such a shape that they could not be removed without breaking several, and we all know well that that honey will have to be sold at a sacrifice. What is worth undertaking is worth undertaking. Well, let us apply it here. There is no perforated metal honey board required for taking comb honey. It is an unnecessary expense.

R. F. HOLTERMANN.

Brantford, Ont.

Concerning Sugar Honey.

MHE *Review* once said that a bee journal can excel only in bee literature, and advises us to draw down

our faces and seriously shun all and every appearances of laughter, wear green goggles and a massive bandana, and be strictly conventional in each and all of our ways of life. Wal, I hev hunted Hippocrates for nigh onto 40 years, and each and every such animal I have found in just such a hole as the above. Mr. Review look at that sugar-honey article you printed lately. Why didn't you haul off and give its anthor one right under the north-east corner of his eye, and give him to understand at once and forever that your journal was not that kind.

Mr. Hutchinson says: "while he has not a particle of doubt that a bee-keeper experienced in 'feeding back'"—hold on, Mr. H., you mean "experienced in deviltry,"—could, with sugar and honey at present prices, produce comb honey. No, that's hypocrisy, again—you mean comb sugar, at a profit by the feeding of sugar. Hold on, three lines back you said sugar and honey; yet you say you are not ready to advise such a course, etc. No, you aint quite ready, are you, Mr. H.? You say "the publication of the Hasty article has been compared to the Wiley *pleasantry*. You say what Wylie wrote was a *lie*—what Hasty has written is *true*. Blamed it I can see the difference between telling a lie and selling a lie. The *Review* says the only question is, whether it was policy to tell the truth. Yes, sir, you should cultivate telling the truth at all times. But was the *Review* trying to *mix* its truth, gently leading its readers by degrees to look upon adulteration of honey as innocent *pleasantry*, as he calls the Wylie lie? Such *pleasantry* has caused bee-keepers much sorrow, and it comes with ill grace from a man who makes fun of innocent, plain reports from bee-keepers, because said reports are not couched in high phraseology, but simply tell their little story which is dear to them. The *Review* says the Hasty article might do hurt if it got into the newspapers in the same way that the "everlasting clack" in them about adulteration prejudices the public against honey. You don't think so, do you? and who but yourself, Mr. Hutchinson has given them more of that "everlasting clack"—about the worst kind of adulteration—and then with jovial complacency you say—but among ourselves—in our own family—in our own class journals—it does seem that a man might speak his mind freely? Oh, verdancy!—let's say that again—let's see—among ourselves in our own family—in our own class journals. Draw the curtain—go behind the scene—mix the honey and sugar—mum's the word. Hold on, the *Review* aint quite ready to do it yet—let's talk it over among ourselves, in our own family, etc. Newspapers are fools—we can keep this