

ed for sale in large quantities, and labeled "extracted honey."

After an experience of about five years in producing and selling honey I cannot help entertaining the belief that the word "extracted," as used in connection with honey, has worked an injury to the honey trade that it will take long years to repair, and created a doubt in the minds of the majority of consumers, that will require much time and patience on the part of the honey vender to explain away.

I can well remember when a boy, that jars of clear "strained" honey were looked upon with an eye of pride, and their contents prized as a toothsome article in many a farm-house. More value was attached to it than to that much comb honey.

I have not written this article for the purpose of calling out any discussion upon the subject, but simply from a humanitarian stand-point. Should it set some genius to thinking, who might be able to hit upon a plan by which my favorite article of diet could be lifted from the mystery and doubt which at present surrounds it, I shall feel highly recompensed.

W. J. CULLINAN.

Kansas City, Mo.

From The Michigan Farmer.

GIVE US A CHANGE.

PROF. H. M. Wiley, apparently grown profoundly weary of the charges rung upon the "wilful lie" and "Wiley lie" by the *American Bee Journal* and their iteration by other apicultural journals, has written to several of them a plain, frank, gentlemanly letter, explaining how he came to make the statement relative to the adulteration of honey which has got him into such extremely hot water—a statement made upon the authority of an eminent chemist since deceased, and in part at least corroborated by chemical analyses both in this country and Europe. The bee papers have published this letter, which is certainly as much of an *amende honorable* as any man could well make, with comments which are hardly, in our humble judgment, at all called for. The *American Bee Journal* admits that honey has been adulterated, but alleges it is not done now, simply because the price is so low it does not pay. Prof. Wiley's article in the *Popular Science Monthly*, which stirred up such a bees' nest, was written in 1881. Both charge adulteration, but differ in how it is done. It makes little difference to the consumer how he gets his glucose, if get it he must.

Samples of honey from a well-known bee-keeper were reported after analysis as "apparently adulterated." Further samples were asked for and indignantly refused. Both rogues and honest men can work the "indignation dodge;" it would have been better to have forwarded other samples and stood the test. Yet the *Journal*

says "the component parts of honey vary so much that few, if any, can positively determine, even by analysis, the purity thereof." If this be true—and the *Journal* would never fall into those "Wiley ways" it has so often denounced—adulterated and unadulterated seem to stand on equal chance, and it is a clear case of "great cry and little wool." The *Journal* says honey has been adulterated, and that adulteration is difficult to detect; Prof. Wiley says honey has been adulterated, and chemistry has detected. Either way the public is heartily tired of the unprofitable controversy—which on one side at least, reminds us of the minister's best sermon, which he always preached when he did not want to write a fresh one—and begs, with due humility, for a change.

We do not publish the above because we think it is at all appropriate, but more to show what outsiders think of the matter. The editor of the *Michigan Farmer* seems to forget that it took nearly eight years to get the *amende honorable* it now talks of.

SUNDRY SELECTIONS.

A GOOD REPORT FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE.

FRANK WILKINS.—Bees came through the winter in very bad shape, but all swarms that were strong enough for the white clover have made lots of honey and swarmed once each.

Pelham, N. H., Aug. 8, 1888.

THOMAS SMITH.—My bees have not done much this year; only one stock has made about 20 lbs. of comb honey, and that stock I did not allow to swarm. I increased quantity two-thirds by artificial swarming.

Durham, August, 1888.

GATHERING HONEY FROM FIELD BEANS.

HENRY PARKER.—This has again been a poor honey season. White clover was no better than last year, almost a failure. Basswood was also a failure here this season; the trees seemed to be diseased; the leaves were covered all over with little knots or warts; a great many of the flowers were blasted. There is, at this date, quite a lot of honey coming from field beans and white clover. Field beans are a good thing, as the honey comes directly after basswood. The drought has affected the crops here very little, and things look fair for a fall crop of honey.

Aug. 6, 1888.

TOO MUCH RAIN.

JOE BLAIS.—As you welcome reports from your subscribers, I beg to say that mine is only half satisfactory, compared with last year. I lost 40 per cent. in wintering, mostly from those out doors; started in the spring with 33 colonies.