

journals that such artificial comb-honey had never been, and could never be, made. Did he take this trouble? No. Then, in this also, he showed either his lack of discernment as to what is right or wrong, or that he was not then altogether certain that such honey could not be manufactured, or that he did not care for the consequences of his slander.

Therefore, by his conduct in the whole affair, he deserves the scorn of all the bee-keepers of the United States, and of all those who despise the liar and slanderer!

CHARLES DADANT & SON,
Hamilton, Ill., July 24, 1888.

From the Bee-Keepers' Review.

FEEDING BACK.

WHETHER feeding back to secure the completion of partly filled section pays, in the long run, I shall not now attempt to decide, but shall content myself with suggesting three or four points which must be maturely considered before the question can be rightly determined.

First, the honey thus produced is never, I think, of the finest quality. I always imagine it to have a flavor foreign to comb honey produced in the ordinary way; and, at least, it candies readily, which alone is likely to place it among the lower grades of honey. Secondly, when it becomes noised abroad that comb honey is produced by feeding the bees, consumers will be startled, and the markets will be affected more or less; and the sale of candied comb honey will have even greater effect upon the market. The inexperienced will buy it unawares and the purchase by them of no more honey of any kind would be a very natural result. Thirdly, to be a success, feeding-back must be done in the interval between basswood and fall flowers. When, of all the year, the weather and the bees are the most trying—a combination which makes the labor very undesirable. Fourthly, if foul brood should find a lodgment in an apiary, and remain for a time undiscovered by the apiarist, nothing else would spread it so rapidly and so effectively as feeding back.

Were it not for these troubles me matters, feeding-back to make partly filled sections available for the market, would no doubt, be profitable. To test the matter somewhat, three years since, I fed one colony extracted honey sufficient to complete three cases of sections—not sections partly filled but new sections with foundation. When completed I found I had fed 124 pounds and had in three cases 78 pounds of comb honey in fine shape. There was not a pound of honey in the brood chamber either when the experiment was begun or when it ended. In this case there was perhaps profit enough, as markets usually are, to pay for the labor involved besides leaving the colony in greatly improved condition.

Now, suppose I had varied this experiment by taking six cases partly filled, containing, say 60 pounds of honey. As the foundation would be well drawn out, and consequently the honey more rapidly stored, I estimate that the 124 pounds would have been sufficient to complete the cases and turn out at least 150 pounds of well-capped

comb honey. We may approximate the profit by comparing the expenses with the result. The 60 pounds of unfinished sections would be worth not more than the extracted honey, which being added makes 184 pounds at, say 8 cents giving an expense of \$14.72, which, taken from \$24, the value of 150 pounds of comb honey at 16 cents, leaves a profit of \$9.28, or 63 per cent. The improved condition of the bees and, the increased salableness of the product may be considered an equivalent for the necessary labor.

To insure the largest success I have found that the following several particulars must be faithfully observed.

First—If separators are not used, it will not do to put the unfinished sections into cases haphazard. The comb of some must be trimmed and sections equally worked out must face each other in order to secure shapely sections of honey.

Secondly—Fairly strong colonies of proper characteristics must be selected for the work. Italians will not do well. So far as my experience goes, a cross between the Italian and the black, with the blood of the latter predominating, rather than that of the former, is best.

Thirdly—The brood chamber must be contracted to the capacity of five L. frames.

Fourthly—The work must be done during warm weather and should be undertaken promptly on the cessation of the flow from white clover and basswood.

Fifthly—The feeders must be kept constantly supplied with honey, which, I think, should not be diluted, but fed as it comes from the extractor.

The feeders should be capacious, the one known as Heddon's is far the best—and are to be placed immediately above the sections.

By observing these hints and the dictates of sound common sense any one may, I think, attain fair success; but as I have intimated the work is not a pleasant one, and it is well worthy of consideration whether it would not be better to keep a few more colonies and thereby obtain equal results with less of wearing labor.

R. L. TAYLOR.

Lapeer, Mich., June 22 1888.

From the American Bee Journal.

Report of Some Experiments in Apiculture.

STARVED BROOD.

A DISORDER which has been quite common in several States during the past season is resultant from conditions prevalent during severe and protracted drouths, and long periods of extremely high temperature, such as has existed over large areas.

The disorder is significant and important, not so much on account of the actual numerical loss entailed upon colonies affected, which in my own case, and in many cases reported to me, have been severe, as in furnishing proof of failure on the part of those food elements indispensable during the breeding season to meet the large