

without metal corners, and much prefer these. It may be because I am used to them. I can open hives and handle them as readily or quickly I think. With the late improved methods frames are not handled or hives opened as much as formerly and I expect to see these frames more generally used.

In my paper read last spring I called attention to the Heddon hive and the new system of management and to the use of shallow hanging frames. I have used these frames in shallow cases for brood chamber the past season (frames four and three-quarter inches deep) and they have fully met my expectations.

We are learning more each season in regard to the importance of formic acid in ripening honey. Now those who extract as a general thing do not do so until combs are capped and contents well ripened in the hive. As a result extracted honey will give better satisfaction than it has in the past when green, unripe nectar was removed as fast as gathered. Such honey soon fermented and lost its flavor. It has been lately claimed that the legitimate use of bee-stings and poison is not for self defence, that stinging is a mere side issue so to speak, that its principal use is to inject the formic acid into the cells of honey and to pierce the cappings of sealed honey for the same purpose. From what is already known this looks reasonable. We know formic acid is a preservative, that it changes natural sugar to its inverted form. That honey is partly digested by it, that many of the medicinal effects of honey are due to its presence and that in its nature it is similar to carbolic and salicylic acid. Had I time I would also like to describe Simmin's new non-swarmling method, which may be of great value; the new Chapman honey plant which has been approved by the committee appointed by the American Bee-keepers' Society to test its merits; the exhibit of honey lately made by the Canadian bee-keepers at the Intercolonial Exhibition held in England; the new Solar wax extractor now used and praised by prominent apiarists, also to call attention to other topics of equal importance.

SAMUEL CUSHMAN.

Pawtucket, R.I.

For the Canadian Bee Journal.

INFLUENCE OF THE PRESS.

THE press of to-day occupies a far more important and powerful position in society than did the orators of Greece simply because its influence is more durable and extensive. The voice of the speaker, though it may carry conviction and sway the feelings and minds of the crowd, has only a

momentary effect, but let the reporter transfer the hot thought to paper and a permanent impress is conveyed to the minds of millions. The words and thoughts of the orator die with the occasion, but the reader carefully engraves them on his memory in the recess of his reading room. Verily might Wendell Phillips exclaim to the angry mob, "howl on I speak to thirty million here," turning to the reporters. The Professor Wiley lie, circulated throughout the extent of our land through the medium of our powerful dailies, is yet accepted as gospel by a great portion of people with whom I have come in contact. Some of them say, "What cannot human ingenuity now accomplish in the way of imitation?" Others, again, who know that Wiley has confessed it to be a pleasantry, say that the honey men brought pressure to bear upon him to write the confession. The merest tyro in apiculture is struck at the lamentable ignorance displayed in the conversation of those unacquainted with the profession. It simply illustrates the saying that "there is no royal road to learning." The influence of this "scientific pleasantry" is far more widespread and injurious in its effect than most of our apiculturists will admit. Newspapers are always on the hunt for items of sensational interest and an experience on the staff of one of the New York dailies disclosed to me the fact that a reporter without a lively imagination was out of his element. When an item appears in any newspaper detrimental to our interest it would seem to me that our duty is to contradict it immediately in the same. About three years ago a chemist named Norton, attached to one of the grape sugar works in the city of Detroit told me in an hotel on Michigan avenue of an apparatus which he claimed to have used successfully in the manufacture of artificial comb honey. He claimed great results from it and said that one party in Chicago made the small sum of \$4,000 by its operation in one year. He asserted that starch, glucose and honey, were, if I remember, the ingredients which were inserted into the artificial comb. The moulds and everything necessary for successful manufacture of the artificial comb honey he said he would sell for the small sum of \$100.00—a little smaller amount than A. I. Root offered for a similar invention. Mr. Root can easily find out Mr. Norton's address, but probably the latter may want more than \$100 if he hears of Mr. Root's generous offer of \$1,500 for a comb honey manufacturing apparatus. Mr. Norton appeared to me to have been deeply affected with the Wiley sensation, and therefore fancied that the operation really could be performed, but it seemed strange to me that Mr. N. did not avail