

tations. An account of your success would, doubtless, be very interesting to other ministers, and they may "go and do likewise."

---

REV. W. F. CLARKE.

AS one of the pioneers of beekeeping in "this Canada of ours," you would naturally expect me to be among the first to hail the appearance of the new bee journal instead of coming in "at the tail end of the hunt," as I fear I am doing. However, this tardiness is rather my misfortune than my fault. I have been living for more than a year past, in a rather out-of-the-way place, only visited by the mail twice a week. Through some unlucky accident, No. 1 of the CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL only came into my hands to-day (April 10) along with No. 2, and in the hope that I may have some chance of sending it to Guelph or Fergus without waiting for our next outgoing mail I pen this brief communication without delay. You have my best wishes for the success of your enterprise, and with Dr. Miller, of Ill., "I am glad you are able to squander some money on a bee-paper," though if the bee-keepers of Canada are only alive to their duty and interest, it will be well supported from the word "go," which I sincerely hope may be the case. You can rely on any co-operation it is in my power to render.

You ask for reports from correspondents. Mine is easily given. For some years I have been too unsettled to do much as a practical bee-keeper, but made a small start last summer, and have tried, with poor success, to make two stocks *hibernate* during the last winter. Dr. Miller's "baby" would state the result. 2—1. In my anxiety to give plenty of ventilation, and not counting on so severe a winter, I over-did the air supply with one stock which succumbed to the extreme cold of the last week in March. I am satisfied from this winter's experience that a much more limited air supply than I had supposed will suffice if it be only *pure* and *uniform*. The stock which has come through would, I am certain, have done better with less ventilation.

---

THE "POLLEN THEORY."

IF late much has been said both wise and otherwise about the "pollen theory." No doubt much of the difference of both theory and opinion arose from our diversity of experience. All localities do not give the same amount of pollen. To illustrate fully my meaning I will state that my bees gather so much pollen that it

becomes necessary for the safety of the stocks to examine them at least once a year and remove the superabundance of that talked-about article. I often find whole sheets of comb one-half to two-thirds, and sometimes more, filled with pollen. These in the brood chamber isolate the bees like so many boards and in that case they first suffer with cold, then eat pollen, get uneasy, move about, get up an abnormal heat, commence to breed, get diseased, foul their hives and die. On the other hand, we, I presume, are all aware that in many places pollen is rather a scarce article. Hence, many good bee-keepers, not having had experience with these two opposite conditions of things, are as far apart in their opinions as they are in their real knowledge of the facts of the cases in dispute. My queens are sometimes crowded out with pollen. Cards used exclusively in top story for extracting are burdened with pollen, they even pack it into drone combs. If our hives were of uniform size I would like to supply those who want it, for I have hundreds of pounds of pollen in my honey house which will cost a good deal of work both for myself and bees to remove from combs. All colonies here are not equally afflicted with pollen, nor do I go over all the hives annually, but sometimes I pay the penalty. I will conclude by saying that I do not consider pollen objectionable, but the superabundance of it is what plays the mischief. However, bees sicken and die from other causes than pollen.

S. T. PETTIT.

Belmont, Ont., April 11th, 1885.

You are no doubt right, Friend Pettit, regarding the difference of pollen in various localities just the same as a marked difference is often found in honey produced in places only a few miles apart. If we had hives with the superfluous amount of pollen you mention we should give the combs containing it to the nuclei building up; by this means we save them the trouble of gathering it, which our bees will not do when pollen is given them, such at least has been our experience. This may account to a very great extent for the difference in opinion on the "Pollen Theory." Mr. Heddon, we believe, deserves all or nearly all the credit for bringing the "pollen theory" prominently before bee-keepers, but if we mistake not, he is not the *originator* of it as many years ago,