

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

- Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/  
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/  
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from: /  
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

- Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: /  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below /  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

# THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

"The Greatest Possible Good to the Greatest Possible Number."

VOL. VIII, No. 22.

BERTON, ONT., FEBRUARY 15, 1893.

WHOLE No. 331

## ORIGINAL CORRESPONDENCE.

OF THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

### THE HONEY BEE CONCERTS; OR ADVERTISING HONEY AT CONVENTIONS.

To some this article may seem premature, to others of no value whatever. Be this as it may, I have nevertheless concluded to present my scheme to your readers, with your permission of course, in the hope that, if not feasible, it may draw out some suggestions regarding a more thorough way of advertising the article produced by the apiarists of Canada.

Conventions generally are agreed to be a good thing in so far as they go; but they do not accomplish, by any means, all that we as beekeepers could desire, no matter how large and enthusiastic they may be. Most of us are aware that the value of a convention is confined principally to those engaged in the pursuit, and while the marketing and advertising of honey is at times discussed, nothing, so far as I have been able to learn, has been advanced except advertising it in the same manner as any other product. This is good to the extent that it is carried out; but we must remember honey is not a staple article yet, and that even printed matter, circulated from house to house, or otherwise, is not always productive of the desired effect. People have not always the time or inclination to read all that comes into their hands, and unless something of specially interest the public is devised, the sales will go on in about the same ratio as in the past.

The scheme, therefore, which has occurred to me as likely to be of considerable benefit, is that, in addition to having the usual convention, something also of an attractive character be added, in order to secure, if possible, a larger attendance of the public, that they might be instructed as to the value of its uses and benefits, as a healthy article of diet for daily consumption.

Very well; we will suppose the O.B.A. or any local association is to meet at a stated place, said town or place of meeting to be one accessible from all quarters by railway, and so situated also as to afford the best facilities for going to and from that point. A three days meeting is billed, and the evening of the second day is to be utilized for the purpose of giving a concert, to be advertised as "*The Honey Bee Concert*," the programme to consist of local and instrumental music, interspersed with brief lectures, by way of intermission, on the bee, honey, etc. Local talent or, if need be, something in the professional line, may be called into requisition, even going so far as to secure the services of a chemist competent to state briefly the value of honey as a food and medicine.

My own conviction is, that if such a course were pursued in every town at which a convention was held, the amount of honey consumed would be vastly increased, and in such a manner as would not only produce enjoyment for the public, as well as diversity for the beekeeper.

Ah, well! but how is this going to be

brought about? And where are the funds to come from? What is to be the admission, or is it to be free? etc. To be sure, these things are to be considered; but to me they are in no way difficult of solution. In the meantime, I would suggest that no convention be held in a place where some one cannot be found who will take sufficient interest to at least assist in carrying out such a measure. Again, while not condemning the way in which the association funds are being applied, I feel assured, never heard of such a course was followed, that it would not be out of place to use a portion of the Government grant for the furtherance of this or any other legitimate means for securing a better market for our production.

In concluding, it does appear to me that instead of a convention meeting and adjoining, with that kindness the Press, the Mayor and corporation may show us while assembled, and little else to remind the inhabitants that such took place, something should still linger in their memories relative to the value of one of Canada's most healthful articles of consumption.

F. A. GEMMILL.

Stratford, Jun. 27, '93.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.  
 THE "REVIEW" AND THE "SUGAR  
 HONEY" QUESTION.

I am disappointed in our American friend, Mr. W. Z. Hutchinson, of the *Bee-keepers' Review*. In the first place, I thought he had more judgment and sense of right than he has displayed on this "sugar honey" question, hatched in his paper; and, in the second place, I thought he had more courage and back-bone than to be afraid of a little friendly criticism and wholesome advice, especially when he professed to be open to, if not anxious for, both.

It was, I think, in the November number of his *Review* that he invited articles for his December number on what the beekeepers should do to "better their condition," and the correspondent, "Ire," this time, to write the "best articles they ever wrote." Thinking I could give our

American friends some good advice on this subject as to how "to better their condition," or at any rate, how not to *worse* it, I wrote Mr. Hutchinson as follows for his *Review*:—

"Your invitation to write an article on the above subject for the December *Review* is no doubt in earnest and all right; but when you tell us to 'write the best article we ever wrote,' that is probably a joke.

"My dear sir, that subject is not great enough to give birth to the best article we ever wrote. For my own part, I shall not attempt to do that in the few minutes I have to spare, and on such a subject; but I shall merely give you some plain though earnest thoughts on the proposed subject, which earnest thoughts, after reading so much about 'sugar honey' in the last *Review*, are fairly clamoring for utterance. When the pot of thought is boiling hot, and the ideas—big or little, good or bad—are bubbling up and running over, that is the time to reach for the quill and open the ink bottle. But, alas! the hand is so much slower than the head that many of them (not always the worst ones) are clean gone before they 'materialize' on the paper. A few of those left behind shall endeavour to get down in black and white.

"It seems to me that instead of telling the backkeepers what to do next, and how to do it, they ought to be told what *not* to do next and how *not* to do it! They are going along pretty fast at present already—some of them extra fast. They have, in the past, found out a great many things and inventions—useful inventions, and some of them not so useful—and they know a great deal. It is just possible, however, that they are getting to know a little too much for their own good. It is possible to have that kind of knowledge. Only a few people can stand it to know too much. They are almost sure to make a wrong use of the surplus information. At any rate, I have a private opinion, which must now be publicly expressed, that some of our American cousins—some of our beekeeping friends on the other side of the line (which most unfortunately divides us)—are actually getting to know too much for their own good, and for our good. 'Tis true, 't is pity, and pity 't is 't is true.' Now, I myself, am greatly in favor of knowledge, of progress, of science, invention, experiment, induction, deduction, and all that, and that. So true is this that I have managed—right or wrong—to get ahead of a good many people on a good many subjects in my life time. But, 'I swan,' I have a job to keep up to some of those Yankees, let alone getting ahead of them.

"Now, Mr Editor, what I am coming at and hitting at, is this 'sugar honey' business. The whole thing is what might be called 'a caution to a caliope!' Who won't have thought it? It is said there is nothing new under the sun. But here we have something near it. And it is something amusing (if it were not so serious) to note the labored arguments of some of our professional brethren to prove that honey is not honey, and that something else is honey—that the definitions are wrong, the dictionaries are wrong, the encyclopedias are wrong, the *vox populi* is wrong; and all must now be set right! And this is all to be done by one professor, one bee paper, and some other beekeepers! But a very few people sometimes may do a very great deal of harm. Even a fool may strike a match and hold it to the pile. But these people are not fools by any means, though they are at present engaged in doing a very foolish thing—in fact, 'playing with the Devil.'

"I may be wrong, but I have an abiding conviction that the beekeepers had better stick to the flowers instead of turning to the sugar barrel for honey. That is the advice I give our friends in the States, and that is the advice I shall give my brethren in Canada" (This was written in November, I have done so.) "The proposed innovation, though plausible and practicable on its face, would not help bee culture in the end, but would damage it commercially and degrade it morally. This, then, is one of the things for the beekeepers not to do, not to do or to do exactly to better their condition, but in order to make it no worse. But this, though vital, is negative. On the positive side the *desideratum* may be summed up in a few words. Reduce the cost of production, extend the market, and enhance prices by sending out nothing but a good article—a *genuine* (emphasize this!) article in clean and comely form. And instead of the volunteers themselves thinking of getting up a spurious article, let them unite solidly to exterminate the adulterator and stamp him out and down and in the earth (not quite literally—just save his life.)"

That, with the exception of two or three sentences which I have now added, is what I wrote to Mr. Hutchinson for his *Review*, and I am sorry to have to say that he lacked the courage and fairness to publish it. If I had been boring him with wordy and long-winded dissertations on this 'topic' and the 'topic' monthly, it would be different; but this was, if I remember aright, the first line I ever wrote to the *Review*, and it will probably be the last. Of course

I shall not assert that positively, for should the *Review*, unfortunately, ever fall into another pit I shall perhaps help to drag it out with or without thanks.

ALLEN PRINGLE.

Selby, Ont.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

### WALKERTON CONVENTION.

While I regret my absence from the Walkerton convention, caused by the conflict of other duties, yet I rejoice to see such unanimity and prompt action in crushing that "hydra-headed monster," which is becoming known as "Cook's Honey," or "Sugar Comb Honey." I am also glad to see that the project is not favored except by a few on the other side of the line. I notice that both Cook and Hutchinson, in the face of so much opposition, believe now that they must be in the wrong. What a pity it is that "great men are not always wise." Let us hope and pray that the "plague is stayed"; but, judging from some of Prof. Cook's correspondents, not a few would like to reap some of the supposed benefit. Judging also from some utterances on the adulteration question at the Michigan State Beekeepers' Association, then Jas. Heddon should be classified with them, in fact worse than either. I refer to the adulteration of dark honeys with glucose. Truly, the United States is rapidly becoming a "great" nation. I am glad to see that *Gleanings* is opposing, and exposing, such doings. Considering the existing state of affairs there, I think it would be better for the beekeepers of this country to help impose a heavy duty on honey, and also to secure, if possible, the special legislation proposed at Walkerton.

The last issue of the C.B.J. arrived ahead of time. I do not say this by way of complaint. A journal that arrives promptly on or before the regular time seems to score a point in its favor. I know they are prized more. Long live the C.B.J.

G. A. DEADMAN.

Brussels, Ont.

For THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

THE HONEY SEASON OF 1892.

The season just passed has been in some respects a peculiar one with us in this section of the country. We set our bees out on the 27th of April—several days later than usual, and for a short time things looked promising. Then elm and maple failed to yield their usual quota of honey; plum trees did not amount to much either, and the weather was rainy much of the time. This left the colonies so low in stores that we had to feed heavily from the 21st to the 29th of May to keep them breeding in good shape.

Then apple trees and dandelions yielded fairly for a few days, enabling them to store enough to bring them up to the 10th of June, when raspberries began to furnish a little honey. The season was very late, and clover did not yield anything of account until the 21st of the month—from eight to twelve days later than usual. On the 23rd we put on our first supers. The wet weather of the earlier part of the season had been favorable for the clover, and it came on wonderfully. The weather proving good the bees stored an immense amount of honey from this source up to the time basswood opened on the 16th July. I never saw, I think, so much honey gathered from clover alone.

Swarming was very late, I heard of very few swarms before the 20th of June. In our home yard of nearly two hundred colonies we did not have a swarm until the 28th of the month, but we discourage swarming as much as possible. A great many complained of excessive swarming, but they did not act as badly with us as they have done in some years.

We had the right sort of weather, warm and muggy, while basswood was in season; and although the bloom was not as plentiful as the year previous, still it did very well, and gave us a good quantity of honey. It failed on the 28th July, and the honey season of 1892 was ended. Bees did not gather enough after this to any more than breed nicely. We usually get a good flow

from buckwheat, but owing to wet weather when the farmers should have sowed it but little was put in. Fall flowers did not amount to much either.

As the majority of beekeepers did not practise feeding their bees, I greatly fear a heavy winter loss throughout a large share of the province of Quebec on account of swarming coming so late, and but little honey being gathered after it. I had to feed my bees an average of about twenty-two lbs. per colony to prepare them for winter. Altogether the season was very good for the advanced beekeepers, all the honey obtained was white, and of extra quality.

THE WORLD'S FAIR.

I am very sorry Quebec beekeepers generally did not stir themselves in good season and prepare an exhibit of honey for the World's Fair next year. The idea was considered by a few; but as the difficulties in the way were many, it was finally abandoned. There is no better honey produced in the world than that obtained from the rich clover fields in the valleys bordering the Richelieu, St. Francis, St. Maurice and other rivers. There is something about the climate and soil that gives it an individuality wholly its own. The beeswax here produced too, has a peculiar sweetness and rich aroma that I have never found to be equalled in wax from any other source. The province should have made a good exhibit, without question.

F. W. JONES.

Bedford, Que., Dec. '92.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

BEEKEEPING THEORIES.

SIR,—In looking over the last number of the CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL, I read with much interest the question, "Why is it?" delivered by J. K. Darling at the last annual meeting at Walkerton. Mr. Darling must have given this subject a great amount of study, for there never was so many facts crowded into so small a space before. On several occasions I have reason to complain of the very complicated way that scientific beekeepers take in

placing their theories before us, so that the novice in bee culture can scarcely derive any benefit therefrom. In my mind there are several reasons why this error occurs. In the first place, some take this course to advertise their own theories and inventions, taking good care that none but themselves will reap the benefit of their experience.

In the second place, the space devoted to such information is far too limited, and instructions are so condensed that the new beginner has to seek blindly what the writer really intended. This, I think, is the great cause of so many failures. In trying to put into practice such limited information, Mr. Darling's timely paper may be the means of remedying this defect; but after all, a practical experience is what is needed most. In conclusion, let me say that I had the pleasure of a visit to the village of Beeton last spring, and, while there, was taken through the factory and bee yards of the Beeton Manufacturing Company, where I enjoyed a pleasant chat with D.A. Jones, the great bee king of Canada, who, though not interested in the company, was kind enough to show me around the town. Sanford, Ont

JAMES BEST.

#### DRAWN COMBS FOR NEW SWARMS.

W. Z. Hutchinson is an ardent advocate for the use of foundation alone in brood chamber, where comb honey is the end desired.

His theory seems to be that a new swarm naturally runs to wax making; and if no chance is given them to indulge therein, they fill up the brood chamber with nectar, and don't utilize the sections; when, if they were given the opportunity to draw up foundation in the brood chamber, the queen would use it for egg laying, and the bees would utilize the sections for surplus stores. Such has not been my experience; but as I am one of those who only keep a few bees for recreation, probably my experience is of no value.

When I first began keeping bees, away back in 1864, among the first things I learned was the fact that bees never rear

brood in comb more than seven-eighths of an inch thick; that is in cells more than seven-sixteenths of an inch deep; while for storage of honey, they would draw out the cells as deep as room was given. Knowing this fact, I did not "catch on" to the value of the same for many years. But at last I got the idea "through my wool," that the way to get surplus stores where I wanted them, was to allow the bees to follow their natural instincts; that is, to give them only such cells in the brood chamber as they would use for brood, and at the same time give them deeper cells above the brood chamber, so that they might follow the natural instinct that always leads them to store all supplies above their brood. This I found easy enough to do, simply by spacing the combs in the brood chamber, just bee space apart, and using combs only seven-eighths inch thick. The first season I tested this matter with two colonies only, and found it worked in practice just as I had theorized it would. The next year I ran all my colonies, some seven or eight, in the same way, with the same result. Having thus, as I thought, proved the theory by actual experiment, I wrote up the matter both for our own journals and for the *British Bee Journal*. Like all new ideas it was met with opposition and scorn by many beekeepers. Not by all, though, for one or two were foolish enough to test the matter, and in their correspondence with myself, thanked me for giving them the idea, and informed me that it worked with them just as I had stated it did with myself.

That the result above stated will follow in every instance, I will not say; but it has proved itself, with myself and with others, to work in a large majority of cases; sufficiently so to prove the rule by the few exceptions. This, however, is not the only point gained by working in this manner. It places natural swarming more nearly under control than can be done by any other method, and to my mind is an illustration of the fact, that our brains were given us, not to attempt to control, or change natural instinct in the

lower orders of creation, but to so work in harmony therewith, as to really amount to the same thing.

It may seem a big job to undertake, but in practice I have not found it such. I have used combs sixteen inches deep, and had them built and sealed over, true as a board, just brood cell depth. By spacing combs wide apart, the bees are given a chance to put their stores in the upper part of the frames, and then swarm out rather than go into sections. It is advisable to leave a small patch of drone comb in the brood chamber, in order that the queen may relieve her instinct in that direction, for bees are bound to rear some drones in any event, and it is wise to give them the opportunity to do so.

I give the above for what it is worth. I have tested the matter for ten or twelve years and know whereof I write.

I only wish that others would give the matter a fair test, and ask would-be critics to do so before they condemn; but whether these critics condemn or praise will make no difference: the fact remains, and can't be disputed successfully. J. E. FOX.

No. Attleboro, Mass., Dec. 21, 1892.

---

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

### THE O.B.A. CONVENTION.

Well, Mr. Editor, the annual meeting of the O.B. Association has come and gone, and it has left a lasting impression on the minds of the beekeepers, as well as the people of Walkerton. Why, sir, I heard even the mayor and other gentlemen on the street discussing the best ways and modes of wintering bees; and the editors of our local papers remarked to me that they had a better opinion of the beekeepers than before; and our jovial friend, too, R. B. Clement, is nearly tickled to death over the C.B.J. He says it is no wonder the beekeepers know so much when they have such gatherings as the one at Walkerton and a journal like the C.B.J. He says that any beekeeper who is not a member of the O.B. Association, or does not take the JOURNAL, is standing in his own light.

To myself the meeting was a very

instructive and valuable one. In the first instance, many knotty questions which had puzzled me were easily cleared up. In the second, because I received a number of orders for my Golden Italian queens,—a number of these orders being from parties who bought of me last season. A price list of these queens will be prepared for your next issue.

A. E. SHERRINGTON.

Walkerton, Ont.

---

### ON THE WING.

Our work at Farmers' Institutes, this year, began at Lindsay; and this being the home of Mr. S. Corneil, I had a pleasant visit there. Mr. Corneil is well known as a scientific beekeeper; and not only that, but he has for years had an extensive apiary. Few of those who meet Mr. Corneil at conventions would imagine that he could take his coat off and go to work cutting out hives. I found there a well equipped, though crowded, work-shop. A good power saw and a large number of tools enabled him to do much work in the direction of equipping his apiary. He had just made a large number of bottom boards and stands of hives to be used the following season. In the bottom board was a ventilator. I did not take the dimensions of it, but should judge it was about 10x15 inches. The ventilator was covered with wire cloth, and could be closed entirely when desired. I know such an arrangement is very useful during certain seasons of the year. I suppose the reason why supply dealers do not keep such bottom boards for sale more largely is because their value is not seen by the general beekeeper, and to make them would add a good deal to the cost of the hive. Mr. Corneil has about one hundred colonies of bees wintered on their summer stands. A smoker which was shown me of that gentleman's design interested me very much. It is a difficult matter to describe a smoker without an illustration, but it had the best valve I ever saw on a smoker, and by means of a peculiar construction in connection with the holes in the bellows and barrel next the tube which connects

them, and a peculiar or rather new idea in connection with the tube between them, one gets, as the current of air passes along, increased draught. The smoker will be higher in price but an excellent one. Anyone wishing a first class smoker might write Mr Corneil; I believe he intends making up a few more than he will require himself. I regret very much that I was unable to visit the apiary of Friend Pringle, the apiaries of Miss H. F. Buller, of Campbellford; John L. Grosjean, Stanley Rightwyer, R. Lowrey, and several others. One cannot visit an apiary, especially one kept by such well-known beekeepers as the above, without being profited. Not the least pleasing of the visits are to go to the homes of those with whom we may have had differences in public or in private. As long as we are human, and take an active part in the advancement of anything, there must be the taking up of opposite views as to system, management and methods. One thinks one way the proper method; another another method. We may be stubborn and determined, yet if we are enemies, there are often good qualities (certainly the man who is a creature of mere circumstances, is anxious to conciliate every one, never there when the fire flies, will do but little harm, but will do as little good. I have no desire to be such a creature). Active as I have been in many questions there is only one which I have sometimes regretted entering into with such warmth, and that is the question as to the proper method of opening out the British market for honey. I would not withdraw all that I have said upon that question; but after taking a calm and dispassionate view, as one can take long after, I feel that opposite views were taken honestly and sincerely; all were anxious to do the best, and difference of opinion would have been better borne in private, especially as to management. It might be difficult for even an impartial judge to decide which was right. The difference has been long healed as far as I am concerned. I have received favors from those with whom I took issue at that

time, and when opportunity has offered I have shown attention. I am thankful that it is not a natural trait with me to hold spite, and if it were I doubt that Christian principles would be strong enough to overcome such a disposition.

I trust, as I have before stated, that everyone will give Mr. Pringle their heartiest support in the work which he has undertaken in connection with the Columbian Exposition. If we do not, our own industry is likely to prove the sufferer, and our own country will prove the loser. We have a noble province, one purer than any jewel in the Union; we have a Dominion with finer and grander resources than we ever dreamed of. Let us do what we can to cast a light upon them.

R. F. HOLLERMAN.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.  
SUGAR HONEY.

SIR,—In reference to the sugar-honey question, I would like to express my conviction that when beekeepers get to advocating the feeding of sugar syrup to increase deficient honey crops, they have taken up about the most effectual means possible for knocking the business on the head. The public as a rule understand very little about honey, and are most sensitive and suspicious in regard to the matter of adulteration; and if it were not for this reason and the difficulty we have in reassuring the consumer as to the natural purity of our product—that it is produced by the bees without artificial admixture—I am convinced that there would be a much better demand for and freer consumption of honey.

Many people are fond of honey who never buy it, simply because the memory of the old-fashioned ways of the grocers and dealers who used to manufacture it (?) by recipe, still lingers with them. They are impatient of the fraud—and right they are, too—and suspicious that it is being perpetuated, and so the producer of legitimate floral honey suffers to this day.

If we want to improve and extend the honey market we want to have our goods above suspicion of artificial admixture of



any kind whatever, whether of a harmless material or no. Customers may buy honey and mix it with other things at their pleasure; but I feel confident in saying that the producer who makes up a short honey crop by feeding sugar syrup, and lets it be known in his community, will have to sell his goods away from home, and hide the fact where he sells them.

For my part, I don't think you can educate the public into accepting sugar syrup honey if they know it; and surely it would give itself away in the granulation. How often we have all heard the remark passed, which Mr. Deadman, in 1st Dec. JOURNAL, makes reference to,—“I like honey in the comb, because then I know it is pure.” The consumer wants pure, naturally gathered honey, and no other; and to my mind it would be a grievous mistake on the part of the beekeeper to try to convince him that he would just be as well off with something else.

The man who learns that you are keeping bees for the purpose of palming off sugar syrup on him, will be likely to come very quickly to the conclusion that he can have sugar syrup made at home without the intervention of beekeeper or bees, and that he won't entertain such a disreputable process for the sake of the little natural honey he would get in the beekeepers' mixture.

I have for years avoided the feeding of sugar syrup as far as possible, even for necessary supplies for the bees, in order that I might give an unqualified guarantee of absolute natural purity of the honey I produce. Of course I am not a law for everyone, but I would rather starve at or go out of the business altogether than adopt or advocate the selling of sugar syrup in honey, and I think it is time for anyone to quit when procuring a livelihood in this way becomes necessary.

Perhaps some one, as he reads, is on the point of exclaiming, “There's nobody advocating this course, and it could only answer in the interest of honest beekeeping!” Well, see that they don't.

Yours respectfully,

R. W. McDONALD.

#### AFTER DINNER THOUGHTS.

Good for you, Brother Miller! You have given Brother Heddon a regular alopatic dose, and it should cure him of his adulteration ideas. I had written a few scorching thoughts on the subject of adulteration, some of which were pointed at Brother Heddon, but I will lay them away tenderly now, for you have done him up, and enough is as good as a feast. Yes: I'm glad you, boys, have got to pulling each others' ears at last to make each other quit, for it relieves me, and I can turn my thoughts in other directions while you fellows finish your job. Brother Newman is all right, it seems, on the adulteration question. It looked a little dark, though, when he let Mr. Heddon spill his mucilage on the pages of the A.B.J., telling us the public don't care if honey is adulterated, etc.; but we'll let Brother Newman off this time. He is not the only editor that has, for some unaccountable reason, allowed such cork-screws to gain admittance to their journal, for quite recently Mr. Hutchinson gained admittance to the C.B.J. in the shape of an explanation of his position on the sugar honey question: but instead of explaining he simply advocated his views at great length, pleading innocence and ignorance of any wrong motive, at the same time hugging his delusive phantom with a grip that showed determination. The C.B.J. hates the word “unavailable,” I presume; and perhaps that's why it for once got imposed upon. Mr. Hutchinson says that he thought, and thought, and thought, before he printed the hasty article in his journal. Please, Mr. H., what were your thoughts about? Did you think the rest of the people in the world were fools, or that you were running a journal in the interest of manufacturing honey? Were you an editor, an educator, or an alligator? Brother Cook is another! Like Hutchinson, his thoughts run in circles. He sometimes is, and sometimes ain't. Perhaps if he used a double decker, split-in-two-in-the-middle, sawed off hive, he, too, could not get bees enough raised in time to gather white honey, and he'd go over with

Heddon on the mouillage side of the question. Ah, me! what work! People that don't know better than to adulterate honey! How grand, how inspiring, poor Mr. Wiley, but how he must grin now. Ah! Mr. Heddon, I don't suppose you're a bit ashamed, are you? How you'd look with that cart load of honey and glucose, selling a bottle of it for medicine, or to some one for sore eyes! You'd say it was just the thing, wouldn't you? But I am letting my thoughts run on this subject again, when I had intended to say not a word more about it but let you fellows fight it out, now that you have at last got at it. It's a question of who is on the right side; as the A.B.J. wisely says, "it admits of no discussion." No sane person would discuss the advisability of going to hell. No more should a person advise us to adulterate an article and impose it upon others, and cheat them with it, simply because it can be done. A person who would do it, or brazenly advise others to, places himself in no enviable position. It's the expression of no high mind that makes the plea that, because confections and molasses are adulterated, it would be right to adulterate honey. I should say for that reason we should not adulterate honey. Because one man does wrong, is it right for another to follow his example? The man that says it is ain't a very good citizen here, and surely won't make a very good one in the hereafter.

JOHN F. GATES.

Ovid, Erie Co., Pa.

---

## WASHINGTON CONVENTION

---

### TWENTY-THIRD CONVENTION OF NORTH AMERICAN BEEKEEPERS' ASSOCIATION.

---

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 325 OF JANUARY 15.]

---

Mr. Benton's Paper.

---

It is now nearly twenty years since I called attention through the apiarian journals to the important work of Mr. Edward Case, then a director of Chancel-

lory in Bohemia, in the introduction and testing of various foreign races of bees, some of them little known and others entirely new; and shortly after the first mention of this work of his translated several lengthy articles written by him bearing on the subject. There may be found in the *Beekeepers' Magazine*, of New York city, for 1876, other notices from various foreign journals which were given from time to time by me, and in 1878 I gave a review of the subject of foreign races of bees before the Michigan State Beekeepers' Association. Again, in the autumn of 1879, I had the honor of presenting to the North American Beekeepers' Association assembled in Chicago an extended notice of the remarkable race of bees native to the Island of Cyprus. A few months later my interest in the subject led me in connection with Mr. D. A. Jones, an extensive and capable Canadian bee master, to undertake a journey to the Old World for the purpose of investigating the various races of bees which had come into prominence, as well as to discover others still unknown, if such existed; and, in case these new races seemed valuable, to import them to our own country. To many of the older members of this society the facts are familiar, as recorded in numerous articles in the bee journals; that we sailed in January, 1880, on this long journey, made visits among many of the prominent beekeepers in various countries of Europe; initiated the work of queen breeding in Cyprus, Syria, and Palestine; and also that Mr. Jones returned to America a few months later, bringing with him Cyprian, Syrian, and Palestine bees, while I still remained in the Orient. One of the conditions of the contract with Mr. Jones was that the qualities of these new races should be represented to the American public exactly as they seemed to be, and that unless, as far as could be discovered, a given race was more valuable than the bees we then possessed, it should not be offered for sale. Mr. Jones had extensive control of the races in the United States and Canada. I answered such calls as came from the continent of Europe, and

after Mr James L. England on his return trip in June, 1880, those that came from the continent of Europe; and after Mr. Jones left England in June, 1880, those that came from the British Islands also. Many of those present have also done me the honor of following me through the public accounts, imperfect though they were, of the long journey to India, and the perilous search in the jungles for the famous *apis dorsata*, the grand East India bee, of which such mythical tales had come to us. And though it is true that the illness, which was the immediate cause of my failure to get these bees here alive, resulted from an overtaxation of my powers of endurance, I am really more pleased at presenting for your inspection dead specimens of *apis dorsata* than these respectable bees would likely have been over my demise had they effected it. Mr. Jones who, it will be remembered, returned to America after spending about three months in the East, did not visit the Orient again, although he remained connected with the work. But when, at the close of 1882, I found myself obliged to leave the East on account of the effect of the climate on my health, he severed his connection with the undertaking. During the following years, with headquarters in Munich, Germany, most of the countries on the Mediterranean sea were visited, some of them especially, and stays of a few weeks or months made. The races of bees native to each country were studied and experimented with in their own lands, and in each instance queens were taken with me to other countries in order to test their progeny in direct comparison with other races, and also to secure certain known crosses for experimental purposes. Thus, eleven years were passed in foreign lands, during which I recall that once for a period of four years in succession I heard no word of my mother tongue spoken outside of my own family. It is but just that I should mention that the constant sharer of this long exile, and in these undertakings, their pleasures and hardships (generally

too many of the latter), has been my devoted wife. She often took charge of the apiary and received and cared for the valuable queens from distant countries, introducing them and preparing and shipping them on long and difficult journeys. It was her skill in this direction which landed in fine condition the first queen bee that ever made successfully by mail this long journey from Europe. And since misapprehensions regarding the possible returns from such work have arisen and often been alluded to in print, it is quite proper to mention here that it is safe to say one half the effort and expenditures put into queen rearing at home would have yielded a far better income. In fact, though I came back with more than a decade added to my years, and I trust correspondingly richer in experience, it finds me poorer in pocket and in health than when I sailed from my native land, and this even though the beekeepers in many European countries extended to the undertaking a patronage hardly anticipated in the beginning. But as the work was not undertaken on my part with the expectation of money making, I could only be disappointed in this direction in so far as the returns were not equal to the expense.

Italian bees were first introduced from Italy by the United States Department of Agriculture in 1859. The finest are found at Modena and Parma. Italians do not breed as true to color as some races, but he thought that five banded bees might be produced of good working qualities.

The Carniolan generally are best with silver gray bands; some there were yellow banded, but these were mixed with other races. In size they rather exceeded the size of Italians when filled with honey. The silver bands were hair, and, when old, the bees become black. On combs the Carniolans were almost as quiet as the Italians. When smoked slightly they hold their ground very well. In gathering they will do quite as well as Italians; they seal very well. They are good wax producers

and collect very little propolis, even in localities where it is abundant. They are very prolific, more so than Italians, but not equal to Easterns. They incline to store honey in surplus combs, therefore breed during the honey flow, and they are very strong at the close. In temper the Carniolans were the gentlest known. Mr. Benton stated that he was four years in Carniola, and never, during that time, required a veil, often taking out fifty and sixty queens a day. A little smoke alarms and subdues them; but not much should be used. This start saves much smoking, and they can be shaken from the combs more readily. If these bees are cross it is exceedingly exceptional. They lack courage when made queenless, and are easily robbed; otherwise they are courageous. Here was a weakness. He at first thought them inclined to rob. When these bees are left alone one did not notice this, but when kept with the blacks this tendency was manifest. Their wintering qualities excel all other races: especially if wintered outside, they collect compactly and quietly.

In Germany, beekeepers fed in the spring to induce early swarming. The tendency therefore was to develop that characteristic. They were sensitive to heat, therefore shading should be resorted to; surplus room should be given early. By careful selection he thought the tendency to swarm might be rooted out, and on that account he did not think American beekeepers should neglect the race. The grey Carniolan has grand properties. He did not think they would replace the Italian queens.

Dalmatian bees, near the Adriatic, were good honey gatherers and comb builders. They might be tested.

Hymetic bees have been kept there in wooden comb hives for thousands of years. In 1790 a work was written describing their system of cutting out combs and making artificial swarms. The bees were not as gentle as Carniolans.

Cyprian and other races were described. Cyprians were quick to move; they had great honey gathering qualities: they

would often gather when others got no surplus. They capped honey close, therefore they were not good for comb honey. They gathered much propolis; they are very prolific; he thought they could be turned to good account; they were exceedingly courageous; smoke had to be used very lightly; they were sensitive to light. He thought for extracted honey they possessed remarkable qualities if the beekeeper was skilful.

What about Carniolan crosses?

You break up the fixed propensity, and do not know what you get.

He had never recommended any Eastern bees in preference to the Cyprian.

Tunisian bees are from Tripoli (they are the Punic bees, as some have called them). They are the blackest bees, smaller than Italians; they fly quickly, are excellent honey gatherers, good comb builders, and cap fairly well, but not equal to blacks. They were the worst gatherers of propolis, and beat anything Mr. Benton ever saw for comb honey. They must be rejected. Their introduction would be very bad for comb honey producers. They could stand a fair amount of smoke; when once aroused they were just as bad as Cyprians, and one was more liable to accident with them than the Cyprians. He did not think they wintered remarkably well. The bees would bite as well as sting. He would raise his voice against their introduction.

*Apis flora* builds in open air; they had never been introduced west of Cyprus. The combs were very small. They were disposed to migrate. One could hope for nothing from them.

*Apis Indica*, not so large as Italians. Many were five banded and very pretty, as high as thirty pounds of honey had been reported from a hive. He thought they would be worth testing.

*Apis dorsata*, found in India. Were in 1881 first noticed by advanced beekeepers. Their appearance was very different, the workers were the size of ordinary queen bees; their movements were different to our workers; they were good gatherers; their wax was an important article of commerce. The combs were generally

suspended on limbs of trees. The cells were a little smaller than our drone cells; the drones were built in the same cells as workers, but the appearance of drones was different to worker bees. He found them not to be bad tempered, and their sting was not as painful as ordinary bees, and were awkward in stinging.

Prof. Riley, United States Entomologist, Washington, D.C., said the question which had just been taken up was problematical; yet he doubted that *Apis dorsata* would ever cross with our own bees. He had little hope in that direction, but he thought for other reasons it would be worth while to experiment.

Mr. Crane followed, dwelling upon the importance and necessity of improving our own races of bees.

Doctor Willetts, assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., said the Department was taking much interest in the beekeeping industry; and the Secretary of that Department desired him to say that they were going to assist beekeepers in the advancement of the beekeeping industry. The Department would be pleased to hear suggestions. The experimental stations would do most of the work; the Department might assist in defraying expenses.

#### AFTERNOON.

A paper by Prof. Cook was read, "Detecting the Adulteration of Honey." Prof. Cook stated we could now detect the adulteration of honey, and therefore we could convict. From work done by Dr. H. W. Wiley, Dr. Kedzie, and Prof. Scovell, honey, if only one quarter adulterated with glucose, can be detected.

Dr. Wiley then followed. He stated that an analysis of honey had been made, and doubts expressed as to the ability of the chemist to detect sugar. Fifty-eight samples were sent, and in every case adulteration had been pronounced. Some, gathered rapidly, had been pronounced doubtful. He thought he could detect sugar fed to the bees, stored, capped and examined from honey gathered from flowers. It was difficult to detect the difference, yet there was a difference. He

did not agree with Prof. Cook in this. Dr. Wiley mentioned a brand of honey found in almost every store, "McMechen's old Virginia" always adulterated. Of samples secured, forty-five per cent were undoubtedly adulterated. Pure honey does not show right handed polarization, and such samples show a high percentage of ash; from the latter alone glucose can be detected. Honey gathered from the exudation of aphides showed a slight right handed polarization. He thought a pure floral honey will have eighty-six to ninety-six per cent reducing sugar.

He tested a pure exudation from the aphides on pine trees, and found it much the same as after the bee had gathered it and stowed it in the comb. Now, if all the adulterated material could be excluded from the market (it was fifty per cent), what a relief it would be to the beekeeper. Honey should have the protection of legislation; it was strange that butter should have been singled out for protection and not other articles, such as honey. The skill of the chemist will keep pace with the beekeeper. Another adulteration had cropped up, that with invert sugar. This was more difficult, and was secured by feeding cane sugar to the bees which inverted it. Prof. Cook thought that nectar was cane sugar and was inverted by the bees. He did not think that Prof. Cook was right about nectar. He explained that at a certain temperature he could detect the difference between honey from flowers and sugar syrup fed to bees and then extracted; if honey and syrup were mixed he could not.

Dr. Wiley then explained the method of analysis. The pollen in the honey assisted in discovering the source of the honey. They had never discovered an adulterated comb honey.

Prof. Riley stated he could not see that it was possible to state that any sample was the product of honey dew. He thought the natural product would vary very much, and this fact would make analysis difficult. He referred specially to honey dew.

Prof. Wiley's definition of honey was that it was a saccharine substance gathered from flowers.

Prof. Riley agreed with Prof. Wiley. Both thought Prof. Cook would find it difficult to substantiate his position.

A. I. Root wanted to know if any one could tell the difference between sugar fed to the bees and then extracted and sugar honey. Mr. Root stated they could.

Next followed Prof. Riley upon the subject, "What the Department of Agriculture has done and can do for Apiculture." [This paper has already been published in the C.B.J. p. 320, Jan. 15.—Ed. C.B.J.]

Prof. Riley, on the principle that we had better ask for what we can get than ask for more than we can get, thought a separate division for apiculture would not be granted.

The committee was reappointed with instruction, as described.

#### GOVERNMENT AID TO APICULTURE.

The committee to whom was referred the matter of Government aid to apiculture beg leave to report and advise that the beekeepers of the United States petition:—1st, That the section of Apiculture in the Division of Entomology, Department of Agriculture, be raised to an independent division; 2nd, That in connection therewith there be an experimental apiary established at Washington, having all the appointments necessary to a first-class apicultural experimental station; 3rd, That the appropriation for this division be sufficiently large, so that the work may not be embarrassed for lack of funds.

This is the least we can ask in justice to ourselves. That most important part of our business depends on the production of liquid honey is in great danger of being ruined by cheap sugar. The chief competition of liquid or strained honey in the manufacture is cane sugar; and the recent removal of the duty on it and the consequent lowering of prices has naturally lessened the demand for honey. We find that we will have to lower the cost of producing honey in order to meet this most unequal competition suddenly thrust upon us. Millions of money are

taken from the treasury to reimburse the producers of cane and maple sugar for the loss occasioned by the removal of the duty, and our legislators entirely forget the producers of honey, whose product is but sugar with the flavor of the flowers added. We do not ask a bounty, but we do ask the Government for all the assistance that scientific research and well directed experimental work can give us in cheapening the cost of production. This is but a moiety of what is granted the sugar men. Our industry is still in its infancy, and while many million pounds of honey are already produced, the business is capable of an expansion so great as to wholly eclipse the present production of sugar from the sugar cane. Your contiguous counties have produced in one season over four million pounds of honey, and this represents but a fractional part of what might have been gathered. Vast as our business may become, the natural benefits conferred by the honey bee on the agriculturalists of this country, in the fertilization of the flowers of fruits, grains, and seeds, will always surpass in value the value of the honey gathered by the bee.

The committee have named Washington as the place for the experimental yard, because it would be most convenient; also because of the longer season in which to experiment. There may be better locations for honey, but for many experimental purposes a poor location may be best. If for any purpose a better flow of honey is desired, such a location may be found a few miles out, and a part of the bees removed to it.

Should the convention decide to adopt this report it would undoubtedly be best to have a committee estimate the necessary expense, and immediately formulate a petition for circulation throughout the country, naming the amount of the appropriation desired and the charges called for, together with a few of the reasons why we demand help at this critical juncture.

T. H. ELWOOD,  
J. E. HEATHERINGTON,  
C. HERSCHRISER.

A letter was then read from Rev. W. F. Clarke respecting the incorporation of the North American Beekeepers' Association. It was decided not to do anything hasty in this matter, but to table it with the view of taking favorable action next year. The opinion appeared to be that the Beekeepers' Union would undertake the prosecution for adulteration, and not the North American.

A. I. Root, Medina, O., stated that it was at one time intended to have a separate organization for the purpose of doing this work. He thought that the Union had better take it in hand. A resolution was passed suggesting that the Beekeepers' Union do so.

Chicago was decided on as the next place of meeting, with the suggestion that it take place during the fore part of October.

#### ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

The election of officers then took place with the following result:—

President,—Dr. C. C. Miller, Marengo, Ill. Vice-President,—J. E. Crane, York Mill. Secretary,—Frank Benton, Washington, D.C. Treasurer,—G. W. York, Chicago, Ill.

The committee appointed to report upon the spraying of fruit trees reported as follows:—

Whereas, strong evidence from various portions of the country has been presented to the North American Beekeepers' Association at several of its meetings, to the effect that the spraying of fruit trees, while in bloom, has resulted in serious destruction to bee life through poisoning, and

Whereas since the complete polarization of the fruit blossom is of the greatest importance to the fruit grower himself, and therefore the destruction of the bees, is not only a loss to beekeepers, and also a great one to fruit growers, and

Whereas, the possible benefits to be derived by the fruit growers from spraying during the time of blooming, are slight at most, therefore,

Be it resolved—That the North American Beekeepers' Association recommend the American Congress of the various States to memorialize their respective legislatures to enact such laws as shall forbid the spraying of fruit trees during the time of blooming.

A number of honorary members were then elected.

Mr. Benton, in his remarks, showed how much the *Dadants of Hamilton, Ill.*, had done for beekeeping in Europe. The book, "Langstroth on the Honey Bee," first translated into French, was now being translated into Russian.

Prof. Wiley was made an honorary member.

The Treasurer reported a balance on hand of \$69.73.

W. Z. Hutchinson received \$50 for his services as secretary of the organization. Thursday was taken up by members visiting various points of interest in Washington.

#### THE BEE-KEEPERS' UNION.

We have received from the General Manager of the National Beekeepers' Union, the following

##### OFFICIAL STATEMENT.

CHICAGO, Ill., Feb. 3, 1893.

To the Members of the National Bee-Keepers' Union:

I hereby submit the following statement of votes received up to the time of closing the polls, on Feb. 1, 1893; There were 348 votes cast.

For President—Hon. R. L. Taylor, 141; James Heddon, 136; scattering, 50; blank, 21.

For Vice-Presidents—C. C. Miller, 272; G. M. Doolittle, 270; A. I. Root, 255; A. J. Cook, 242; G. W. Demaree, 228; scattering, 248.

For General Manager, Secretary and Treasurer—Thomas G. Newman, 321; scattering, 3; blank, 24.

For Amended Constitution—289; against, 28; blank, 31.

For Salary of Manager—20 per cent., 342; scattering, 6. Back salary voted, the years being added together, amount to 566. This, divided by the number of votes, lacks a little of being twice—carrying for one year, and leaving votes for 218 over. It will therefore commence with Jan. 1, 1892.

THOMAS G. NEWMAN,  
General Manager.

## THE FOUL BROOD INSPECTOR'S REPORT.

In accordance with the request of Mr. McEvoy, the O.B.A.'s Foul Brood Inspector, we publish his report, prepared for the Walkerton Convention, *verb. et lit.* Mr. McEvoy seems to think we have done him injustice by making a precis of it. If so, it has been done quite unintentionally. The report is as follows:—

I, WILLIAM McEVoy, Foul Brood Inspector, do solemnly declare that on the 11th of May I began my official work, and finished up on the 4th of November. The orders came in very early, and I rushed things as fast as I could, and kept pretty well up with the work considering the amount I had to do and its being scattered so widely over the province. I inspected one hundred and eighty-four apiaries during the past season. These apiaries that I examined were in the counties of Essex, Kent, Haldimand, Westworth, Oxford, Middlesex, Lambton, Perth, Waterloo, Wellington, Halton, York, Hastings and Lanark, and in the cities of Hamilton, Guelph, Stratford and London.

After a careful consideration I believe that there must have been not less than one thousand cases of foul brood. I took the greatest of pains every where to explain everything very thoroughly to the owners how to cure their foul brood apiaries, and at the same time warning them that I had to burn what they failed to cure. I then expected the owners to cure their foul apiaries by my methods of curing foul brood which I believe will be followed by the bee men of every land in the near future. When I was appointed Inspector I fully expected to get every foul brood colony cured and not to have to burn one hive of bees, as it was to the interest of every bee keeper to cure and make all he could out of his bees. And I knew that if the owners did not misunderstand me, and did exactly as I told them, that they would soon cure their colonies no matter how badly they were diseased. But, oh, such a time as I had to get the colonies cured of a plague by all sorts of men was a much larger job than I ever expected. Very often I had to tack round a good deal and get the best bee keepers to go and help their neighbors or they never would have got their colonies cured of foul brood. In one locality I found an apiary of fifteen colonies badly diseased with foul brood and the combs built every way so they could not be moved, and owned by a very old lady. In such a case as that, with every thing out of order, I did not expect

an old lady of her time of life to make a cure and as that apiary was near some fine bee yards something had to be done; but to burn up fifteen colonies of bees for an old lady that could not cure was something I did not like to do, so I had again to tack around. I got a good bee keeper to buy up her colonies and cure them. The most of the beekeepers in every locality were very anxious to get rid of the disease, and many of them would down the plague in a short time, while a few others just as anxious to cure would make some of the greatest mistakes that it was ever possible to make and still have the disease in their apiaries. In some localities I went back and found where they were making the mistakes and set them right, and explained how to finish up the curing another way. I also wrote long letters to others that had almost cured, how to cure when the honey season closed suddenly, and how to prepare for and cure foul brood colonies at once in the fall, and I am very much pleased to say that these men succeeded in curing after all. Some men that had only a few colonies of bees, and these bad with foul brood, were the very hardest to get to do anything, because they had very little at stake, and if I burned their few diseased colonies their loss would be very little, while it would be a very serious thing for the owners of fine large apiaries if these few diseased colonies were not cured or burned before the bees from the large sound apiaries robbed them. Mr. Wm. Coventry of Woodstock had a large and very fine apiary which cost him a good deal of money. One of Mr. Coventry's neighbors bought a few colonies of bees that had foul brood and brought them near his in Woodstock. The few foul brood colonies soon died. Then Mr. Coventry's bees robbed them and got foul brood. Mr. Coventry was very busy and had a dread of the disease spreading through the whole apiary. He then thought it best to stamp the plague out at once by fire. So he went to work the past summer and burned up twenty-two colonies of bees that had foul brood. I was sorry to hear that, because these colonies could have been cured. In the most localities that I have been in the bee keepers that had foul brood in their apiaries complained bitterly of some neighbors having foul brood colonies that their bees robbed and then got the disease. The feeling in some places ran high on account of heavy losses from the disease. I am now pleased to say that things have settled down very nicely, and that the bee yards that were once so foul are now in fine condition. I burned one colony in Woodstock, seven in Stratford and three in the county of York between Newmarket and Aurora.



My time, car fare and livery hire amounted to \$616.30.

WM. MCEVOY.

Woodburn, Jan. 9th, 1893.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

QUESTION DRAWER.

A subscriber writes as follows —“I intended asking you for a description of a chaff hive, but the Bristol hive described in the JOURNAL of December 15, is exactly the one I wanted. I do not understand how the cover opens by means of the rope and straps of wood, which I should like to have explained more fully. The frames I am making are  $14\frac{3}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$  inches outside measurement, all made of  $\frac{1}{2}$  inch stuff. As this is a nice light frame to handle, I would like to know if, with Hill's device on top in the chaff hives like the Bristol, would they winter as well as a Langstroth? Which is the best way to work for comb honey—using wide frames on outside of brood till partly filled, and then putting them into crate as bait, or using the reversible frames without side sections? If using reversible frames, will the bees carry up capped honey below the brood, and put it in the sections, that is if there is not much of a honey flow? Is it best to take off sections directly they are all capped or nearly all capped, or to tier up? I took off ninety-eight sections from two swarms directly they were capped, and the honey is now so thick it will not drop from a spoon and is delicious in flavor. Therefore, what is the use of tiering up as the sections and cappings only get stained.

A SUBSCRIBER.

Replying to the above correspondent, I would say that the lid of the Bristol chaff hive is made to swing by nailing two strips about 5 inches long by  $\frac{5}{8} \times \frac{3}{8}$ , with upper end bevelled off like a chisel, on backside of outside body, at the upper outside edge, one at either end with highest point outward. This forms a sort of a hinge or support to the corner when it is opened. A  $\frac{3}{8}$  screw should be put in  $\frac{3}{4}$  of its length, a couple of inches from upper edge of one end of the outside body, inside at frontside, and a corresponding one in end of

corner near the lower inside front edge, and by means of a strong cord, attached to the screw heads, allows of the cover being swung back as far as desired, the length of the cord regulating the distance. When closed, the cord is inside the outside case, out of the way and out of sight. Bees should winter equally well in a Bristol hive made to take frames  $14\frac{3}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$ , as in a Bristol L. hive, but we would prefer and advise a standard frame.

Using wide frames and crates is a good way of producing comb honey, but we would dispense with the wide frames, as too much machinery, and use only the crates. Reversible frames of all kinds have about had their day. For bait sections use clean, unfinished sections left over from previous season, or what is preferable, two or three sections from another colony that has already begun work, placed in the middle of your crates. In using reversible frames we doubt if the bees would carry much sealed honey from below the brood and place it in the sections during a scant flow, but cannot speak from experience. The advocates of such frames have claimed they would, however. All sections should be removed as soon as filled, of course. Tiering up is practised to give the bees sufficient room to all work to the best advantage without loss of time.

F. W. JONES.

Bedford, Que., Jan. '93.

Why is the letter "L" like a young lady giving away her sweetheart to another?—Because it makes over a lover.

Who was the first whistler, and what did he whistle?—The wind; he whistled "Over the hills and far away!"

What great commander, after having been killed in an engagement, came home in good spirits at last?—Nelson.

Why is a candle nearly burnt out like a certain county in Ireland?—Because it is Wick-low.