

is warm enough for easy and clean work, if the knife is a good one so as to be sharp and in fine order. Not all the knives in use can be sharpened to perfection by every bee-keeper. . . The sharpening of a knife is a work of art. Bingham knives, that he makes, depend on the fineness of the steel for their cutting ability and quality and for holding an edge at a low temperature. Beveled knives should be sharpened almost entirely on the beveled side. I have found an ordinary scythe stone, kept wet, to be the best to sharpen my knife. Select a fine smooth stone from a lot that are straight and smooth, and keep it exclusively for the purpose. No knife can be sharpened nicely on an uneven stone. One might suppose that such a stone would not give an edge fine enough for the purpose of uncapping, but it does on the knives I use. My opinion is, that with a good knife well sharpened, hot water is vastly worse than useless in uncapping sealed combs."

No doubt there is a deal of truth in what Mr. Bingham says relative to some not understanding how to sharpen a knife; in fact, I am no expert in that line myself. Nevertheless, I am inclined to think that the quality of the knife is often to blame for the trouble. About the time Mr. Bingham first began to make his knives, my grandfather and great-uncle both purchased a knife from the maker direct. These two knives are still in the neighborhood, and I can, with little trouble, keep them in first-class order. Not so, however, with three or four other so-called Bingham knives purchased by myself during the past seven years; even professional knife-grinders cannot put a decent lasting edge on them. The two

knives mentioned are not in my possession, and the parties owning them will not sell them, else I would soon have them, even if I had to pay double the price of new knives. I may as well admit that Mr. Bingham's article in the Review has aroused my curiosity and led to some correspondence, and I hope ere another season to have some knives as good as those two of twenty years ago.

While the writer cannot agree with Mr. McEvoy as to the advisability of re-queening each colony every year yet there is a great deal of truth in what he and Mr. Hand have to say in February C. B. J. While my experience has proven to my satisfaction that nearly all queens are as good the second year as in their first, after the second year a large percentage begin to fail. While it is my aim to replace all queens of this age with young stock, yet my intentions are not always carried out, and I freely admit that we have lost considerable in the past by having too many queens in our apiaries. I have an idea that there are others in the same category, and, this being the case, radiation in the articles on the subject, as, for instance, those of Messrs. McEvoy and Hand, should prove of real benefit to the fraternity. One paragraph in Mr. Hand's article is especially good, and should be written in letters of gold and hung up in a conspicuous place in every apiary. I refer to the following:

"We may talk about feeding, and spring stimulation, and juggling with combs, all of which may be all right in their place, but we can't dodge the fact that our success or failure is more dependent upon the queen than upon all else."

Speaking
minds me
has to say
the discuss
convention
last. He
Evoy, S. D
R. F. Holte
pronounced
feeding."
tion, and n
lot of mist
constitutes
For instanc
tion of the
who, as I
displayed
ment in th
upon the qu
declared,
scores of ti
stimulative
bloom was
three old be
very extra
Dickenson
al, but I h
is pretty
friend McEv
house is a
tion in the
interpreted by
ar as friend
ed, honestly
he stands on
wish to r
ere many
ention, the
er, who ai
with the ide
feed the
at occurs
over, in me
wise to fe
rather in th
estion; cer
ce has de
uring the