

when I went through them, to find, to my delight, all the stocks that had these carefully bred queens as strong in bees and with as much food as when packed for winter; even the one with twelve pounds of bees in it did not seem to have consumed any during the whole six months. The whole of the queens were laying, but not a particle of brood could I find. I examined some of them again on May 4th, when I found the strongest with seven square feet of combs filled with brood and eggs, and others, in proportion to their strength, on the 18th ult. I have not used an ounce of food for my bees this spring, nor shall I require to give any. The only thing I have done has been to let them alone.

If it is possible to practically winter our bees on nothing, and yet always have them in swarming strength, I think there are yet great possibilities in bee-keeping. I cannot in this article do full justice to the subject, therefore I shall have to take it up again when I have more time. The matter is of the highest importance, and without "hibernation" it cannot work. My contention is that the so-called dysentery is Nature's remedy to weed out in winter those bees that are constitutionally weak, and leave the fittest to survive and procreate themselves during the coming season, and that the complaint is more allied to dyspepsia than anything else.—A Hallamshire Bee-keeper.

It is, of course, very gratifying to me to find that I have at least one disciple in Britain, who believes in my hibernation theory, and that he is a bee-keeper of so much ability and experience as your correspondent, "A Hallamshire Bee-keeper." The suggestion that artificial methods of queen-rearing may have had something to do with causing winter dysentery, is new to me, and opens up a tempting field for thought and investigation, which I hope will be traversed very thoroughly by abler pens than mine. I shall watch eagerly for the fuller treatment of the subject which this writer promises, and have no doubt many others will do the same.

"All the authorities in America deny that bees truly hibernate." "America" here stands for the United States. It is the usual manner of speaking in Britain; no distinction is made between Canada and the U.S.—it is all "America." Well, it is hardly correct that "all" the apicultural authorities in the U. S. deny the hibernation theory. There are many excellent practical apiarists in the U.S. who believe it as firmly as I do. But those who regard themselves and are generally considered by the bee-keeping public in the U. S. as the great lights

and leading spirits in bee-dom, not only deny that bees truly hibernate, but do it in a manner so contemptuous, that it is not easy to have patience with them, or behave courteously toward them. You may disbelieve a theory, and argue against it, without treating it with scorn. But from Prof. Cook downwards, there is an air of lofty intellectual pride assumed in regard to this subject, which seems to imply that the authorities consider it unworthy their notice. They will not condescend to argue about it, or muster strong reasons against it, but prefer to poke fun at it, and speak lightly of it; but ridicule is not argument, and truth cannot be put down by the cap and bells of the jester.

These lofty airs of our U. S. brethren as they are so fond of calling themselves and us, are largely attributed to that national vanity which so often shows itself in their speeches and writings. U. S. bee-keepers have caught the prevailing spirit. We Hinglishmen are a lot of numskulls anyhow. We can't invent anything; and we can't discover anything—only Brother Jonathan has gumption enough for such achievements. Old Johnny Bull is in his second childhood, and must take lessons from Uncle Sam. So completely had American bee-journals and bee-men hoodwinked us here in Canada about the backwardness and old foggyism of British bee-keepers, that we did not know until Mr. D. A. Jones paid them a visit, and our Canadian commissioners followed and got acquainted with them, and Mr. Coway came over here to see us, that they are the peers of any apiculturists in the world, and can teach even U. S. authorities a thing or two.

I have been led into this line of remark partly because I read the foregoing article just prior to the arrival in the C.B.J. of the communication by the same author which so sharply, and still so justly criticises Mr. Hutchinson's review of Cheshire. If I am not mistaken, that article will stir up a hornets' nest. Personally, I am very curious to know more about that quaint old Charles II patent, and hope we shall not long be kept in suspense over the promise of something startling, which our Hallamshire friend has to say about it.

WM. F. CLARKE,

Guelph, June 29, '89.

If H.B.K. has any of those queens to spare, friends Cook, Root, Hutchinson and Pringle would, no doubt experiment with them.

#### SECOND-HAND JONES S. W. HIVES.

We have several hundred of these in stock which we offer complete with 12 frames at 70cts. each f. o. b. cars here. They have been used one and two seasons and many of them are painted.