

responsible for the acts of Frenchmen or Germans. We owe it to ourselves, and the nation of which we form part, to take care that the saddle is put on the right horse.

Perhaps the worst part of the article in *Chamber's* on this subject is the following in which ignorance and prejudice are alike conspicuous. "But even pure American honey itself is inferior; hence there will never be foreign competition in this article, as in the case of grain and meat." Either the writer of these words has never seen and tasted "pure American honey" or prejudice against transatlantic products vitiated his taste and prevented his forming a fair, impartial opinion of it. This continent can "stump the world" as to the quality of the honey it produces, and if the writer in *Chamber's* will visit the display to be made the coming summer at Kensington, he will be compelled, however reluctantly, to alter his opinion. He is premature in flattering himself that "there will never be foreign competition in this article, as in the case of grain and meat." There is this competition to some extent already, and it will become more keen as our honey products become better known among British dealers and their customers. The crying down of the transatlantic article is one proof that the competition not only exists already, but has begun to make itself felt. There is now the same outcry against American honey that there was against American cheese and American meat when their competition began to tell in the English market. They were branded as inferior in quality, in the same way that *Chamber's* and other journals are now trying to affix the stigma of inferiority to the honey exported from this side of the Atlantic. As the cheese and meat have triumphed over the ignorance and prejudice of the old world, so, in due time, will the honey. We can produce honey, as we do grain and meat, cheaper than our old country competitors, and before very long, it will be discovered by the general public of Britain that "pure American honey" equal in all respects to the "home honey" held at two shillings a pound, can be retailed to English, Scotch, and Irish customers at less than half the money.

WM. F. CLARKE.

Guelph, March 26th, 1886.

In saying that we shall be able to make our mark in the European market before many years, friend C. puts it just right. Our honey is second to *none* in the world. You may rest assured that the exhibit at Kensington will be of such magnitude and of such a character as to wipe out all prejudices. If we cannot satisfy the editors of *Chamber's*

Journal, *London Times*, and others of the most important papers any other way we will put our products where they can taste them, and lend them each a spoon at the same time. We shall not go there to take a second place or be cried down. Our honey, like our cheese, will be sought after and we will make such a market as will tend to largely develop the industry in this country. Every producer's name will be on his own honey. It will all be inspected before it is sent and will be taken there by *experienced* bee-keepers instead of speculators whose object is to deceive the public and make money. We are sorry that our brother bee-keepers in the United States should be accused of adulterating their honey, and we feel satisfied that they are not guilty; but when they sell their honey to large dealers who adulterate it and put it on the English market as pure, a certain amount of the blame will be sure to attach itself to the *producer*.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

DEEP VS. SHALLOW FRAMES.

QUESTION departments are meaty and interesting. They contain much instruction and food for thought. Nearly all the queries touch, with more or less force, the experience of the time-experienced, modern bee-keeper.

I was not a little interested in Query No. 60 on page 759, "Deep vs. Shallow Frames." The idea that deep frames possess advantages for wintering, that shallow ones do not, is an old one, and still believed by many at the present time. I have carried bees through varying winters 18 times, and several times in hives whose combs varied in depth between 4½ and 20 inches, and yet I have discovered nothing to convince me that the depth of our combs had any effect upon our success in wintering. I have met many bee-keepers who thought deep combs best, but upon carefully quizzing them, it invariably turned out that the idea was borrowed and that neither within their experience or philosophy had they any reason for such belief. I know one bee-keeper who has wintered on combs 4½ and 5 inches deep, for over 20 years, and he holds that these shallow combs are not only *better* for wintering but for rapid and safe brood-rearing in spring. His *yearly* success goes far toward proving the correctness of his theory and practice. I have never talked with a bee-keeper who had thoroughly tested extremely shallow combs, but