

A man selling dry goods has of course, a right when a rival store starts to announce either by placard or in person to every customer when he enters the store that so and so has started selling dry goods, but men who pay 100 cents in the dollar are not built that way. It would not be considered business, no one would care to give such a man credit, they would want spot cash. In queen rearing, if Mr. Hutchinson made a business of queen rearing why not announce when he advertises, that Brown and Jones and Smith are also in the business. He says it costs to advertise, well I guess it cost something to run a Journal. A few years ago nearly all the bee papers had a list announcing that so and so, etc., giving full name and address, had sent in supply catalogues and of course, every dealer sent it. It was a very cheap, free notice, it could be got for the price of one catalogue and a one cent stamp, worth probably nothing to the Journal. The Gould, Shapley & Muir Co., faithfully sent them and I gave personal attention to the matter. I said there's a good thing going, twenty, thirty, or forty thousand bee-keepers can have the company's address for four catalogues and four one cent stamps, a snap worth looking after. The publishers had a right to insert the notice, but in this respect I had no respect for their business shrewdness. I agree fully with Doctor Miller from his standpoint, and more, it is no kindness to draw attention to a paper which in nine cases out of ten is trying to occupy a field already well covered, which will give inferior service, and when, often the unlucky subscriber gets, after a few months nothing for his money.

* * *

Mr. Hutchinson is gravely discussing the question of comb foundation and, of course, he has a perfect right to discuss the question, just as he had a right to issue his pamphlet on the Production of Comb Honey and lead a great many astray on the best method of management to secure comb honey. He has a right to discuss comb foundation, just as he had a right to

change his views about the methods of comb honey production, but is it not just a little hard on bee-keepers for Mr. Hutchinson to publish these misleading statements, that is, if there are any bee-keepers left who have faith in what he writes. Mr. Weed has taken him to task for tending to lead the public to believe that he knew how the deep cell foundation was made, when he knew absolutely nothing about it. Just as long as there is a thick side wall no matter how perfect otherwise, so long will there be fish bone in the finished comb. Let Mr. H. or anyone else take a section of honey, extract the comb, then soak the comb in water thus getting rid of the honey, which remains. Then dry the comb and when cold carefully scrape down the side wall and close to the base he will find the side wall has never been thinned by the bees. Is this a fact—go and see—and if it is, shall we aim at comb foundation with a thin or thick side wall? Common sense will answer the question.

* * *

While I have a Review in hand I may as well express myself upon Mr. Hutchinson's view as expressed in the *Comb Foundation* following: "In hiving a swarm when producing comb honey, I would not give the queen any drawn comb (unless it might be one where no queen-excluder is used) if I were practicing contraction of the brood nest. Such comb will be at once filled with honey to the exclusion of the queen. Let them build comb in the brood frames and the reverse will be true. If we should allow comb building, or have foundation drawn out, at the side of the brood nest, we would defeat the object for which contraction is practiced, that of forcing the bees into the supers." Now is this correct? If we so express ourselves that bee-keepers understand our remarks to apply to bee-keeping everywhere, and these remarks do not then apply, we may do serious mischief. If you are producing honey for market, and wish to make dollars and cents, I do not think you can afford to use starters anywhere. I formerly used a starter that