

placed over a colony of bees as soon as they are hived without any comb below is liable to cause the bees to put pollen in the sections, but if there is some comb below and a perforated metal and wood division board this will prevent them from placing pollen in sections. Sections filled with comb put on before the honey flow starts are liable also to be filled with pollen, and some of our best comb honey producers call them pollen catchers or pollen traps. Two supers may be placed on a hive the one next to the board with foundation in the sections and one above with comb. In this way there is less liability of getting pollen in your sections. After the bees commence putting honey in sections those filled with comb are an advantage, providing it is snow white comb. If it has got soiled by age or being held too long for the bees to travel over, it should not be used, as the beautiful appearance of your comb honey might be injured.

For the Canadian Bee Journal.

#### A Review of Mr. Doolittle's Article.

**M**R. Doolittle's article "Working for extracted honey," although no reply to the query of Mr. Trowbridge, may be fully as valuable as though it had informed the reader what its author "does with the parent stock, also what is done with the new swarm."

Mr. Doolittle fears that there will be too great a proportion of comb honey produced; that there is a "craze" among bee-keepers just now upon the subject of comb honey production. I know that we Americans are given to "crazes." We bee-keepers "went crazy" over the honey extractor and injured the honey market as a result. We are now recovering, getting back upon safe ground, but I hardly think there is going to be any such rush into the comb honey branch of bee-keeping as to warrant the application of the word "craze." If there should be a craze upon comb honey production it would work no injury to bee-keeping as did the extracted honey craze. Mr. Doolittle's comparison of wool and butter raising is not an analogous case. The price of one has but little influence upon the other, while the prices at which extracted honey is sold has an influence upon the price of comb honey. As Prof. Hasbrunch says: "Extracted honey must always compete with similar sweets, such as sugar, molasses, syrups and glucose and the principal recommendations will be its novelty or cheapness; while it is weighted in the race

for popularity by its inconvenient tendency to candy, and if it does not candy it is immediately exposed to the suspicion of being adulterated."

In years past and gone, large quantities of extracted honey, some of it unripened, competed with other similar sweets in the race for popularity. Extracted honey came out behind. Prices went down, from 25 cts. to 6 or 7 cts. and, in its tumble, extracted honey dragged comb honey down with it to a great extent. Then the lessened quantity of comb honey enabled it to rise. If Mr. Doolittle, or anyone else, anticipates a rise in the extracted honey market as the result of what he terms the present craze in comb honey production, they are more than welcome to take advantage of it.

In the next paragraph Mr. Doolittle lays too much stress upon the importance of having prolific queens. I am aware that Mr. Doolittle is not alone in holding this view, and, perhaps, with the methods employed by himself and some others, prolific queens are an important factor, but where is the policy in employing such methods and fixtures as necessitate the use of unusually prolific queens and call for a large amount of manipulation? Did queens cost three or four dollars, there might be some sense in urging them to their utmost capacity, *i.e.*: if it did not wear them out all the sooner, but when the cost to the honey producer is almost nothing, why not have enough of them so that the capital (hives and combs) may be fully employed without any worry about prolific queens or any shifting and changing about of combs? Some one (I believe it was Geo. W. House) has said: "Other things being equal one queen is as good as another." These may not be the exact words, but it is the idea, and I agree with it. I value a queen, not according to the number of her workers but according to their characteristics. Of course we must have numbers, as well as valuable qualities in bees in order to succeed, but numbers can be more cheaply obtained than by employing prolific queens and manipulation. I do not value populousness per hive or colony so much as I do populousness per comb. Mr. Doolittle used one expression with which I most heartily concur, *i.e.*: "Good queens are only of value when we surround them with favorable circumstances."

I agree with Mr. Doolittle that the way to raise extracted honey, as indeed it is to raise any honey, is by the tiering up method. I, too, prefer to use frames in the supers that are the same size as those used in the brood nest, but I would have all the combs only half depth, *i.e.*: one-half the depth of the brood nest. If Mr. Doolittle would adopt such hives and supers he