

The Plain Section Again.

Understand me, friend Holterman, I take no exceptions at all to your holding a different view from mine. We cannot all see things alike; but I do not want our firm classed as a swindle when I feel sure you did not mean to imply that.

It seems to me you have not read carefully all I have said on the plain section and fence. If I have anywhere said that a section without bee-ways would IN ITSELF give fatter (that is, better filled out) combs, I should like to have the statement pointed out. I have all along tried to make it emphatic that the continuous passageway afforded by the fence—that is, THROUGH the separators and AROUND THE ENDS of the cleats had to do with the whole matter, if anything. Goodness gracious, no! the mere putting on of a detachable bee-way, other conditions being the same, could make no difference whatever. In the Aspinwall separator a similar condition was secured, but in a different way. Now, do not misunderstand me this time. If we use a solid separator, and cleat it, making the cleats $\frac{1}{2}$ inch wide, as thick as the old bee-ways in sections, we should have the same kind of comb filling, with this one exception that the bee-ways in the one-piece sections are narrower than in the four piece; and insofar as the latter are wider, there will be less of a tendency for corner holes; that is to say a four-piece bee-way section, with plain separators, solid clear across the face of them, would be filled out exactly the same as the plain section opposite the solid cleated separator. The only difference between the two conditions is that in one case the bee-ways would be on the sections and in the other on the separators.

And again: I think you have not read carefully what I have said regarding tall sections. If I anywhere claimed that a box taller than broad is better filled out than one square, other conditions being the same, I should like to be shown the statement. You will not forget that the United States is very broad; that we are not manufacturing goods for Ontario, Ohio, California or any other section of the country. York state calls for tall sections; Ontario has a little fad all its own—sections just $4\frac{1}{2}$ square, but only 7 to the foot. To say that these were a "humbug" or all "nonsense" just because they are a

fad in Ontario, and because we in Ohio use $4\frac{1}{2} \times 1\frac{1}{2}$, would, to say the least, be hardly fair to you Canucks. It seems to me that in all these matters, even if we cannot all see alike, we should have charitable feelings for the opinions and practices of those who differ with us.

I am glad that what I have said above, cannot be construed as coming from mercenary motives. There is a "big wall" over which the A. I. Root Co. cannot very well climb.

Yours, etc.,

THE A. I. ROOT CO.,

E. R. ROOT.

[The above is written in the form of a letter, and as it may throw some light on the other side of the new section and fence question, we take the liberty of publishing it. Friend Root appears to think my remarks were especially directed at him. Such is not the case. It dealt with the question at large. When I said that the plain section was "a decided humbug" I used the term in the sense of it being a piece of nonsense or folly, and I still think it a mistake. Time will tell. As to the narrower section, I believe it is not a fad but good common sense, and time will show that, and I believe is showing that it is a move in the right direction, as when at the North American Bee-Keepers' Convention, at Albany, some years ago, the commission men told you to take comb honey in narrower sections. I am not even going to allow you to call it "a little fad" without a protest. How would this read:—"Ontario has the good sense all its own to use sections $4\frac{1}{2}$ square, but only 7 to the foot." But just let me tell you you are all wrong. We use and have used for many years, more $1\frac{1}{2}$ sections than all the rest put together. There are great responsibilities resting on an extensive and influential bee supply company, and I always think one is to be careful about changes in the construction of goods. Let the path be reasonably firm before you tread it. The above is doubtless an honest difference of opinion, and I am only advising to the best of my judgment. —EDITOR.]