

Bee Journals for Bee-Keepers.

IN THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL Mr. J. D. Evans gives his ideas as to what a good bee journal should be. Three specifications:

1. "It should strictly exclude from its columns all reports of big crops; they are seldom true, and always misleading." (Rather tough on the veracity of bee-keepers).

2. "It should honestly publish failures." (Is the truth to be told when one has a failure, and suppressed when one has success?)

3. Reports of conventions "should not be printed in full, but only a synopsis containing the practical points brought out." (But "there are others," Mr. Evans, who consider the "very best" feature of THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL its full convention reports.)

Mr. Evans further says: "I know of no journal published entirely in our interests. If the publishers of bee papers are not induced to boom the profession in order to have more customers to whom they may sell supplies, or from whom they may buy cheap honey, the desire for a larger field from which they may secure subscribers produces the same result, but would we be any better if THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL came under the control of the Ontario Bee-Keepers' Association? I am afraid not. I doubt whether we could agree as to what should be inserted therein."

In Germany, where a large proportion of the bee journals are run by bee-keepers' associations, they do not seem to differ from the bee journals of this country in this regard, unless it be that they do a little more toward urging bee-keeping for all. Whether the climate of Canada differs greatly from that of Germany in this respect may never be certainly known, unless the Ontario association should become the publisher of

a bee journal.--American Bee Journal.

We might also add the British Bee Journal to these as a good specimen of an independent bee paper, conducted by a management with whom the matter of a subscription list from a financial standpoint, is but a very secondary consideration. No paper has done more for bee-keepers, has given fuller crop reports, nor has advocated more strongly the development of the industry than the B. B. J.—Ed.

Tall vs. Square Sections Again.

E. E. Ochsner, of Wisconsin, gives the tall section the black eye in a recent issue of Gleanings. He thinks the square section looks much the best. There will always be some difference of opinion in regard to styles of sections, because we do not all fancy alike. I believe had tall sections been in as general use as the square section, many would have become tired of the looks of the tall section, and would be favoring a change to the "nice" square section, while as it is, the tall section is rapidly gaining favor with those who like a change. For myself, I do not admire a section 3½x5, as such a section when not filled out clear to the wood, looks too much like a little narrow strip of honey, so to speak, while a section 4x5 suits my mind's idea much better than any other size, but the trouble with this size is, the supers that are in general use now will not conform to this size section, and I do not believe there would be enough gained, even in looks, to advise a change to this size.—Progressive Bee-Keeper.

For sticking labels on tins, flour and water well blended and boiled, with perhaps a little alum to preserve, is as good as any.—Australian Bee Bulletin.