

For The Canadian Bee Journal.

PRACTICAL BEE-KEEPING.

WAX, COMB AND FOUNDATION,

IN rendering wax, I use the Jones' wax-extractor. "Old Sol" may, perhaps, do the work fairly well in his Solar extractors, but I render in the winter when I have plenty of time, and my faith is in steam for that purpose.

BROOD AND EXTRACTING COMB.

I am in favor of wiring. I do not think we can get a first class comb without it. The brood comb should be strong enough to bear shipment over a rough road heavily laden with its freight of honey, pollen, brood and bees; and the extracting comb should be strong enough to bear the stress of the extractor and of free handling when full of honey. I have never yet seen an unwired comb, unless black with age, that would meet these requirements. I therefore wire my frames, and advise others to do the same.

SECTIONS.

I have yet to see the section to suit me. The ideal section is I think, still to come. If it has appeared I have not seen it. A narrow, double slotted, grooved-all-round, four-piece section would be good, and some of those English sections described by Mr. Jones are doubtless good, but we want something better than any of them. It was thought when the one-piece section appeared that the four-piece would go to the wall, but we soon found that the best of them would persist in showing up their acute and obtuse angles inside after being put together. We want a section, strong for shipment, perfectly true, and so constructed that the foundation can be inserted uniformly even and with facility and despatch. Let us have it.

FASTENING THE FOUNDATION.

The fastening will of course be an essential part of the coming section. Meanwhile we may discuss the present *top* fastening. I got a Parker fastener some years ago but soon threw it aside and now never use it. My plan is primitive and simple and might not suit others, but it suits me. I made a wooden knife of hard wood with a broad edge as wide as the foundation. With a burning lamp at one hand over which to draw the edge of the foundation to be attached, and a basin of water at the other in which occasionally to dip the wooden knife, I can go off with the work at a very satisfactory pace. Of course the lamp is only required when it is too cool to work the wax without it.

ALLEN PRINGLE.

For the CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

The Bona Fide Use of a Nom de Plume.

IN page 425, Aug. 22nd, you touch on this matter, and as the rule "across the pond" seems to be, for each writer to sign his own name, I will just give my views on the matter, as I am one of those who prefer a *nom de plume* in preference to my own.

There are many reasons why writers prefer so

to sign. One John Smith might be confounded with another John Smith, so out comes a *nom de plume* as a sort of trade mark. Then modesty may be the reason. Others again resort to it, because they think it hides their identity and they can say things they would not like to be known came from them. These are the bad class and should not be allowed to use one, as you point out.

If I were running a paper I should tell all readers that the name and address of every writer could be had on application, on purpose to put a check to any abuse.

There is another reason which applies to my own case; where one constantly writes in his own name he is sure to have a lot of admirers. These, many of them novices, take the liberty of writing to him on some trivial question or other, enclosing a stamped envelope for a reply, no doubt thinking no one else was doing so at the same time. Now, when a batch of 100 or more letters comes to a busy man, what is he to do? He certainly cannot find time to answer them even if he does find time to write long letters to the bee-papers; if he is a gentleman he cannot be rude or discourteous, or keep the writers' stamps, so he is in a fix; I found it so when I wrote in my own name. Many wanted to know what I had to sell, and as I had nothing, not even a book, and did not want my time wasted, I had to drop my name and adopt a *nom de plume*, since which time no one thinks of writing to me on rudimentary subjects. I have no objection to all the world knowing my name and address.

A HALLAMSHIRE BEE-KEEPER.

The use of a *nom de plume* is seldom justifiable when writing on matters apicultural. In England the writer's real name is seldom given, but on this continent a man usually has sufficient backbone to come out over his own name. To letters such as the above or those of "Amateur Expert" the incognito causes no objection, the matter treated being general rather than controversial. On this continent the differences in climate are such that unless writers give their location any suggestions as to management would be useless, the reader not having a basis for an idea as to its suitability to his district. In our opinion when one of these gentlemen who use an alias gets into a controversy with one who uses his own name, the discussion loses all interest, for the first man is an irresponsible non-entity who strikes his opponent in the back from behind the *nom de plume* wall. The John Smith