

Raising Combs of Brood to the Extracting Super.

In an exceedingly interesting and instructive article in March "Review," Mr. Chapman of Michigan holds up the advantages of intensive bee-keeping as opposed to the claims of those who encourage the keeping of large numbers of bees on the rough-and-ready system.

While the most of Mr. Chapman's arguments are sound and logical, we are sure to differ with him in some minor points, as is but natural.

Mr. Chapman lays great stress on the desirability of hoisting two combs of brood (as much sealed as possible) to the extracting super when it (the super) is first put on. Again, in a few days, he takes out two or three more combs of brood and puts them in the upper story. While the plan has many things in its favor, sometimes, as I found to my sorrow last year, it involves considerable risk.

If we were always sure of weather conditions all would be well, but if Michigan is anything like Ontario, weather is a factor always to be taken into account.

Last season, at the Cashel apiary, we hoisted brood into quite a number of upper stories the day the supers were put on. Weather was ideal and colonies strong, but within 12 hours the temperature was near the freezing point, the bees deserted the upper stories entirely, with the result that nearly all the brood in the upper stories perished.

While this might not happen again in a number of years, yet it was an expensive experience, and likely to make the experimenter go a little slow before trying the plan again. Another point Mr. Chapman scores against those who do not use queen-excluders is that the super combs become clogged with pollen. That is my

main objection to putting combs of brood above the excluder, as I find the bees carry a lot of pollen into the super combs whenever there is brood near them. I wonder if Mr. Chapman is not troubled in this way? Perhaps locality may make the difference. At any rate, when I pressed the question on Mr. McEvoy (the greatest exponent of the plan in Ontario) he admitted that pollen went into the combs, but added that the greater amount of honey produced more than compensated for the damaging of the combs.

Some Experience (Not Experiments) in Wax-rendering.

During the early winter, as a result of going over about 3,000 extracting combs, cutting out pieces with pollen in, scraping off burr combs, propolis etc., I secured material enough to turn out 82 pounds of wax by melting in a wash boiler and pressing in a Gemmill press. The slum gum was saved until about a month ago, when, having nothing to do, I concluded to put the residue through the steam wax press in small quantities at a time, and see how much more wax I could get. We gave each batch lots of time and lots of pressure, spent nearly a day and a half over a roaring hot fire, and, when all was done, I had 1½ pounds of second-grade wax.

Oh, well, I had satisfaction anyway, and have learned, in regard to wax-rendering, that what the Gemmill press won't take out is not worth bothering about until we get some better implement on the market than we have at present. Did I save the slum gum again? Sure thing, and I imagine that Buffalo chap is just itching to get a-hold of it and take out a lot of wax from material I have handled twice over. No, friend Hershiser, you won't get a chance to poke fun at me in that style, as I shall "bide & wee" until the improved "get-all-the-wax" presses are on the market, and then