

factors of the problem into consideration, I think much of this ado about preventing increase is more otherwise than wise. My own practice is to let one swarm come from each colony if they want to, and if they don't want to they can stay at home. Nor do I ever find myself under such a system overloaded with bees—winter losses being only from two to six per cent. The fall "doubling up," when every queen who falls below the mark is weeded out, and the spring "doubling up" of any weak colonies, together with sales, generally keep stock down to the desired number.

But the question still remains, how to prevent increase when such prevention is really desirable. That the prevention of after swarms is as desirable as such swarms are unprofitable, will hardly be questioned. As to how to accomplish this we mostly all have our own ways of working except the novice who is always looking and asking for ways. Our English cousin Simmins has his method, and our American cousin Heddon has his, both before the public, and still the cry comes up, "How shall I keep the swarms back?" With the former method I am practically unacquainted, as I have never felt the necessity of using it. The latter I have used somewhat, with success and without success. I neither endorse nor condemn either of these plans or any other, but simply outline the method I pursue myself, which is good enough for me, at any rate.

I urge the queen to do her best, by supplying favorable conditions, up to the honey flow or first swarm. I then put the whole of the working force of bees in the new swarm on the old stand, give them the sections or extracting story off the old hive as the case may be, and keep them so busy at work that they have no time to think of swarming. The queen is of course confined by means of the perforated zinc to her brood chamber on about six Langstroth frames or their equivalent of some other size. Then I give them lots of room, lots of air, and lots of work, and in these three conditions lies the secret.

We will now go to the old hive that has swarmed. After the swarm is out, and before carrying it to its new stand, I lift out the frames and shake from them into the new hive all or most of the remaining old bees and many of the young ones, and destroy all the queen cells but the best one. This leaves the working force together where it ought to be, with the sections or second storey, and takes the swarming heat completely out of the old hive. By supplying it also with the three "lots" above mentioned, in nineteen cases out of twenty there will be no further trouble.

ALLEN PRINGLE.

Selby, June 1st, 1888.

For the Canadian Bee Journal.

HOW TO PREVENT INCREASE.

I AM too busy at present to write much of an article on the prevention of increase, but the following method will answer very well. First, give the bees lots of room before they get the swarming fever. Second, hive the first swarm on a new stand, the next swarm that issues hive it on empty frames. Carry it and set it down alongside of the old hive that swarmed first. The next swarm you hive in the same way on empty frames and set it down alongside of the old hive that swarmed second. So on you continue right through the season. Always leave the old stand, and carry the swarm that has just issued to the old hive of the last swarm. You want empty hives enough to hold the swarms of one day. In the evening go around and break out all queen cells. Shake the swarm down in front; they will run in. Finding strange combs, not many bees, and no queen cells, they will take up house at once, and are not very likely to swarm up again. By this method you only get one hive of an increase, that being the first swarm.

JAMES ALPAUGH.

St. Thomas, May 31st, 1888.

For the Canadian Bee Journal.

QUEEN INTRODUCTION.

THE HALLAMSHIRE LAW AND MR. J. E. POND.

IN the issue for April 18th, page 68, Mr. Pond brings up his system, which I had mentioned on page 28, April 4th, with the assertion that it had never resulted in failure in his own experiments. He allows the hive to remain unexamined for four or five days, except carefully examining the entrance, to assure himself that the queen had not been killed and carried out.

He does not claim perfection for the method, as he says all methods may fail, still he thinks it as safe as any other, and where brood production is a matter of consequence, he holds the saving of two days' time is quite an item.

I don't know, Mr. Editor, if the serious printer's blunder in the last word in the sentence preceding the one in which I first mention his name, was the cause of Mr. Pond penning his letter or not (the sentence should have read, "without any bread or eggs removing," not "remaining") the context would have put him right. But still his letter betrays a spirit, which I am sorry to note in one I have always read with respect and profit, and to whom in my writings I have always tried to render credit for what belonged to him as well as every other *Cæsar* as