

keeping a few colonies for the pleasure of it, and cared nothing for the amount of labor as compared with the amount of surplus, I am not sure but I would use wide frames. But as I am trying to make the most money for my time and labor, I can't afford wide frames. In their defense, however, I may mention that the difficulty of getting sections out of them has been overrated. A certain W. Z. H., in many respects a very decent kind of a man, once said, if I remember rightly, that he could empty a Heddon super while he was getting the first section out of a wide frame. Quite true, probably; but it only showed he didn't know how to empty wide frames, for the first section should never be taken from a wide frame, but the whole eight at once; and I think I can take 1,000 sections out of wide frames in less time than out of Heddon supers. Still, if I did not want to use separators, I would rather use Heddon supers than wide frames, on account of less labor in manipulation. Even without separators, I much prefer the T super to the Heddon, on account of greater ease and safety in taking out sections, particularly if the sections are allowed to remain in the supers till the weather becomes cool.

In your editorial, Bro. Hutchinson, you speak of "the inability to contract the surplus apartment to less than a whole case" in tiering up. Let me take issue with you. Any number of sections from one to twenty-four may be put in a T super. It is some trouble, and I doubt if it would be desirable to put in fractional parts of rows across, but I have during the past season used a number of supers in which each super contained a single row, or six sections, and others containing 12 sections, the full super containing 24 sections. These partly filled supers work satisfactorily—as satisfactorily, I think, as any other system, with or without tiering up. So long as I use T supers, I presume I shall each year use some partly filled. All that is necessary is to put in place of an omitted row a thin board in the bottom, or some pieces of sections.

As to width of sections, I have used in considerable numbers five different widths, measuring 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 to the foot. On the whole I found no advantage in having any other than the ordinary 2-inch, or, to be exact, 1 15/16 inch.

When I first heard of side openings to sections I whittled them out in about 100 sections. So far as I could judge from so limited a trial, I could see no advantage in them. We are apt to become enthusiastic over new things, especially those of "our own git up," and I have thought that the advocates of open sides were just a little too extravagant in their claims. The claim that "the greater accessibility to all parts induces the bees to enter more readily"

I don't. I have no difficulty in getting my bees to commence work in sections as soon as I want them to, and I wouldn't give a cent, I think, to have them commence any sooner than they do. Give them a single section (somewhere near the centre of the super), out of which honey has been emptied, and there is no trouble about their beginning as soon as I want them to. Considerable stress is laid on the point that a bee can save a good deal of travel by going across from one section to another, instead of going around. What does she want to go across for, or around, either? If she has a load to deposit in a section she would better go straight up, transact her business, and then go straight down again, without wasting time in unnecessary travel crosswise. I think bees may be a little more inclined to extend their work sideways, if there is ready access in that direction, and this may count for something when the super is not crowded full of bees. I have seen open bee-ways with very straight combs well secured to the sides, and I have seen just as straight and just as well-secured work with closed sides; and I have seen bulgy work with open as well as closed sides.

I changed from four-piece to one-piece sections regretfully. The one-piece give more trouble by being out of square. There is trouble about breaking at the corner. They have the "naughty" corner, but they are more rapidly put together, and I changed pretty largely, because I wanted to follow the crowd. I don't believe in following the crowd always, especially in morals and politics; but as far as possible I think it is better to use what is nearest a standard article in the way of supplies. I like the two-piece sections well.

C. C. MILLER.

Marengo, Ill.

From the British Bee Journal.

MINORCAN BEES.

IN July last we announced that through the kindness of Mr. F. C. Andreu, there was a probability that the qualities of Minorcan bees would be tested in England. The queen, which was transmitted to Mr. Abbott, was safely introduced, and we have a further report from him in August that the queen had done well, and that he had been able to raise a number of young queens: but, owing to the bad season, there had been a difficulty in getting them fertilised, only one out of fourteen raised proving fertile; also, owing to the weather, although Mr. Abbott had induced the queen to lay a large number of eggs in drone cells, he could not persuade the worker-bees to rear the larvae, although they were well supplied with food. Mr. Abbott does not enter into the merits or demerits of the Minorcan race, as they have had no chance at present of showing what they are. Our correspondent, Mr. F. C. Andreu, had stated they resembled Carniolans, but it will be seen from a letter in our columns this week,