

Inverting the Brood-Nest.

One of the late innovations in bee-keeping which has gained favor so rapidly that we must think it has come to stay, is that of inverting the frames of hives. In either case the brood-nest is turned upside down. This was first accomplished by so arranging the frames that they could be readily inverted. Instead of the old Langstroth frame with its single top-bar, which had projecting ends, a perfect rectangular frame, with no projecting bars, was made to swing in a larger frame with projecting top-bar and end-bars which reached a little below the middle point of the end-bars of the inner rectangular frame. By use of wire nails the inner frame is pivoted to the outer half-frame, so it can swing in and be inverted in a moment at any time. I have used these frames now for two years, and like them so well that I am changing all my combs into these reversible frames.

Within the last two years an attempt has been made to improve upon this plan by inverting the entire hive, which is about the size of the common Langstroth hive, and consists of two horizontal sections, which can be used either independently or together. Thus it will be seen that the frames in this hive are only about half as deep as those of the usual Langstroth. These frames have close-fitting end-bars, and when put into the hives, rest on tin projections, which are tacked to the bottom of the end-boards of the hive. When all the frames are put into the hives, a wooden thumb-screw, which is set in the side-board of the hive opposite the end-bars of the frames, is screwed up. This holds all the frames firmly, and so when these screws are thus turned the frames are all held securely, and the entire hive can be turned bottom up in a moment.

The advantages of inverting are: 1. Combs are built and fastened to the frames on all sides. Every bee-keeper knows that bees always fasten combs firmly at the top and along the upper half of the edges. When this is once done we have only to remove the frames, when the union is made complete about the whole margin of the comb. The advantages of such entire union are that the combs are held securely, and are in no danger of falling out when extracting or shipping bees.

2. The spaces between comb and frame which serve as hiding places for queens, are removed. This last is a great gain, as anyone who has sought for queens is aware.

3. Reversing frames places the honey below the brood, which is unnatural. Hence, if just as the season opens, when we place the sections on the hive, we reverse the frames, the bees at once carry the honey above the brood, or into the sections where we wish it, and once employed in filling the sections they make no halt till the season closes. If, when we reverse, we uncap some of the honey, we will hasten this rush to the sections. Many who have been annoyed at the persistent refusal of their bees to work in sections, will appreciate this argument in favor of reversible frames, though to the expert apiarist this is the weakest argument.

4. When a bee-keeper has all the bees he wishes he can preclude swarming by this simple work of inversion, which, in case the hive is reversible, is but the work of a moment. Curious as it may seem, the bees at once cut away or remove all queen-cells as soon as the combs are turned upside down. Thus by inverting the hives each week swarming is prevented, and all but the work of a moment.

Of course this last, and indeed all the points, argue loudly in favor of the reversible hive. To invert a hive takes a moment; to reverse all the frames is the work of several minutes.—[Prof. A. J. Cook, in Rural New-Yorker.

Correspondence.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.—1. Please write on one side of the paper only. 2. Give full name, Post Office and Province, not necessarily for publication, but as guarantee of good faith and to enable us to answer by mail when, for any reason, that course seems desirable. If an answer is specially requested by mail, a stamp must be enclosed. Unless of general interest, no questions will be answered through the *ADVOCATE*, as our space is very limited. 3. Do not expect anonymous communications to be noticed. 4. Matter for publication should be marked "Printers' MS." on the cover, the ends being open, in which case the postage will only be 1c per 4 ounces. 5. Non-subscribers should not expect their communications to be noticed. 6. No questions will be answered except those pertaining purely to agriculture or agricultural matters.

Correspondents wanting reliable information relating to diseases of stock must not only give the symptoms as fully as possible, but also how the animal has been fed and otherwise treated or managed. In case of suspicion of hereditary diseases, it is necessary also to state whether or not the ancestors of the affected animal have had the disease or any predisposition to it.

In asking questions relating to manures, it is necessary to describe the nature of the soil on which the intended manures are to be applied; also the nature of the crop.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the views of correspondents.

Small Fruit Culture.—Those of our correspondents who have asked questions about the management and cultivation of small fruits will, we hope, kindly wait till the proper season arrives, when we can describe the methods much more fully and satisfactorily than in our correspondence columns.

"Adulterated Salt."—Again referring to the fraud still being largely perpetrated upon the public by the manufacture of adulterated salt, I regret the Department of Agriculture will not make public the analysis made by them some time ago of the various brands of salt. It is absolutely necessary that the farming community of Canada should know where to buy an honest salt and the proper brands to select. Mr. John Ransford, of Clinton, promised to aid me in rooting out this evil, but I find he has been slow to fulfill it. At a meeting of the County Council of Huron at Brussels, in the first week in December, I find the Messrs. Ransford and Coleman, of Seaforth, were present. They appealed to that body to memorialize the Government to put a standard weight on a barrel of salt, but to remedy the evil of making and selling adulterated salt they were found "wanting." I herewith submit the resolution passed by that body, in which you will see that instead of providing for the non-production of that "vile stuff," they still make it non-incumbent upon the manufacturer to increase the adulteration rather than to diminish it. Moved by Mr. McMillan, seconded by Mr. Clegh, "That the Warden and Clerk, on behalf of this County, petition the Government at Ottawa to pass a law rendering it a punishable offence for any salt manufacturer to sell salt in barrels, sacks or bags without having the name of the manufacturer and the net weight of salt contained therein legibly printed on the barrel, sack, bag or other package, and that the net of salt in a barrel be 5 bushels, or 230 lbs., and further rendering it a punishable offence to sell salt so branded that does not contain the weight as branded thereon." I have been told by good authority that Mr. John Ransford was the original penner of this motion and openly admitted so at the meeting. Now, this motion reads very nicely to those unacquainted with this "adulterated stuff," but makes no provision for what kind of salt it may be, and still further provides that those who make a salt that cannot be pounded into the size of barrel submitted by "those gentlemen" must resort to adulteration to make the weight to keep within the law and compete with dishonest salt. Now, I am not ignorant of how this adulteration is used, nor any salt manufacturer, nor yet ignorant of who does use it. I therefore say if Mr. R. was anxious to "root out this evil" why did he not add, as he admits in your issue of September, that the Government make analysis at least four times a year? Why is he so reticent to the important fact, "That we want and must have an inspector." The argument has been used that this would increase the cost to the consumer, but such an argument is "child-like." For one cent a barrel extra would examine all the salt in Canada, and where is the man who would murmur against paying that additional cent to know he has "salt," when he purchased a barrel branded such. Now, I am strongly in favor of the foregoing resolution were it to include some means by which to eradicate this fraudulent practice of adulteration. In your September issue Mr. Ransford imputes motives of dishonesty in weight to me, but let me ask the farming community would they not much rather buy a 200-lb. barrel of honest salt than 300 lbs. of half salt and half — (I loth to mention

it) to cure their butter and feed their stock. This adulteration is a "cheap" material for which they have to pay freight and buy as "salt." In vindication of the motives imputed by Mr. R. of light weight, allow me to say:—I publicly advertise five kinds of salt in five different sized barrels, which are to be found in the hands of every dealer in Canada, including Mr. R.'s own office. Am I not at liberty to sell (or is it dishonest) a half, or quarter, barrel or sack? Is Liverpool salt not sold in sacks, half and quarters? Do I deceive the public in placing my advertisement as such in their hands? Simply because Mr. R., perhaps, would require too small a vessel to contain anything less than a 300-lb. barrel, he feels those that can do it should not, because "he can't." Why does Mr. R. not approve of the "efficacy of the plan" of an Inspector? I'll await his reply. Now, Mr. Editor, to remedy this demoralized state of affairs we should have the various sized barrels and sacks according to law, and a properly appointed Inspector. One size barrel will not do, as we find for vessel shipment we want a 250-lb. barrel; again, on the long portages of the great North-west a half and three-quarter barrel is necessary (Mr. R.'s 300-lb. is too heavy); and, by all means, some method to detect "adulteration." Happily for this country, those producers of adulterated stuff have had to abandon the manufacture of dairy and table salt, as it would not dry. We are, therefore, somewhat free from the disgusting fact of thinking that the public were consuming into their systems this poisonous, vile stuff. Mr. R., I am sure, is not "green" enough to use it, but if his conscience is still so "green" that he thinks 300 lbs. of adulterated salt is equal to 200 lbs. of good, honest salt, I wonder he is let at large on his own farm for fear "his cows might eat him."—JOSEPH KIDD, JR., Goderich, Ont.

[We are surprised that we do not hear from farmers on this important question, many of whom must have some ideas about the quality of the salt they purchase, or whether they get honest weight. We don't wish to commit ourselves to a policy without first becoming acquainted with all the facts. At present we cannot see our way clearly to advise the appointment of an inspector, who might become a political tool, or a pliable lump of adulterated clay in the hands of the fraudulent salt manufacturers. If the Government had done their duty and published the names of the manufacturers of the adulterated salt which they analyzed at the Model Farm, there would have been no demand for an inspector. The Government seem by their action to prefer an inspector, which will increase the power of their political agencies.]

The Farmer and the Merchant.—In your December number you print a letter from a "Store-keeper in Peterboro' County," complaining of farmers not marketing their produce as early as possible and paying their store bills, and in a style not complimentary to their farming customers. Now, sir, has not every question two sides? In the first place I would ask, Do merchants give twelve months' credit to farmers out of pure philanthropy, or do they not rather do so to increase the volume of their business and make more money, and do not farmers have to pay an increased price for the accommodation? Is there a merchant in Ontario who will say that if he received cash he could not sell his goods cheaper? And, then, as to prompt payment. Certainly, that is most desirable, but in these times of extreme low prices is it not in the interest of the storekeepers themselves that farmers should get the highest obtainable price for their produce, that they may be enabled to pay their accounts in full? In your November number you published an excellent article from the London (Eng.) Miller, showing that the estimated wheat crop of the world was this year nearly 15,000,000 bushels short of the estimated consumption, and although that is a small matter, still in the face of previous years' large surpluses, are not farmers justified in holding their wheat for at least a small rise, and is it not in the interest of even storekeepers themselves that wheat, at least, should have been so held? And I claim for farmers that, having been charged a credit price for their goods, they are entitled to use their own judgment in marketing their produce; and if I had been a customer of the Peterboro' dealer, I should transfer my custom to where it was better appreciated. By inserting this communication in your next issue you will oblige.—G. B., Burnbrae, Ont.

[The farmer certainly has a right to market his produce when it suits his convenience, and drive the hardest possible bargains with his storekeeper. If the storekeeper does not like the farmers' system of doing business, let him turn farmer. If the farmer does not pay his bills when they are due, this is a different question. Every farmer is morally and legally bound to fulfill his promises; if he does not do so, the storekeeper has his remedy, like all other business men. The trouble here is that the storekeeper would lose reputation and custom by suing, while the farmer's credit is little affected by being sued. In truth, the farmer is master of the situation, and if the merchant chooses to become his servant, the farmer is not to be blamed. The storekeeper, like the farmer, can manifest his independence by selling for cash. If he cannot insist upon a cash basis, he is at liberty to engage in a less competitive business.]