

difficulty in finding her in the hive.

The swarms put upon full sheets of foundation did not exhibit any undue tendency to swarm; but those hived on starters swarmed excessively and built exceedingly poor comb. Herewith will be found an engraving of seven combs out of eight in a brood chamber; the eighth comb was entirely drone comb. At the stage of building herein illustrated, the bees swarmed again, and the instance illustrated was not at all isolated. The result of the experiment must of course be received with caution; but thus far, without full sheets of foundation, the Carniolans have shown themselves a decided failure. They do not appear to build a proper proportion of worker comb, and the building is done very irregularly; but this deficiency seems to be overcome when the foundation of the comb is supplied. In the meantime, we would advise bee-keepers not to be in any hurry to introduce the Carniolan bees until another season's test can be made.—From Agricultural College and Experimental Farm.

Notes and Pickings.

—D. W. HEISE.

After reading all the arguments that have been advanced in favor of the plain section and fence, in five bee journals during the past six months, I have come to the conclusion that the most potent advantage brought out is that the sections will be better filled, and therefore will command a fancy price. This better filling, as I understand it, is expected to result from more free communication. Now, I just want to whisper that if better filled sections are really desired by honey producers and consumers, (Doolittle says not,) and freer communication will bring about that result, I think I know how it can be secured to a far greater extent than can possibly be done with the plain section and fence as now advocated. And if anyone wishing to learn the plan will drop into the private sanctum of this picker any week-day afternoon, I will deem it a pleasure to try and enlighten them from my (very limited) knowledge of comb-honey production.

Editor Root tells us, in *Gleanings*, that "Mr. Cogshall of York State does not

believe in taking time to pry off the super. A yank or a kick removes it and clears it of bees at the same time. Of course it angers the bees." Singular, isn't it; but Mr. C. considers that of small moment compared with the time. He runs his bees not for convenience, but for the dollars and cents; and if a kick will earn another cent, he "kicks," stings or no stings. If Mr. C. or any other man was situated as I am, and would give his bees such treatment as that just quoted, not only would the super with its industrious occupants be kicked, but the operator would (by wrathful neighbors) be kicked so long as there was anything of him to be kicked at. I consider such treatment of the bee-keepers' very best friend as almost if not extremely inhuman.

In *Gleanings*, 206, R. C. Aiken asserts that if an average colony cannot make a gain of at least 2 pounds of raw nectar per day, we should not expect any surplus of either comb or extracted honey, unless the flow should exceed 30 days duration. This is some information worth remembering and worth testing.

In answering a question A. B. J. 183, in regard to a remedy for moth worms, Dr. Miller says: "Let me first tell you how to encourage the production of moths. Allow plenty of pieces of comb to lie around for breeding places, where the moth can lay her eggs. If a colony dies in winter, be sure to let the empty hive with its comb, stand out where the moths can get at it. They will be delighted with this arrangement. Be sure to increase rapidly, so as to have a lot of little colonies so weak they can't fight their way against the moths and worms. If they can also be queenless, that will help greatly, and it will be still better if they have no Italian blood. If you don't care to have your combs eaten up with moths, just do the opposite; and above all KEEP ALL COLONIES STRONG."

In reply to that article on page 1-6, A. B. J., in reference to the identification of laying workers, I want to say to its author (the Boiler of Beedom) that perhaps you have misjudged my judicious manner and lenient consideration in matters of this kind. I find no fault with the assertion you make, but rather heartily concur in your views. But I do take issue with you when you make the "accusation" that I did "aid and abet" the promulgation of the idea that a laying worker can be "seen and told by her looks." Say, Mr. Boiler, just read my comment on the article quoted again, and if you or the president