

take long. The ug and the sand at 1 be 5c per block what means the To this must be labor. As it takes er as cement we close by. Shorter some hives (Langvould use as much king them larger, rith the size mold larger would be molds will make placing them on each other. The lev house is nothw of these at the ed on top of the can be used for . In the cut the tion of a few at and the board at loved. By making s, less molds will uld be better. le, not only because of its durability, but less moisture gathers to rot the bottom-board.

Hives do not freeze down, as with wood, which is an advantage when removing to winter repository, and yet they are not easily displaced because of the concrete being slightly rough. The blocks themselves, being weighty, stay in place well. A little coarse sand is good to level up with.

Brussels, Ont.

WHY LOSE FIFTY PER CENT.
Indexed PROFIT?

The Langstroth Frame Out-of-Date.

By Samuel Simmins

(Concluded from Page 12)

It should be understood that it is not the actual size or superficial area of a frame that may make it undesirable or unequal to another of a different shape, but of almost the same dimensions in square inches. For instance a brood frame 30" in 'length by 5" in depth would be a veritable death-trap, and would not lend itself to any sort of manipulation; while another frame 16" long by 10" deep would fulfit all the economic conditions required in a modern beehive.

The Langstroth frame is both too shallow and too extended in length for ensuring universally safe wintering. Why was it adopted in that form? For the one mistaken reason that the bees should more readily enter the supers; and yet there is not sufficient depth of comb for any good prolific queen.

In the days when only small guides were used as "bait" in the upper part of the sections, or such supers as were first used, the shallow frame may have been an advantage in inducing the bees to start work above. But now all that is altered.

We have, or should have, more prolific queens and better honey-gatherers while bee-keepers almost invariably use full sheets of foundation in their comb supers, if they have not as yet learned

how to start all drawn combs in their sections.

Consequently the only reason why the shallow stock frame was thought to be desirable, has long since ceased to be a factor in economic management; and it is time bee-owners extended the depth of the frame, as well as the results that should follow the change.

There is hardly a bee-keeper using the shallow Langstroth frame but who is assured in his own mind that a deeper frame would give him far more security in winter; and consequently greater profit in summer. There is hardly any need to reason the matter out, the conclusion is evident.

Mr. F. Benton was so certain on this point that at one time he adopted a plan of turning the Langstroth frames and hive up on end during winter, thus ensuring that the bees had a more compact bee-nest, and they would gradually rise higher as the stores were consumed.

In their normal position if the bees start clustering to one end of the frames, nothing will induce them to draw back to the other end for food during a long spell of cold weather. In a cellar it may not matter, but when set out, the bees are often in a precarious condition, with insufficient stores above them.

If only two or three inches were taken off the length and added to the depth, a great benefit is derived, and a more economic condition set up for all seasons.

I have tried frames 14"x14" but consider these, as also the Quinby, out of proportion for general manipulation, and finally decided on the 16"x10" frame as the best for all purposes.

I believe the late Capt. Hetherington preferred a deeper frame than the Langstroth, using the Quinby with a thousand or more stocks. On a larger scale he would have had greater losses with the shallow frame.

The late Mr. C. Dadant likewise discarded the shallow Langstroth frame,