

stand, and enter the new hive, where they find their queen, but an empty hive. It will now be seen that the old hive or stock will lose a large proportion of bees, and the old queen, the same as in the case of a first swarm going off; but it will contain all the combs, honey, and young bees, save what are contained in the one card removed. If queen cells were not already started, they will at once start them, and a queen will be developed in ten or twelve days, only a day or two longer than when a swarm issues naturally. The swarm in the new hive will be in just the same condition as a first swarm would be, except that they have one card of comb instead of an entirely empty hive; and the next day even this card of comb may be removed, first shaking off all the bees and queen, and replaced in the old hive again, leaving the swarm to build all new combs, as in natural swarming. It will be seen at a glance that nothing can be nearer nature than the plan I give. "But," says one, "it is difficult for me to find the queen, and I should like some method that I could practise safely without searching for the queen." Here it is then. When you wish to make a swarm, remove the stock you wish to divide a few feet, and take an empty hive and set it on the stand where the stock stood. Now remove each card carefully, shaking off or winging off the bees back into the hive, and place them in the empty hive. By the time you have placed them all in there will probably be enough return to nourish the brood. If not, let it remain a short time, while you put frames into the old hive from which you have just removed the combs, and as soon as a sufficient number of bees have returned to nourish the brood, remove the hive to a new stand, and place the old hive back on its stand again. In this case, care must be taken that the hive containing the combs and brood has bees in sufficient number to nourish the brood. I consider it the better way to find the queen, as in the first method given.

J. H. THOMAS.

Brooklin, Ont.

Mitchell's Combined Hive and Bee-house.

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—I have been waiting for some person more able than I to answer the enquiries of "A Young Apiarian," concerning Mitchell's Hive; but seeing no answer, and considering it worthy of one, I will give my own opinion of some of its advantages.

The hive is enclosed in a house; it requires no stool or bench, and there being a hollow wall all round the bees, and door to shut them up in winter, it requires no protection from heat in summer or cold in winter.

The bottom being an inclined plane of half pitch, it is kept perfectly clean, leaving no dead bees, comb dust, or filth for the miller to deposit her eggs in. It is so protected by the house and outside door that it

may be opened in winter sufficiently to be self-cleaning, thus keeping the bees dry and healthy.

The comb frames are so constructed that only a small corner of the comb and honey comes near the entrance, enabling a weak swarm to protect themselves from robbing bees and millers.

It has movable ends, that is, the end in the inside of the hive lifts out, giving room of three and a half inches to examine every comb without lifting them out of the hive. They also give room to lift them when the comb is built wavy or crooked.

The bottom is hung so as to close entirely or open to any size, thus giving the bees entrance room or ventilation, as circumstances require.

I find that I can manage bees more easily in this hive than in any hive that I have tried, Thomas's not excepted. By lowering the bottom board to its utmost extent, and taking off the cap, light is thrown through the hive, so that you can see the combs as well as though they were lifted out. Although last winter was hard on bees, and a great many died, I have not heard of one stock being lost in this hive. If required, I will write again, and give its superiority in respect to its honey boxes, outside door, robbers' stop, alighting board, ventilation, artificial swarming, &c.

H. H. P.

Woodstock, Ontario.

Bee-hives.

To the Editor.

Sir,—Observing in the GLOBE for June 18th, a reply by H. H. P., of Woodstock, to the enquires of "a young apiarian" concerning Mitchell's Hive, in which he gives his opinion of the advantages of that hive over other movable comb hives, I cannot help thinking that the whole affair was an advertising manœuvre, to get Mitchell's hive before the public. Be that as it may, I wish to call the attention of bee-keepers to some of the advantages claimed for Mitchell's hive by H. H. P.

Being somewhat of a bee-fancier, I take great interest in any real improvement in the management of bees, and wish therefore to consider well all the advantages claimed for one hive over another. At the Provincial Fair last year, I had an opportunity of examining Mitchell's hive, and comparing its merits with the Thomas hive, which has gained such a wide-spread reputation, and I must say that I fail to see any of the advantages claimed by H. H. P.

He says: "The hive is enclosed in a house: it requires no stool or bench, and there being a hollow wall all round the bees, and door to shut them up in winter, it requires no protection from heat in summer or cold in winter." It appears that he means by a "house" an outside case of boards around the main hive; but what advantage is this over the Thomas

hive? None at all; for that hive not only is encased, having a hollow wall around the base, but the air is confined, making it even warmer than the Mitchell hive. Even Langstroth's compound is enclosed in far more of a house than Mitchell's. But does this hollow wall make either of the hives require no other protection from cold in winter? Such an idea is simply absurd. Will two layers of boards, with the space of one or two inches between them, keep out the frost during our long cold winters? It is a hint led by all leading apiarists that bees should be wintered where they will not freeze, and even Thomas admits that bees in his double-boarded hive should be wintered indoors. What advantage, then, has the Mitchell hive in this respect? None at all. But "it requires no stool or bench." Why? because the stool or bench is a part of the hive, and must be carried wherever the hive is carried. This, instead of being an advantage, is a very objectionable feature. A double-walled hive is heavy, to say the least of it; but to have it attached to a case of boards beneath it, from ten to fourteen inches high, like the Mitchell hive, is very objectionable indeed. Not only is such a hive inconvenient to handle, but there is material enough beneath the main hive to nearly or quite make two good bee-stands.

Again, says H. H. P.: "The bottom being an inclined plane of half-pitch, it is kept perfectly clean, leaving no dead bees, comb dust, or filth for the miller to deposit her eggs in. It is so protected by the house and outside door that it may be opened in winter sufficiently to be self-cleaning, thus keeping the bees dry and healthy." What advantage is this, pray, over the Thomas hive, as the bottom board of that hive is also on an inclined plane? And who does not know that bees will clean the bottom board of their hive, even if on a level?

Again, he says: "The comb frames are so constructed that only a small corner of the comb and honey comes near the entrance, enabling a weak swarm to protect themselves from robbing bees and millers." Well, I must confess this is a new idea. I have long understood that a small or contracted entrance enabled a weak stock to defend itself from robbers; but that a weak stock is better able to defend itself because a small corner only of comb and honey comes near the entrance, is simply laughable. H. H. P. fails to mention the fact that the peculiar construction of Mitchell's frames renders them more difficult to manufacture than the Thomas frame, and does not give sufficient breeding space for the queen, which is a very serious objection.

Again, H. H. P. remarks: "It has movable ends, that is, the end in the inside of the hive lifts out, giving room of three and a half inches to examine every comb without lifting them out of the hive. They also give room to lift them when the comb is built wavy or crooked." Now, what advantage is there in movable ends? Is not a frame as easily removed as a movable end? I am ready to take either the Thomas or Langstroth hive, and re-