Mar. 1909

## The Canadian Bee Journal

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

JAS, J. HURLEY, EDITOR, BRANTFORD, ONTARIO, CANADA

9091

Vol. 17, No. 3.

MARCH, 1909

Whole No 529

NAL

0

3.50

A strange pathological problem was brought to our attention recently. bee-keeper who is a personal friend of the writer, and for whose reliability we can vouch, says that his wife cannot handle section honey-not even to sell on the market when there with other farm produce. It appears that the handling of it immediately affects her hands, face and eves. The hands break out in a rash; the face round about the eyes becomes similarly affected; the eyes shed water and grow dim. She can extract honeythat is, she can uncap it and work about the extractor, but the moment she handles omb honey exclusively the above sympoms present themselves at once. She escribes the affection as being somewhat ike salt rheum. She is positive the affection occurs only when handling comb honey, and has experienced it several times. What can be the cause of a cutaneous affection of this kind arising from the handling of comb honey? The matter is entirely new to the writer, but perhaps some of our readers may know other like instances. Dr. Bohrer somewhere says that the poison from the sting if the bee is upon the capping of the omb. We paid little attention to this when we read it in a recent discussion he had with Dr. Miller in A.B.J., but low we are willing to sit up and do ome thinking. There is a cause—what s it?

The British Bee Journal announces the eath of Mr. W. Broughton Carr, known readers of that journal as "W. B. C." b. Carr was an associate editor of the B.J. He occupied a very distinguished lace among British bee-keepers, and his eath is much regretted.

At the recent convention [O.B.K.A., Ontario] "almost all, if not all, the inspectors stated that they had found more disease than they expected. One inspector had found 41 per cent. of the apiaries he visited diseased." This is a very serious indictment. It would almost read to me as if the system followed has a weak point, and, personally, I hold strongly the fault lies in the fact that simple shaking is depended on as a cure. We in this country would never trust to this alone. Every hive where the disease is even suspected should be thoroughly cleaned and conscientiously disinfected before being again used.—D. M. Macdonald, in British Bee Journal.

We entirely disagree with you. The difficulty does not lie with the method of shaking. This has long since been proven to be a success. Its existence to such an extent as above indicated lies rather in the entire absence of any treatment. With the appointment of more inspectors and the greater efforts to search it out, its existence has been more thoroughly disclosed. Its existence in many places was entirely unknown to the owners of the bees. If the shaking method (the McEvoy method) is properly applied the cure is most effective and thorough and renders disinfection not only unnecessary, but entirely useless.

We had the pleasure of a call a few days ago from Mr. Isaac Balmer of Burlington. He reports wintering conditions good. His bees are outside. Mr. Balmer raises his own queens. He first buys a very select queen and then breeds from her. He impressed us as being a very able bee-keeper, and we regret that time did not permit a more extended interview. Read what he says in another column.

al