

foul-brood material, etc., and I shall be pleased to communicate the results to the B. B. J. in due course.

In the article quoted from above (B. B. J., September 10th 776, p. 406), the writer, "W.," makes a statement strongly confirmatory of our Canadian system of treating foul brood. He says: "I have had a long and melancholy experience with this pest, and in my case mere feeding with disinfectants (salicylic acid, phenol, formic acid, or Naphthol Beta) has proved useless. But, early in my troubles, I found that swarms from infected stocks, if put on sheets of foundation in fresh hives, remained comparatively free from all trace of infection, especially if the new hive was, as far as practicable, saturated with some disinfectant." To the foregoing I wish to call the special attention of those correspondents of the *Journal* who some months ago felt called upon to manifest such impatience, if not discourtesy, because I felt it my duty to press somewhat strongly upon British bee-keepers who were afflicted with that pest, foul brood, in their apiaries the wisdom and propriety of trying our method of cure, and the folly of refusing to try it simply because it was in conflict with certain of their preconceived theories or opinions on the subject. Besides the home evidence quoted above, I also saw in the *Journal* since that time another strong case in evidence for our method of treatment, but I cannot now turn it up to give particulars. Let the reader note the two prominent facts in "W.'s" experience, which, he says, was "long and melancholy." The first fact was that the drugs "proved useless," and the second fact was that, early in his troubles, he "found that swarms from infected stocks, if put on sheets of foundation in fresh hives, remained comparatively free from all trace of infection, especially if the new hive was as far as practicable, saturated with some disinfectant."

Now, what do these facts mean? They mean a great deal; and over here they have been multiplied indefinitely. If the queen is diseased, and the workers are diseased with the germs of foul brood, communicable by them, how is the mere putting of the diseased queen and bees on "foundation" going to prevent the disease breaking out as soon as they begin to rear brood in the new comb? On this hypothesis, the fact given by "W.," and the thousand we have to add to it, are inexplicable. On the other theory, that the honey is the chief medium of communicating the disease, the thousand and one facts are explicable and intelligible.

The treatment practised with such success in this province, by the official Foul brood Inspect-

ors and others who have occasion to treat the disease, is predicated on the theory, whether right or wrong, that it is chiefly through the medium of the honey that the disease is spread. We do not say that queens and workers may not be constitutionally diseased or tainted with the germs. We do not impeach the scientist or discredit the microscope. We simply say that, so far as we know—so far as we are cognisant of the facts—neither queens nor workers communicate the disease; while we do know, and have verified in thousands of cases, that through the medium of the honey the disease is communicated and spread. And while we do not assert that the disease has never been cured by medicating the bees, we do assert that it has been cured thousands of times without drug medication of any kind, and without medicating the bees in any way save to relieve them of the contaminated honey their sacs may contain.

Why were "W.'s" infected swarms from diseased colonies cured by merely putting them into clean hives on comb foundation? Simply because they used up the whole of the infected honey they carried with them in making wax and drawing out the foundation, instead of giving it to young brood. If "W." or anybody else wishes to prove this to his own satisfaction, let him take the infected swarm from a diseased colony, and, instead of putting it on foundation, put it on empty combs, which he knows to be perfectly clean and free from the foul-brood taint, and then note the result. The honey carried away by the swarm, instead of being used up in building comb, will be stored in the empty comb and used in rearing the brood, which will prove to be diseased. Considering the importance of the issue, the trouble of such a test is trifling, and I would ask the opponents of the plan of cure we are advocating (and which we know to be efficacious) to put the matter to a practical test, and do it fairly.

And since "W." has gone so far, and been successful in curing his new swarms, he can go further, and cure the old diseased stocks. Should he unfortunately have occasion to deal with the pest the present season, I would urge him to prove this matter for himself, and report results, which I venture to predict will be exceedingly gratifying to him.—ALLEN PRINGLE, Selby, Ontario, in *British Bee Journal*.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

An Uncalled for Criticism in "A. B. J."

WE wish the editors of the *American Bee Journal* to understand that we are not in the habit of "cabbaging," as they euphoniously term it, matter from other peri-