

popular when I began the production of comb honey, but I have left that method behind, and adopted better methods. I would use "dummies" in the brood chamber—say three—and with the other five combs filled with foundation I have no drone comb to trouble me. I have done this when I did not expect a full flow of honey and I have had every cell in the five combs filled with brood and pollen, so that any surplus honey there was, was certainly put in the sections. Now some one may argue, and I am sure the Canadian Bee Journal is open to articles upon the whole subject, that if the honey flow stopped early and there was no prospect of a full flow, then the brood in the five combs would be useless. I doubt the correctness of that assertion. No one is a stronger believer than I in the theory, that when bees do nothing and are comfortable there is little loss of vitality, and that when bees are active they lose vitality and they breed, that there is as it were, a balancing if nature is left alone. But when a bee-keeper allows his bees to exhaust their vitality without giving the queen a chance to deposit a fair amount of eggs, the result is a lack of balance. If field bees are worn out at the close of the flow, there are few young bees to replace the old. The bees quiet down as they always do when no honey is coming in, and of necessity worn out bees go into winter quarters. Some will admit that even with no flow, these hatching bees are all right. It is much easier to see that nothing is lost by full sheets of foundation, instead of starters in the brood chamber during the clover, thistle and linden flow, when these may be expected to be followed by a fall flow. Why? Because if you do not rear at least five combs of worker during clover and linden you will not have the desired number of workers for the fall flow. A few may say Mr. H. is right when there is no flow, but we doubt if anyone who has experience with a fall flow of honey will find this management is correct under this other condition. A few articles upon the whole subject would be of value to many.

On page 919 Canadian Bee Journal appeared an article "Foul Brood and the Board of Agriculture,"

Foul Brood. We saw this in the British Bee Journal, and if we understand it correctly, it was originally published by the British or English Board of Agriculture as Leaflet No. 32, and the article did not originate with the British Bee Journal. As one or two persons appear to think that in spite of the address being given, it might mean the Ontario Board of Agriculture, a body which by the way does not exist in Ontario or Canada, we cheerfully make the above explanation. We are anxious to have all possible light thrown upon this question of Foul Brood.

* * *

The Australian Bee Bulletin for Feb'y 23th, has the following: "It was resolved on the motion of Mr.

Prof. McEvoy's Tipper, that Prof. Services Recognized McEvoy, of Canada,

be thanked, on behalf of the bee-keepers of Australia, for his excellent letter on Foul Brood, which appeared in a recent number of the Australian Bee Bulletin." We must congratulate Prof. McEvoy, but we do not want to see him go to Australia to stamp out foul brood, we require his services here in Canada.

I am much pleased with the Journal and like to read different views on bee-keeping. I have written a short article on the care of bees in the spring, which I should have sent in for the April issue, and if you find it suitable and of any use to you, I shall be glad to see it come out in your Journal at some future date. I might also say, that bees in this part of the country have wintered well about 80 per cent coming through. Wishing you success with your Journal.

Yours truly,

ALBERT J. CUNDICK.

Warwick, Ont., April 10th, 1897.

[We are pleased to have article which will appear later.—Ed.]

Owing to a very heavy supply of important contributed matter for this month, we are obliged to hold over the Ontario Convention Report till next issue.—Ed.