

you will see, Mr. Editor, by the clippings I enclose from the *Journal of Horticulture*, which you can either reprint or forward to Mr. Pond.

The assertion that "all methods may fail," I consider unpardonable, in the face of the fact that I claim infallibility for my law, and that he offers no evidence to refute it.

Now, I have carefully tried Pond's system of giving the queen at dusk via. the entrance. Also Simmins' of first starving her thirty minutes and dropping her in from the top by lamp light after dark, also one other way I devised myself, viz., removing the old queen by lamp light after dark and giving the fresh queen at the same time. The results of all these different ways was exactly the same, viz., the fresh queen was invariably unmolested till the seventh day at least; queen cells were always started and sealed, and even when the new queen did become the mother of the hive she never got to laying before the eleventh day. These facts were fully demonstrated both by myself and T. Banner Chambers Esq., F.L.S., see *B.B.J.* for April 5th. In Mr. Chambers' case he lost every queen, in mine I lost 35 per cent., and sometimes a daughter was reared from her eggs; if she was given in a laying condition. Another point I wish to note is, I don't think a single queen was ever killed by the bees they were given to, but simply because they could get no homage or attention, they left the hives of their own accord. Now, in the face of these facts—fully demonstrated—which anyone can prove for themselves, what is the value of Mr. Pond's statement that he does not examine the hive for four or five days, when never a queen is missing before the seventh day?

Mr. Pond's system, or his theory, by which he explains it, contains a most important element of truth, which enabled me to solve the important problem of introducing virgin queens, but he was mistaken in the effect. No one has yet upset Huber's statement made a century ago, that bees will not accept a stranger queen until an interregnum of twenty or twenty-four hours has elapsed except by uniting a large quantity of worker bees with her as well.

If Mr. Pond will refer to the *British Bee Journal* for December 23rd, 1886, page 597, he will see that S. Simmins says that Mr. Pond admits the system he is advocating to be his, i.e., Simmins', and hints that he, Pond, got it through his mentioning it in a private correspondence from himself, (Simmins.) I have never admitted that Simmins' system was different to Pond's, and I wrote a long reply, which the editor of the *B.B.J.* refused to publish, but it was published in the *Journal of Horticulture* for Feb. 10th, 1887, page 120.

He thinks the saving of two days, required in my law "quite an item" where brood production is a matter of consequence. Now, I deny that this is so, for when a queen is given in accordance with my law, the bees stimulate her to such an extent to regain lost ground that in less than eight days she has fully made up for the two days lost, particularly if she is a good one, and so much is this a fact to be relied on, that one queen will keep two good stocks fully supplied with brood, carried out in the following way (particularly in spring when queens are often lost, and they are very dear or difficult to get and it is too early to rear fresh ones): Just remove a queen from a stock and drop her into the queenless one, on the ninth day cut out every queen cell formed in the hive she was taken from; forty-eight hours afterwards give them the queen back, and though there is an interval of a fortnight; these two stocks will make as much headway in spring as if each were headed with separate queens, and this can be carried on until there is a chance of a queen being mated, then instead of giving them the queen again I would give them combs filled with new laid eggs. I have been practicing this dodge rather heavily this spring as I have found so many of my strongest stocks queenless, and I have even given and lent queens to neighbors, and yet the only real loss has been the time required in the necessary manipulations, thus it will be seen how much "loss" there is in the forty-eight hour interval required, there *might* be a loss if the interval was eleven days, but this I greatly doubt with a good queen.

Though it is unpleasant to find it necessary to write this, still I feel it my duty to do so as there is too much envy, jealousy, and crowing backwards and forwards of the Spread Eagle and the Golden Lion. I never personally stop to consider what country the various men belong to whose names will be handed down to all time; it was the men and not the country that did the work. This brings me to notice the article by Geo. J. Maloney on page 54 as a specimen of the "crowing" I allude to, if my memory serves me right, the same writer was crowing some time ago, over the wonderful achievements of Mr. Hoge in creating a demand for American honey in England, with the result you publish on page 5, that his deluded creditors got 0.65 of a penny in the £. Hoge thought Britishers were all fools and would accept any statement however absurd or untruthful. For instance, he stated in his advertisements that the hoarhound plant in California would, (i.e., each plant,) furnish enough honey for a hive of bees to thrive on.

Probably Mr. Pond thinks I am an anony-