

stop them laying, but it will effectually stop the bogus brood rearing. Let them lay away and gather on. This I shall continue till the end of the honey season, or till they wear themselves out laying eggs and gathering honey. This may seem a little hard on the bees, but I see no other way in such exceptional cases of saving myself from loss, and this, I suppose, we have the right to do so long as we do not verge on "cruelty to animals." Of course if the weather happened to prove so unfavorable for three or four days after taking all their honey that they could not gather any, I would feed them, but in good weather when there is honey in the fields they must gather it or starve.

ALLEN PRINGLE.

Selby, Ont., Aug. 4th, 1886.

We have not, as yet, had a case of fertile workers so bad that we could not introduce a laying queen by the use of chloroform. We fully agree with you that dumping them out, or moving the hive to a new location, is useless, and think there can be no greater mistake than to imagine that there are only a few laying workers, and, that if they are disposed of, the trouble is over. Experience leads us to believe that if you could remove the fertile workers every day others would take their places as long as any bees were left in the hive to care for the eggs. The ordinary way of introducing queens will not answer in case of fertile workers, as they will refuse to accept them. Sometimes by taking away all the combs and leaving them without for twelve or twenty-four hours, then spraying them with diluted honey and shaking them up in the box until they become so thoroughly wet that they cannot fly, putting the queen in with them and giving them another shake, after which they may be thrown down in front of the hive and allowed to run in the same as a swarm, they will accept the queen. The combs in their new home should contain brood in all stages. We have frequently found this plan to work. The queen would go on laying and sometimes the fertile workers would also lay for several days. In all such cases we now introduce with chloroform. We have never found the bees to work so well when fertile workers were in the hive, especially after they had been queenless for some time and their numbers were becoming less. Friend Pringle, how did you destroy their brood? Did you change their

combs every three or four days, allowing the eggs or brood to chill, or did you wait until the larvæ were capped over? Your plan of changing combs, if done about every four days, would doubtless work, as little honey would be consumed in the rearing of brood.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

MR. HEDDON CRITICISED.

PLEASE allow me to correct a misleading sentence in my article on page 387, which should read: "Mr. Heddon, and every practical bee-keeper will agree with me, that this is the worst part about the hive; and I believe the one that will fulfil my prophecy."

In defence to myself and our beloved pursuit allow me to reply to Mr. Heddon's criticism on page 326, where he charges me with too much self-esteem, etc. If I am guilty of his charges he ought not to get nervous about it, as I have probably made a mistake in copying self-esteem of Mr. H., for the past couple of years, by reading his articles in the bee-papers up to the late numbers. Allow me to quote just one of the many to prove my statement. On page 409, the present volume of the *A. B. J.*, Mr. Heddon criticises Mr. Dayton's surplus arrangements and says: "While from my standpoint I do not conceive that the arrangement he describes is at all practical, that it will ever meet the wants of producers of honey." Mr. H. does not give any reason for his statement, nor has he even seen the arrangement. By this it appears (considering his language on page 326) that he has extra privileges, or is he infallible?

I admit that I expected too much of Mr. H., for him to agree with me on that split and stick arrangement about the hive, as I never saw that he admits anything (excepting once about four years ago,) but that will not alter my eighteen years' experience and conclusion a mite. Mr. H. wonders if Mr. T. has studied law, on which I will decidedly say no, as I have every respect from what I have heard and seen when I hear law or lawyer, and which it seems to be just fun to Mr. Heddon, as he has lately told us considerable of his studies on it and which he also put in practice considerably in his criticism by turning and twisting my "conclusion" into "seriously compelling," etc., and these seem to be his weapons with which he is trying to bluff us, if we criticise his hive. Of course, if the hive is as good as Mr. H. writes of it, then there is no need for him to get angry; it should make him glad if any one says something against it, as that gives him a better chance to bring the good qualities (if there are any,) before the public and