

no harm, provided you do not disturb the bees; but be sure that you keep them dark. If they are not partitioned off, take an old horse blanket or quilt and hang it up in front of the hives so that the light (day-light or lantern light) may be kept from them. This is very important. Keep an eye on your cellar for dampness. This must be avoided at all costs. Beyond this we do not know of any assistance we can give you. If any of our readers think we have overlooked anything we would be glad to hear from them for our January issue. Now, Mr. McKinnell, let us hear from you in the spring, and tell us what success you have had in bringing these bees through. We can assure you that if you are successful in bringing all out next spring, your first year's operations will be entitled to be described as most extraordinarily successful. Ninety-five pounds of honey and three increase is something better than we can do ourselves.—Ed.]

WILLIAM R. HOWARD, M. D.

Endorsed the McEvoy Method for the Cure of Foul Brood.

For the benefit of our British readers we give below the conclusions of Wm. R. Howard, M. D., after an exhaustive investigation into the nature and treatment of foul brood. With this the controversy ends, so far as we are concerned. Our only object—which we think we have attained—was to establish the fact that it was due to a Canadian bee-keeper that this simple and effective remedy was discovered.

The following is taken from Dr. Howard's book, published by George W. York & Co., Chicago, Ill., 1894.

After giving the results of his experiments, Dr. Howard concludes as follows:

"In conclusion, let me say that the publications of Mr. Wm. McEvoy, Foul Brood Inspector of Ontario, instigated

this research. In correspondence with Mrs. Jennie Atchley, of Beeville, Texas, on the subject, I agreed to investigate it as thoroughly as possible, hoping to throw some new light on this vexed question. In the light of all that has been written, by Cheshire, McLain, and others on the one hand, and McEvoy on the other, it was evident that if McEvoy was right the others were wrong, and vice versa. My impression was that McEvoy was wrong, and after reading Cheshire, McLain and others, I reached the conclusion that, from a scientific standpoint, they too, were in error in many of their observations and deductions. In the treatment it seemed plausible that if the latter were right, in that the spores floated in the atmosphere, there could be no cure by any method. If McEvoy were right, then there were two points to investigate—are the spores thrown off into the surrounding air? and if so, how long do they retain their vitality under such circumstances? An answer to these two questions would certainly throw new light upon the subject. That thousands of practical bee-keepers believed that both honey and pollen in infected colonies contained the infectious germ, I knew, but of this I was not now certain; so after obtaining suitable material to commence work, I determined to carry on my investigations independently, and let the results prove whatever they would, acting solely without interest in anyone's pet theories. I have finished my work, and, in a manner satisfactory to myself, so far as I have gone; but I earnestly regret, that for want of proper material, I am unable to verify the experiments of Cheshire, McLain and others, in regard to the presence of the bacillus in the blood of the adult bee, in the undeveloped eggs in the ovaries of the queen, and in the spermatozoa of the drones. In my criticisms of each of these gentlemen I have intended to be impartial, regarding each one as honest, capable, and deserving much credit for original methods; and where we have disagreed it is purely on scientific grounds, without any feeling of personal prejudice whatever.

I regard the use of any and all drugs in the treatment of foul brood as a useless waste of time and material, wholly ineffectual, inviting ruin and total loss of bees. Any method which has not for its object the entire removal of all infectious material beyond the reach of both bees and brood will prove detrimental and

destructive
currence
referred
ing review
methods

Mr. McFoul Brood has attracted the bee of his method and a few conclusions all; and a that incite as much writers.

In the foul combs frames with the end of out the st diseased h the old cor removes t sheets of c time the f are drawn consumed in ers and cor high temper tain infect combs conta were at fir totally dest to begin wi or disinfect ease being the time in

On Novem Mr. McEvoy important cwered in a 1893:

1—Have brood to die

Ans.—Yes, once fairly foul brood days than at

2—Have yo the perfect b their lives to with?

Ans.—Neve many as five brood, in orde a fair swarm of this work I find only a very rotten c when the col