

securing the most desirable off-spring. A queen to fetch a good price, must have already produced satisfactory progeny, so that the mating shall have been proved all right.

We are inclined to think that the Punic queens or bees, and their so-called wonderful advantages will explode when they are thoroughly known. Advice from those not interested in the sale of them, leave us little hope of satisfaction in introducing them. We are inclined to think that the person who pays \$80, or even \$8, for a stock of these bees, and mixes them with his Italians, will find that he has made a great mistake. We are determined not to mix them, and hope that no bee-keeper in our locality will get them.

We Are Accused of Plagiarism.

ONE of the most contemptible acts of which an editor can be guilty of, is to appropriate from his contemporaries, meritorious articles and palm them off as original by failing to credit them to the journals from which they were filched. This has occurred several times with articles which have appeared in the BEE-KEEPER, and for which we have paid a good price. The last offender is the *Canadian Bee Journal*, who reprinted from our October number the address on "New Uses of Perforated Zinc Excluding Boards," by F. H. Cyrenius and fails to give us credit for it. If this had been the *Journal's* first offence we could have overlooked it, but it was not.

The BEE KEEPER is rather hard on us, we think, as we can assure our cotem that we had no desire to misappropriate any of the BEE-KEEPER's articles, and if we have failed to give due credit it has been an oversight on our part, which we will try and guard against in future.

More About Foul Brood.

THE following in reference to the question "Are queens from foul broody stocks diseased?" appears in *Gleanings*:

I have always been under the impression that the foul brood bacilli were to be, and have been, found in the reproductive organs, etc., of some queens taken from diseased stocks; but the following from a letter of Dr. Lortet's, in the May number of the *Revue Internationale*, shows me that this is not his opinion:

"During the latter months of the past year and this spring I have received from some of

your courteous subscribers six queens taken from undoubtedly foul-broody hives. I have been able, on these females, to verify that which I have already stated before; viz., that the eggs are healthy, neither the ovaries nor ovules contain bacilli. I believe, then, to be able to state once more, that foul brood is not transmitted by inheritance, but only by direct contact with the infected animal, or by injecting nutritive substances containing foul brood bacteria."—Dr. Lortet.

I think your opinion on the above, which is of so much importance in the treatment of foul brood, would be of interest to bee-keepers.—T. D. Schofield, Alderly Edge.

The editors of the *British Bee Journal* reply: "The quotation our correspondent gives has not escaped our observation, but we have not thought it necessary to notice it, because we do not think it is conclusive that queens do not sometimes become diseased. It only shows that the six queens examined by Dr. Lortet were healthy. Although it is believed that queens may be diseased, it by no means follows that every queen is so. Hilbert found, out of twenty-five queens, only three diseased. He also found that such queens given to healthy stocks produced the disease in these stocks, and that it was very difficult and almost impossible to cure the disease while such queens were present. Just as every bee does not become diseased in a foul-broody hive, and as every human being does not contract cholera although exposed to its influence, so, we take it, there is immunity from the disease with some queens. Strictly speaking, we cannot say that every queen of a foul-broody hive is necessarily diseased, nor can we say that every queen is exempt from the disease. The great hope of stamping out foul brood exists in the fact that it is not hereditary, and, in cases where foul brood is difficult to cure, the queen may reasonably be suspected to be diseased, and should be destroyed, as it is hopeless to effect a perfect cure while such a queen is present.—*British Bee Journal*.

[Of the 75 or 80 cases of foul brood that we had in our apiary some three or four years ago, nearly all of which were treated on the starvation plan, and in all which the queen was retained the disease never reappeared, where we had observed due caution, putting the bees into clean hives, on frames of foundation. On about a dozen, for the sake of experiment we put the bees back into old hives, on frames of foundation, but did not scald them. In all of these the disease reappeared, showing that the spores of foul brood must have resided in the old hive, and hence the reappearance of the dreaded malady. Now, the singular point here is, that, in all of these foul-brood cases, where treated right, not one of the queens had the disease, or, at least, her colony long after treatment was perfectly healthy. In the United States we would conclude that, if the fatal germs were ever present in the ovary of the queen, the cases where this may occur are very rare indeed.]