

eration of bee-keepers to hold their memory in derision instead of veneration.

A HALLAMSHIRE BEE-KEEPER.

P. S.—Since penning the above, the JOURNAL for June 27th has turned up, in which I note the letter of Mr. J. E. Pond, page 266, for the first time, (Dec. 1st.) I readily accept his explanations. I have never exchanged a line with him, but having carefully read many of his articles and concluded he was a gentleman—his letter proves I have no cause to think he is otherwise—I certainly felt called upon to correct him for what was evidently a wrong impression founded on not seeing through a printer's blunder; first to put myself right, and secondly, to put himself right, for you see a little spot in a very white garment looks more conspicuous than a big black patch on a dirty one. I am conceited enough to think my skin is at least as tough as his own. I never take offence at anyone dissenting from my views or teachings when they are honest in what they say, with such it is a pleasure to get into a controversy, as then, I either learn something or else someone else does. I am not going to quarrel with him over his system though I think he has made an error, and in the interests of right and progress, it is my duty to point it out. I don't care a rap, whether my law is disputed on my side of the "big pond" or not—that is no proof I am wrong—the same thing has happened many times before. The countrymen of Galileo made him say the sun went round the earth, after he had shown that it was the earth that turned round every 24 hours.

But there is at least one learned savant—T. Bonner Chambers, F.L.S.—who believes in its *absolute infallibility*. It is this, which I claim for my law, I can quote a long string of names who have tried it with "*uniform success*," which at least would disprove what the Rev. Geo. Raynor, F. Cheshire, T. W. Cowan, Dr. Geo. Walker and others say. But this is not enough for me, I must go the "whole hog" or no "hog" at all, and if it will do any good, I hereby challenge the whole world to prove it is *not* infallible. While metaphorically shaking hands with Mr. Pond and assuring him I am quite satisfied, I trust he and all others will get to work to prove whether I am right or wrong.

There is something more in the law than introducing a queen safely; there is the truth of a great scientific fact in natural history at stake, and all who go to work will be helping to pull it out of the mine into broad daylight.

A. H. B. K.

Bees hold no spite against an accepted queen and do not destroy her as soon as there is a prospect of raising another. We have introduced a number of old queens by this method and lost none. But bear in mind the bees had been smoked at the entrance and from the upper corner of the quilt where the queen was put in, and the introduction was usually done after sun-down and frequently after dark. If done at noon or in early morning the result might be different.

As to queenlessness, under the Sim-

mon's system they never remain queenless for any length of time and here we think it has some valuable advantages. The Simmons is the most rapid system we have practiced.

For The Canadian Bee Journal.

STALHAMMAR'S REPLY TO HOVIND.

MY DEAR SIR: I arrived at home after nearly a month's trip in this country as well as abroad. I find on my writing-desk your always valuable JOURNALS and those of Nov. 7 and 14. Reproved in these by Mr. Harold Hovind, of Norway, to be very "irascible," etc., I have done my very best to control myself and to be calm, and I hope, sincerely, to have succeeded in this, no way, difficult task! First of all I will most heartily congratulate Mr. Young on having friends "cleaning his dirty linen" when this gentleman prefers not to do it himself. One day he needs a minister of justice to defend him; another time he wants Mr. Hovind! So far as I understand, Mr. H. only confirms my writings. I have only to put in the name of Mr. Newman instead of yours when enumerating the gentlemen belonging to "the ring." Although an error which I openly confess, still you will find it excusable when continuing to read the article where Mr. Y. is speaking of you and of the reverend Clarke. Please let anybody translate his article in the March copy of his journal of this year, page 41—a reproduction of my article in my paper—and ending at page 43, where his criticism begins, it will perhaps be of some interest to many of your readers.

His article is also reproduced with foot notes of mine in the April number of my journal. For the foot-note 1, page 49, (let this be translated into English *quite true*.) I do reproach Mr. Y. for his way of showing his gratitude to the bee-keepers of America, for all the benevolence spent upon it. The expressions of Mr. Y. would claim some early explanation or excuse on his part; it would have been manly done, but up to August 13, when I wrote to you in that direction nothing was done. Is my behavior or that of Mr. Y. the best proof of being that of a gentleman? Every one of your readers will judge. From my childhood I have always been educated and informed that it is a duty, and a virtue too, to defend those absent, or those, probably unable to defend themselves. Mr. Hovind seems to consider this a *fault* of mine, and will attribute my actions to inferior reasons. Will, or *can* he be so mean? Can he not feel, can he not understand more noble sentiments? The worse