

note, and which in reality is a foot, leg and half a body, not merely to get an opportunity to call me names, such as flat-head, I object most emphatically. You leave your readers to infer that I have not studied the question carefully, and therefore do not know that what causes fish bone, is thickness and quantity of wax and not texture.

Upon my word, the gall of some people is incomprehensible. Just look at the Review, page 121. The idea of any man rejoicing in the fact that he is a heretic in theology and apiculture. Poo woo—

[You refer to an article by Mr. W. F. Clarke, in which he makes this confession. We rejoice that he has made a confession of what may have long been known.—ED.]

I admit I have not given the questions much consideration. But say, don't you think when you get a superfluity of wax in foundation, you will have both fish-bone and texture. You also say in that miserable leg note, that you had some of the article in your house, and it was no fish-bone. I feel inclined to accept your statement, but I hesitate, because a person who will call names, will do other things. I mean eat honey without fish-bone. You may add this to the next instalment of Notes and Pickings. The note of it is, That a flat head is preferable to an S. A. P. head, and the picking will be at your eyes the next time we meet. I like foot-notes a little bit yet. But I'm mad—

[I believe I will have a good look and see if any swarms have come out. I have no time to answer this.—ED].

There is a man from Loveland, Col., who shows in Gleanings page 319, a magnified view of how a foundation looks when fastened by a pressure machine, only to a section. Now assuming the distance between him and me is 1200 miles. If I were that distance less 15 feet nearer then what am, there would be an (Aikin) head come with a tremendous crash off that ridge pole, for saying that all foundations put in the section by that method is likewise. I use nothing but a pressure machine so arranged to the sheet is turned exactly into the proper position before the pressure is taken off. And no such results as he shows in the cut with me. But I'm only a fleebite in comb money production.

According to the answers given to the question clipping question, 1089 C. B. J., the majority who answer do not seem to have any fear of a degeneration of wing power. Of the 14 who answer, I think 9 either pronounce themselves as clippers, or are in

favor of the practice. I too am a clipper first, last and all the time, and have found it a great convenience.

Foul Brood.

I wonder how many of the readers of the Progressive Bee-keeper take the American Bee Journal and Gleanings. Then I wonder how many read Mr. Cowan on "Foul Brood," on page 50 of A. B. J., and Mr. Holtermann on the same subject on page 96 of Gleanings, (both for this year), together with the comments of the editor of Gleanings, on both. And the surprise is that the editor of Gleanings apparently agrees with both. Mr. Cowan says if I read him right, that while foul brood bacilli at the temperature of boiling water, are destroyed, the SPORES the real seed which produces foul brood, apparently suffer no damage at that temperature, but will retain the power of germinating into bacilli, or foul brood after they have been subjected to boiling water. Mr. Holtermann has proven, through experiments carried on by the Ontario government, that the low heat required to melt wax is amply sufficient to purify the worst foul brood combs possible to be obtained, so that no spores are capable of germinating from wax thus rendered: and as I said before, the strange part is that Editor Root endorses both statements as correct. It would be interesting to have Brother Root explain how a temperature of 142, (the point at which wax melts) will kill foul brood SPORES in Canada where Mr. Holtermann lives, while a temperature of 212, (the point at which water boils), will not damage such spores, in the least, in England, where Mr. Cowan resides. There is something wrong somewhere, and as my experiments in 1872-3, when I cured my apiary of foul brood so that it has remained cured ever since, proved that boiling water would destroy every vestige of foul brood, and as hundreds of others have proven the same things, I am compelled to believe that Mr. Cowan, with all his high research, must have made a mistake.—Editorial in Progressive Bee-Keeper.

[I do not think there is necessarily anything strange about this, or if there is anything strange, it is that the Editor of the Progressive has not studied the conditions before comparing. Might there not be something which would prevent