

common opin-
ime journey,
and nectar.
ston Bonnier
ers only pol-
ater or only
in "Glean-

ing on dan-
llen in little
while their
podded out,
athered con-
e time. If
resent in the
very strange
y and take

a bee in its
ted particu-
hile passing
nk its head
o the flower,
was to be
oticed clearly
lly adhering
nd fro. We
hat the bees
oney at the

Fork! May
he "A.B.J."
Yours is an
independent.

ble, but all
se who have
write to the
most valuable
against cer-
olicy is just
ation as the
elects certain
Both these
which writes
least valu-
o never says
r his fellow-

then a sub-
or he simply
els his sub-
a the usual

custom is to write a letter to the editor combatting his views, and insisting on his printing it. The latter is much the better method. In Canada we are rather inclined to be American and "stand-offish." We agree or we disagree, and if we disagree with the editor we too seldom try to discuss the question at issue. We are not a nation of letter-writers.

If Canada is to be great and to have a unified rational opinion, there must be an interchange of views between the people of the various sections and between those who have opposite or diverse aspirations and ambitions. No periodical is in a better position to facilitate that exchange of opinion than the "Canadian Courier." Hence we invite correspondence on any and every national topic.—"Canadian Courier."

Substitute "Canadian Bee Journal" for "Canadian Courier" in the above, and you have our opinion exactly. It does not follow that because the editor permits his readers to express their opinions that those opinions are necessarily his. He desires to get the view-point of as many of his readers as possible, whether they agree or disagree with him. So long as an equal opportunity is given to all to discuss any question upon which there is a difference of opinion, readers should not quarrel with the editor. This promotes healthy and helpful discussion, and as a result the truth is brought approximately nearer.

DISINFECTION OR NO DISINFECTION

Mr. D. M. Macdonald, in "British Bee Journal," referring to The Canadian Bee Journal, says:

"In a recent extract I ventured the assertion that simple **shaking** is insufficient to clear out the dregs of foul brood. The Editor in March issue quotes me, and says, 'I entirely disagree with you.' I, in turn, disagree with his pronouncement, and give emphatic testimony from this and the other side in support of my contention. Dr. White, expert in bacteriology, in April 'Gleanings,' says: 'Use no bee-supplies from an infected apiary unless they are thoroughly disinfected.' Just what I said. 'It is always safer to allow the bees to go into a new hive or a hive which has been thoroughly disinfected.' Just what Mr.

Cowan has ever taught. Mr. Root is equally emphatic on this feature. His words are: 'Too much emphasis cannot be placed on this point. Our own experience has demonstrated that foul brood could be (and has been) communicated by the hive alone. All hives should be disinfected.' Mr. Hurley should fall in line!"

Such an array of authority does seem formidable. I lay no claim to be an authority on this matter. Experience is my only authority. And I cannot refrain from still believing that old hives may be used without disinfection. I have Dr. White's bulletin No. 75, part IV., before me. In this he says: "Some preliminary experiments have been made, but the results do not indicate that drugs, in the treatment of this disease, have the value advocated by some English writers." I remember the launching of the formaldehyde cure, and its subsequent miserable failure. Now as to disinfection of hives and frames, it is my firm belief that when the diseased combs with their contained honey are taken from the bees, and subsequent robbing therefrom is absolutely prohibited, the four-day treatment on starters and subsequent sheets of foundation will effect a permanent cure with the use of old hives, without any disinfection whatever. It has been done thousands of times, both in the United States and in Canada. It is true that Mr. E. R. Root expresses an emphatic opinion that "foul brood can be (and has been) communicated by the old hive alone," but I doubt very much the absolute certainty of it. With so very many opportunities for the bees reaching infected honey, and the possibility of their taking some of it with them from the starters, I cannot understand how one can say **positively** that it came from the non-disinfected hives. But Mr. Root says further: "While, 99 times out of 100, merely shaking on to foundation is perhaps sufficient, yet if there is one case in a hundred where disease is transmitted through the hive (and we have ample proof that there is), **all** hives should be