

I do not know that I could prove these theories as to the origin of foul brood, but I have seen a great many cases of foul brood under those and similar conditions. I find by microscopical observations that as soon as the disease gets well started many of the young larva are attacked as soon as they are hatched. These often die before being sealed up, while others are sealed up and die after. All the foul brood that I have ever seen are backward in the cells, that is with the head in the bottom of the cell. I have often been asked if foul brood caused wrong presentation, or if wrong presentation caused foul brood. It is plainly to be seen that the first is correct. When the disease attacks the larva, in its agony it turns itself with its head in the bottom of the cell and remains in that position. But many of them attain their full growth in the early part of the disease, before they die. If the combs are taken from the hive before the larva is sealed, they will often push themselves backward out of the cells, but they will not do so if left in the hive. I have examined a great many foul brood combs this season, and I have seen a many cases just after being sealed, which to look at, seemed to be healthy and perfect, but when the caps were cut off, apart and sometimes all would show the wrong or backward presentation, and if an attempt is made to drag them out of the cells, at any stage of the disease, they will break and run like so much matter, while all with the proper or head presentation can be drawn out whole. I have noticed that whenever there has been found a few cells in a hive with this wrong presentation it is only a matter of a few days before we have a full developed case of foul brood. Therefore, I never wait or procrastinate in the matter but attend to it at once. The great trouble with many bee-keepers is that they try to cut it out, but this is like trying to cut a cancer with a knife, the roots are left and the disease soon develops again.

My system of curing the disease is practically the McEvoy plan, while I do not strictly follow his rule it is similar. I feel greatly indebted to Mr McEvoy, and I believe the whole bee-keeping fraternity have been benefited by him to some extent. At least all those who have adopted his theory seem to believe that his system is the best.

My way of handling this disease is as follows: Just as soon as I discover foul brood or any of this wrong presentation, I take a clean hive, then I put in one frame fully or wholly filled with pure clean honey. I set this in the centre of the hive, and I fill the hive with frames of founda-

tion, after they have worked two days I take out the frame of honey and replace it with another frame of clean honey and the job is complete. I do not exchange the foundation frames at all. I expect that some of my brother bee keepers will take exception to this modus operandus for the cure of foul brood. But allow me to state that I have followed this plan for two years and I have never lost a colony of bees by this disease when those instructions were followed. For this reason and in the absence of something quicker or better I expect to stay with it. The only trouble that I have experienced has been carelessness by some bee-keepers in destroying the foul or rotten brood. I have heard of some who were anxious to save some of the nice clean brood. There would probably be one or more cells of this nice brood, with this wrong presentation, and the result would be foul brood again. This is what Ben Franklin called penny wise and pound foolish, they may save a few cents and lose many dollars.

I will relate one circumstance that tends to prove that foul brood is, as I have before stated a disease of the young brood and not of the living bees.

A bee-keeper on finding a colony with foul brood, examined his whole apiary, when he found five cases in all, also one with laying workers and two with no queen and no unsealed larva. He smoked the bees and transferred the three strongest as I have before stated, then put the other two foul brood colonies into the queenless colonies, also putting the one having the laying workers into the weakest one, and the bees were not troubled with the disease after. I decidedly would not recommend such a course, yet it indicates that although the disease is introduced by the bees by contact, it seems to need young larva to introduce it.

I do not introduce these ideas as a standard for anyone to be guided by, but in the hope that further knowledge may be gained on the subject.

Salt Lake City, Utah.

[We do not know that we would like to subscribe to the above views, but good may result from a discussion of the subject. Some of our readers will doubtless have something to say on it. Let us hear from them.—Ed.]

I think the CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL has very much improved, and I would not like to be without it. JOHN HANBRIDGE.

Everett, Ont., Feb'y. 14th, 1896.