

egotistical" if he uses his own name in writing for the press. Here in America he is looked upon as a *coward* if he uses a *nom de plume*—as one who has not the courage to put his signature to what he has written—as a sort of a *sneak* that hides behind a *nom de plume*.

W. Z. HUTCHINSON.

Flint, Michigan, Feb. 12th 1889.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

Bees Stealing Eggs—Vagaries of a Queen.

YOU want to know what the pranks were that my bees were cutting up during the past season, so I will begin and give you some of them. I had one colony queenless in spring, and as it was pretty strong and expecting some swarms to come off in a short time I allowed them to remain without a queen until some of the other colonies swarmed, when I would have queen-cells to give them. A few days after my best colony of Italians swarmed I opened their hive and cut out a nearly matured queen-cell, took it to my queenless one to insert in one of their combs. But on opening the hive and lifting from the centre the frame to which I intended to attach the cell, you may judge of my surprise on finding a queen cell with a queen larva nearly ready for being sealed over and not another larva or egg to be found in the hive. Did they steal the egg from which this larva was produced, or how did it get there? If they did not, is it possible that in their anxiety for self-preservation they might even steal to preserve the existence of the colony? I can account for it in no other way and would like you or some of your experienced correspondents to give their views on this subject through the columns of the C.B.J.

The next freak, the only one besides the above that I will mention at this time, and one that I must say puzzled me even more than the other, was the, to me at least, strange conduct of a colony into which I introduced a pure Italian queen, a very fine one. I put her in the hive, as I thought, successfully. She went in among the bees quietly and they showed no hostility to her, nor any signs of being queenless afterwards. But on the evening of the fifth day after introduction I wanted to see how she was working, but could find no sign of her in the hive, but instead I found seven queen cells built, three of them being sealed over. I went to work at once and cut them all out, went to another hive and took from it a cell that was nearly ready to hatch out and inserted it in place of those I had destroyed. I went the next morning to see if it was hatched but found the side of the cell torn open and

empty. I knew at once that there must be another queen in the hive and on looking over the frame in my hand on which the cell had been torn open and its inmate—allow me to say—murdered, I saw my old queen majestic and unconcerned, striding over the comb on which her inoffensive rival had been slain, which brought me to the conclusion that a virgin queen had been sent me instead of a fertilised and laying one, and that the bees, on account of her not laying, commenced building cells to raise another one to supersede her, and that she had been out on her mating or bridal tour when I first looked for her, and on her return had destroyed the one given in the cell. I at once wrote to the party who sent her, informing him of what had happened and the conclusion at which I had arrived. He was not at all surprised at my conclusion, but assured me that the queen had been laying before he sent her, but he very generously sent another, a tested queen, to replace her, for which he shall always have my best thanks, but the matter is as yet a mystery to me, and I hope I may yet get some light on it. You or some other person may enlighten a novice thorough the C. B. J.

Yours very truly,

ALEX. BLACK.

Sonya, Feb. 11th, 1889.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

A Correction—A Word to Disbelievers.

BY going over the file of C. B. J. again, particularly for the purpose of reading your articles on "Practical Bee-keeping" with leisure—you know during hunting time those papers are stored away, because excitement is then too high and the general talk is deer and the shooting of them—I found in your comment on Muskoka an error, which should have been corrected before this. On page 888, C. B. J., you say:—"We are privately informed—that a lot of Bro. S's. colonies were not weighed—if they were it would bring the yield much higher." Your informant should have said "Hives," instead of "colonies." I weighed my colonies as stated, in my report, page 732, C. B. J. but had a lot of well filled and sealed combs in hives, which I did not weigh, in all about 250 lbs. Of these I sold 50 lbs. to some neighbors, who had found some late swarms in the bush for wintering. A hundred pounds or so of the finest, we used at the table, and another hundred pounds or over are in the combs yet, which I will not be able to extract till next summer. I did not include this lot in my report nor any of the drippings from the cappings (of