

kept a cluster of bees without food for eighteen days, and even at the end of the of this period, only a few bees were starved." Without distinctly denying that the above was the case, we would say we cannot recollect of any experiment with such a length of time taken to starve the bees. Those taking the greatest length of time to starve, were bees given an abundance of time to fill their honey sacks; every bee was given this opportunity. Then the bees kept in a fairly cool and dark place, undisturbed would consume their honey in the least time.

It is not fair for Mr. Corneil to conclude from such a test, that in a season of activity when building comb and being otherwise in a state of activity the bees take the same length of time to get rid of the honey in their sack and, therefore to remove the comb built in the new hive after four days according to McEvoy's plan, is useless.

The starvation plan must be carefully done throughout. The bees must have a chance to entirely fill themselves, not some but all. Then when they begin to show signs of starvation the diseased honey has been consumed. It is not, then, a question of time, but of *symptoms of starvation*. A much better plan to get rid of diseased honey, which the bees may take with them into the new hive, is McEvoy's. Put the bees upon starters, first the bees are liable to use for wax secretion the diseased honey, failing that, they consume it themselves, and lastly, should any be left it will be cut away with the starters, and the bees make their second start with the triple precaution that all the old honey has been wiped out. The cure is effected, some claim, in every instance. No one conversant with Mr. McEvoy's work denies but that the cure is effected in every or almost every instance, some say in every instance. Getting rid of the old honey is at the root of the system. It is strange that R. L. Taylor cannot see this. We are not surprised that Mr. Corneil should so easily and constantly stumble, when he discusses the foul brood question, he has not practical

knowledge of the disease, but Mr. Taylor has practical knowledge and is an able bee-keeper and differing widely in his views upon the foul brood question.

Again, in the same article, Mr. Corneil says: "Cases are on record in which, during the honey flow the disease almost disappeared, but afterwards returned with all its former virulence. I venture the opinion, that in such cases, even so simple a disinfectant as common salt in the food, might have been sufficient to so weaken the microbes that the balance would have been turned against them, they would have been overcome by the phagocytes, and the disease eradicated."

The "phagocytes," Mr. Corneil mentions are "an army of germ killers" to defend the the larvae against foul brood and other germs. Sometimes the phagocytes come out ahead, sometimes the foul brood germs. It depending upon the power and number of the army on either side. The reason why in a good honey flow the foul brood almost disappeared he says was because under these healthy stimulating conditions the phagocytes became more abundant and overcame the foul brood germs. A little salt added, he thinks would assist in entirely destroying the germs. Note "the disease almost entirely disappeared, but returned with all its former virulence."

The explanation is easy without the phagocytes. When the colony is in the first stages of the disease and not many cells are affected, with the fresh honey coming in freely, the bees are not likely to feed the larvae diseased honey. The disease disappears entirely or almost entirely only to return when honey is taken from a diseased cell after the flow ceases. The salt in this case would play about as important a part in the entire extermination of foul brood in the colony as salt plays in the attempt of the little boy catching the sparrow.

We have been with Mr. McEvoy upon this question to a great extent. That foul brood can be caused from chilled brood we have felt inclined to doubt.