

sition to Mr. Cheshire's statement, that the disease is sometimes introduced with the queen, may perhaps be gathered from the following. When the Roots were battling with foul brood a few years ago, the question was raised as to whether the disease would be carried to other apiaries by queens and bees shipped from their yard. On page 682 of *Gleanings* for 1887, we find Mr. Doolittle writing as follows: "If you accept any other theory of the spreading of foul brood than through the honey, such as that the disease is in the tissues of the old bees, and in the ovaries of the queen, as put forth by Cheshire, you put an effectual barrier on the queen traffic, and an untold catastrophe on bee-keeping throughout the world."


Cheshire seems to have anticipated just such opposition from men like Mr. Doolittle and Mr. Jones. On page 138 of the *B.B.J.* for 1885 he says: "That queens can and do sometimes bring disease to the stock into which they are inserted, I have put altogether beyond question; and this fact, although perhaps at first unwelcome to dealers is, after all, an addition to our knowledge, which tends directly to the advantage not only of the bee-keeper, but of the dealer himself, since the interests of the two, when clearly understood, are found to be identical."

I think I would be quite justified in applying Mr. Jones' expressions of surprise at the want of knowledge of certain persons "at this late date," to himself and his friend, Mr. Doolittle, but I forbear.

S. CORNEIL.

Lindsay, Nov. 6th, 1891.

S. M. Doolittle's Reply.

 HAVE only a few words to say in reply to Mr. Corneil's article on "*Bacillus Alvei*." He says I make "no attempt whatever to justify" my position against Mr. Cheshire on the foul brood matter, "but proceed to find fault with his teaching." Well, if proving that honey is the chief way, if not the only way, that foul brood is spread in the U.S., or the whole of North America, while Mr. Cheshire says that only occasionally can honey convey it," is no attempt to justify my position, then I am no judge of logic or of any matters pertaining to bee-keeping. Quinby said he took foul broody honey and fed it to healthy young swarms soon after they were hived, and *every one, without exception had caught the contagion*," and hundreds of bee-keepers know that this is the sure result of such a course, and yet, notwithstanding all this, Mr. Cheshire rises and says, (and Mr. Corneil would have us believe what Cheshire says in preference to our own experience, and

that of our beloved Quinby), "There is not one single old idea about this disease which is not incorrect, except that it is contagious," and "the old bees almost invariably are the channels of infection." I *know* that I cured my apiary in 1872 and 1873 by the Quinby plan of hiving all natural and driven swarms into clean empty hives, and right in the face of this *knowledge*, Mr. Cheshire and Mr. Corneil tell me that the disease is *not* spread, only occasionally by the honey, but *by the old bees which are full of bacillus alvei*. No one respects or prizes scientific research more highly than I do, but to be of value to me that "research" must not run right squarely up against *positive known facts*. Quinby cured hundreds of colonies of bees of foul brood by simply hiving them in clean empty hives. I cured my whole apiary in just the same way seventeen years ago, since which I have not even seen a single cell of foul brood in our locality, and hundreds of others have cured thousands of colonies in the same way, while with all the care and best endeavor used by those careful experimenters, the Roots of Medina Ohio, not a single colony was cured by Mr. Cheshires' plan; but in order to cure them they had to finally come over to the *old Quinby plan*; that *one single old idea* among others about this disease, which Mr. Cheshire says is "incorrect." If I have made no attempt to justify my position, all right, I am willing to abide by the judgment of the general reader. I am not prejudiced in the matter, and had hoped that time would prove that the phenol cure would be one which the every day practical bee-keeper could use with success; but as such has not proven to be the case, there was no other way for me to do, as a faithful servant of those for whom I labor, but to lift up a warning voice. The part of Mr. Corneil's article in which he gives any tangible proof to support his theories, is so fine and hair-splitting that it is of no value to the rank and file of our pursuit, and reminds me of the winding up of the "pollen theory" as put forth by Mr. Heddon, in which, to get the theory out of the corner in which it was driven, the microscope had to be used to prove that enough pollen remained about the sides and bottoms to the cells of what all practical observers would call perfectly empty combs, to give the "disease" to any colony; thus proving that all the previous talk about giving bees combs containing no pollen, and then feeding sugar syrup, could not be of any practical benefit to the average apiarist of our country. In conclusion, permit me to ask Mr. Corneil, if Mr. McEvoy of his Province, who is appointed by the authority of that Province as a *foul brood inspector and curer*, is exterminating that disease by the