

done in various ways. For the sterilization of material by disinfectants, there was a tendency formerly amongst bacteriologists to run to such disinfectants as corrosive sublimate, carbolic acid, etc., but later work has shown that there are a number of common chemicals which will act just as well, or perhaps better. Corrosive sublimate has lost much of its reputation as a disinfectant within the last few years, and carbolic has been shown to be not nearly so powerful as at first supposed. For cleaning hives and frames which are suspected to contain the spores of foul brood, a hot 10 per cent. solution of soft soap is perhaps as effectual as any that can be recommended. A good strong solution of washing soda when hot is also very active, destroying the spores in a few minutes. Both these are certainly better than five per cent. carbolic for disinfecting the hives and frames, as their cleaning properties are so much better than it, and Belwing has shown that five per cent. carbolic requires at least three hours at blood heat to destroy the spores of anthrax. In case the soap or the washing soda is used, however, it must be used as hot as possible. Of course, anything which is of no value should be burnt.

I trust that in this paper I have thrown a little light upon some of the facts in connection with the disease of foul brood; but as I stated in the beginning, I reserve the privilege of submitting to you, at a future meeting, the results of next summer's work. Before closing, I desire to express my thanks to your able secretary, Mr. R. F. Holtermann, for the assistance he has given me, and also to Mr. S. Corneil, of Lindsay, for advice and for the use of volumes of all the principal Bee Journals, which he has supplied me with; also to Mr. H. H. Larrabee, of Michigan State Agricultural College, in connection with the subject of comb foundation.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

We have an explanatory note from the editor of the *A.B.J.* in reference to Prof. Clarke's assertion and the former's

denial as to the editor's presence at the Illinois State Beekeepers' Convention, and our own remarks thereon. It appears now that we were all of us right in relation to one aspect of the affair, and all wrong as to another. Prof. Clarke stated in his report to us that the editor of the *A. B. J.* was present at the meeting, etc. On page 753 of the *A. B. J.*, the editor says he was not present—an assertion which led us to say that if he was not there the fault was his own, and not Prof. Clarke's, who evidently "took it for granted that the editor of *A. B. J.* was there." It now turns out that Friend York was there and was not there; that is to say, that although he really attended the meeting, he was not present when the resolution referred to by Prof. Clarke was passed, in consequence of the fact that it was necessary for him to be absent for a short time to meet some friends who had just arrived in the city, the resolution being passed in his absence. We feel a little disappointed to think that our remarks, which were conceived entirely in a jocular vein, should have been regarded *au sérieux*. However, it's all right now, and we won't any of us do it again.

o o o

We are exceedingly obliged to the editor of the *Australian Bee Journal* for its kind and complimentary remarks in regard to our modest work, and are happy to know that we have touched upon some topics which may prove of interest in Australia. In this respect, we are glad to be able to reciprocate, inasmuch as we find our antipodean contemporary brimful of valuable matter for consideration. Its column of "Recipes" is really a very valuable contribution to the economic adaptation of honey to domestic culinary purposes.

o o o

We observe from the *Bulletin* that Mr. W. S. Pender, of Drumfin Apiary, West Maitland, Australia, has been notified by the postal authorities that the department has determined upon allowing the transmission through the post-offices of the colony of packets containing bees from