

Can the disease be cured, is the critical question of the day? Yes. Why is it not generally and satisfactorily done? Why are not all the rattle snakes in America killed, the cobras of Asia, the lions of the jungle, the rabbits of Australia or sharks of the sea? A lion can be shot if seen, or poisoned if pursued to take bait. If either cannot be done a thousand shots fired into a jungle may not take effect. A rattle snake come in contact with may be killed, but all the sticks and stones hurled at the rocks will not reach those in its crevices and holes. Foul brood can hide in the holes and crevices of bee cells and in the forests of growth upon their walls as safely from all the drops of acid or other missiles that may be fired at them. Many may be and are killed but some escape, live and reproduce.

Once in a while a bee-keeper may, and does succeed in arresting the disease, but it is under very favorable circumstances that it can be successfully accomplished. It is doubtful if there be a method in existence that will work satisfactorily in anything like a maximum percentage of cases under all circumstances. We have tried the best known methods. They cure, but in circumstances similar to ours, the cure about equals the loss by disease in cost. Were we again to be similarly placed, the most perfect of all purifiers, fire, will do the work of curing. It is the simplest, quickest and best in the long run.

These facts, merely hinted at, carried out in practical detail have led a goodly number of our best and most successful bee-men to put forth effort in securing legislation. These facts laid before our legislators, aroused their sympathies toward an honest and profitable industry, and to-day the business has its first protecting barrier. The bill may be severe. If anyone should lose one to five thousand dollars through the wanton abuse of privilege would they say "Own up. Be honest for once and fall in line. Magnify our law and give to the world, to our neighbor, the purest, cleanest, highest, healthiest bees in existence."

J. E. FRITH.

Woodstock, May 20th, 1890.

Weighing Sections in with Comb Honey.

HONESTY VS. COMMON PRACTICE.

MR DEMAREE'S practice of selling comb honey by weight, deducting therefrom the weight of the sections, led someone to ask through the JOURNAL if this is the

common practice. The answers to this question brought out a variety of opinions. I ventured to say Mr. Demaree's plan was the honest one. Your own note goes to show that you coincide with the views of those who believe it right to weigh the sections and charge for them; your language is "we cannot say with Mr. McKnight that it is the honest one (deducting the weight of the sections) if by that he implies that the other and common method is a dishonest one." Well, what is honesty! May it not be defined as an absence of deception. If there is a distinct understanding between the seller and the buyer that the wood in which the comb is built is to be charged for as honey, then there is no deception and no dishonesty, but if no such understanding exists and the seller weighs up the basswood or spruce and charges for it as honey the transaction is dishonest. It may quiet the conscience but it will not remove the injustice to say "the sections costs the producer money. If you buy a barrel of flour and you get 190 lbs. of flour and 6 lbs. of wood you would be very likely to ask the miller "why this shortage?" You would not be satisfied if he replied the barrel costs me money." If you buy a lb of tea from your grocer and you get 15 $\frac{1}{2}$ oz. of tea and $\frac{1}{2}$ oz. of paper, you would be very likely to suspect the honesty of the grocer. In all branches of trade the cost of the *original package* is supposed to be covered by the profit on the gross sale, unless it is distinctly understood otherwise; a thousand examples might be quoted in commercial practice to show that your position is not tenable for ten you can show to support your contention. Unquestionably Mr. Demaree's practice is the honest one, and the "common" one (unless in cases where there is an acquiescence on the part of the purchaser) is dishonest, because there is deception in it.

R. MCKNIGHT.

Owen Sound, June 30th, 1890.

We must still confess that we do not see this matter in the same light as Mr. McKnight. Common consent makes a law, that law is looked upon as honest, and in law would not be characterized as *dishonest*. If we take the very example quoted by Mr. McKnight, but few will be found who will characterise it as dishonest. The paper is weighed in with almost every pound of tea that is sold, and the calculation is that the cost of the paper is by this means covered. This is the rule with tea, sugar, rice, and all other groceries of like nature, and the same rule applies to honey in the comb. Perhaps, if we come right down to the fine thing, it may be *morally* wrong, but common usage makes it *legally* right, because there is "an acquiescence on the part of the purchaser," just as Mr. McKnight says.