

We have lately been studying German and French Bee Journals, and are surprised to find that so many in these countries hold

#### Foul Brood.

the idea that foul brood develops spontaneously. Germany and France are countries which have brought out our best bacteriological information, and they are a people fully aware of all the arguments that we have in opposition to this theory. It certainly would be interesting and important to have a solution to this to this question. If McEvoy should be right in his claim that it may develop from chilled brood, the province will not be large enough to hold him. But, Mr. McEvoy, please remember for the present take the safe ground, and keep quiet about it. Howard may be right, after all.

\* \* \*

Prof. A. J. Cook is already having an influence upon bee-keeping in California.

The following is from The American Bee Journal:

**Legalized.** "The Anti-Honey-Adulteration law of California has been referred to in these columns several

times recently. Mr. C. H. Clayton, of Lang, California, on July 1 wrote me as follows concerning it:

Referring to the editorial on Page 412, "Against Honey Adulteration," I take the liberty to send you a copy of our law on the subject. I think it will prove of interest to all the readers of The Bee Journal. There was another anti-adulteration law passed at the same session of the Legislature, which embraces in its terms all articles of *food* and *drink*.

C. H. CLAYTON.

The "copy" of the law kindly sent by Mr. Clayton reads thus:

**CHAPTER CIV.**—An act to prevent the sale of imitation or adulterated honey, and to provide a punishment therefor. (Approved March 26th, 1895)

**SECTION 1.** Any person who, by himself or an agent, sells, or offers for sale, or in any way disposes of, any substance or composition of the appearance of honey, or which in color, consistency and taste, resembles honey, but is not honey—the natural product of the bee, or a pure extract therefrom—upon the representation

or claim or pretence that the same is honey, or a pure extract therefrom, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of one hundred dollars, or by imprisonment in the county jail for three months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

**SEC. 2.** For the purpose of this Act, "pure extract of honey" is honey extracted from the comb without the addition of any other substances.

**SEC. 3.** This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

Now if the California authorities will see to it that the above law is strictly enforced, the adulteration of honey in that State may soon be a thing of the past. Other States would do well to have a similar law enacted, then, with proper enforcement of them all, the conscienceless adulterators of honey would soon be driven out of their nefarious business."

The above just legalizes as honey everything that is stored by the bees, and if the bees can be induced to store glucose, glucose will become honey. Of course, this is in accordance with Prof. Cook's idea, but we predict it will not enhance the reputation of the California honey, although it may legalize the sale of sugar syrup as honey in California.

#### Foul Brood.

Wm. McEvoy.

At the Bee-keepers' convention held lately in Brantford, Mr. Evans raised the question by asking: "Should not the public be made acquainted with the fact that a person has foul brood." I replied that it would hurt the bee-keepers' business long after their colonies were cured, if that was done.

Mr. Calvert said Mr. A. I. Root published in his own paper the fact that he had foul brood, and it didn't harm his business in any way." Mr. Root is a manufacturer of bee-keepers' supplies, with a world wide reputation for turning out first-class stuff, and that made his case quite different from the bee-keepers that have to depend upon the sales of their honey and bees for what they make out of the business.

Mr. McKnight said:—"I do not think that our inspector should publish to the