

UNFAIR EXHIBITING.

Feeding Back Old Honey.

[3476.] Regarding the reply to O. Roberts (on page 470) I appeal to you in the interest of bee-keeping generally, and of honey shows in particular, to publish the following explanation of the methods of the exhibitor referred to in the Query of a correspondent whose Query appears on 448. A shadow now rests on the fair fame of Cheshire bee-keepers, and the sooner it is removed the better. Besides, the principle involved is one which affects exhibitors all over the country, and the future success of honeyshows is imperilled if they are once suspected of not being "fair and square." There can be no doubt that the award of the first prize to the said exhibitor at the Honey Show in Chester last month has caused great dissatisfaction and surprise among exhibitors and visitors to the show. The winning exhibit was a sample of beautiful light-coloured honey, whereas no such light coloured honey has been gathered in the district in 1898, nor was there another sample staged at this show. What the exhibitor has done to secure such a sample of honey may have been done in good faith, and with no intention of obtaining prizes unfairly. If he has fallen into an error, let him admit it, and I am sure his fellow competitors would soon forget it. Your correspondent (2123) says that the exhibitor admits the feeding back of the honey, which was afterwards extracted from the supers. The question, therefore, very simply resolves itself into this: "Is it fair or unfair to feed back to the bees in 1898 honey which was gathered from flowers in 1897, and then extracted and exhibited as 1898 honey, when the schedule says 'gathered in 1898'?" These words "gathered in 1898" are understood by ninety-nine out of every hundred bee-keepers who read a schedule of a show in 1898, to mean "gathered from flowers of the current year." This latter sentence I have never seen in any schedule, and I hope the day will never come when such minute details must be given to secure fair showing among the followers of our craft.—FAIRPLAY, Chester, November 26.

I am much pleased with the accuracy and perfection of your goods. The material and workmanship of the frames and comb foundation is excellent, and I believe your goods excell anything in the market.

A. R. MCRAE.

Bear Brook, Dec. 20, 1898.

FOUL BROOD.

How We May Know the Disease.

It is not difficult to diagnose this malady. As the name implies, the germs only attack the larvæ or brood. In case the larvæ are effected they do not develop but really putrefy, for putrefaction is only the attack of organic matter by some bacterium. Usually, unless the disease is well under way there will not be many diseased larvæ on a comb, and so the odor about the hive will not be so manifest as to give warning of the presence of the evil; yet the observing apiarist—and no apiarist can afford to be other than observing when this disease is about—may still detect the presence of the malady. The cells with the diseased brood will either not be entirely capped over—that is there will be a small central hole in the cap—or else if capped over, the cap will be concave like the capping of the honey cell instead of convex. Thus when brood cells are seen with small holes in the capping or with the caps sunken, we should at once examine to see if the cause is foul brood. The best way to make the examination is to take a pin, push the head into the cell and pull it out and if it brings with it a brown stringy mass, looking like decayed organic matter which when it lets go from the head of the pin, flies back as if elastic, then surely the disease is present in that hive. The new bee disease of the last few years is entirely different. In that case, the larvæ turns black but keeps its form and does not turn to a decayed salvy mass. Thus I have given a description which will enable every person to easily determine the presence of this dreaded pest—The Rural Californian.

I was a subscriber to The Canadian Bee Journal before its first copy was printed, it has improved greatly since.

ROD. MCLEAN.

Picton Co., Nova Scotia.

I have for several years dealt with the Goold, Shapley & Muir Co. in bee supplies. I have in every instance been pleased with the quality of their goods. I believe their comb foundation is equal, if not superior, to any of the United States make. I have found the firm prompt and correct in business. I hope the above brief testimonial may be of use to you.

W. A. WHITNEY.