

the interest of the party who introduced the Bill. The farmers were blandly told that they were entitled to higher prices, and that the so-called pure-food law would enable them to get them, and they were thus deluded into shouting and voting for the fellow who threw them this very thin "pap." Jefferson wrote in 1789, "the tyranny of the legislatures is the most formidable dread at present, and will be for many years." In the light of the acts of this, the year of 1899, we can see that he was clearly correct.

Take the pure-food law of Illinois as an illustration, and some of these incongruities will make themselves apparent. The Food Commissioner, a creation of the last legislature, is to have for his duty the enforcement of the law now existing, *o.* that may hereafter be enacted, regarding the production, manufacture and sale of dairy products or the adulteration of any article of food?" If so, why place them in contrast with all other articles of food? Self interest! Here is the hand of some one who has more interest in one class of producers than in all other producers and consumers combined.

A similar so-called pure-food law was passed in the State of Missouri, which makes it a criminal offence to sell any article intended for human food which contains arsenic, colomel, bismuth, ammonia or alum—a very good law, perhaps, if it had not been in the interest of some one's baking powder. The same legislature let a duplicate of the Brosius pure-food law die in the hands of a committee. Why did not the Illinois law specify honey or apiarian products? Simply because the politicians have not felt the necessity of throwing taffy to the honey-producers as a class.

Let us away with this kind of nonsense; let us have done with this political jobbery; let us enact a national pure-food law in the interest of the consumer, and not for the benefit of any class of producers, let them be for many. Let us as a nation declare that it is a crime to adulterate, to falsely brand, to sell anything for what it is not. If this lowers prices, let them go down. If it raises let them go up. Any business that cannot live in the face of honest competition deserves to die. The honey-producer has nothing to fear from the competition of any article or compound that is sold for what it is, and does not carry a lie on its face. There is great need for education along this line. The moral sense of mankind must be awakened, and they must

be made to feel to knowingly sell falsely-branded or adulterated goods is to commit a crime, morally if not legally. I have here an illustration of such a criminal work in the shape of a jar of so-called honey. It is labeled "Kellogg's Pure White Clover Honey, Medina, O."

I remonstrated with a dealer in our city about selling adulterated honey. He said it was nothing to him, that he would sell a man mud if he wanted it. I said, "So would I, but I would not sell him mud when he asked for honey," neither would I sell him two quarts glucose and one of honey which some unscrupulous mixers had labeled "Kellogg's Pure Clover Honey," for honey, for it is not honey, and the man who labeled it honey knew the label was a lie when he put it on, if he ever thought enough about what constitutes a lie to understand the real facts in the case. To take a man's money for a mixture of glucose and honey when he asks for honey, is obtaining money under false pretenses just as much as it is to give a check on a bank when one never had any money deposited there. They send men to the penitentiary for the latter; why should not the same penalty be inflicted for the former crime? Will some honest (?) mixer please rise up and explain?

There seems to me but one way to get at the root of this evil, and that is by a national law making it a criminal offence to adulterate or misbrand any food or drug in any territory of the United States and the District of Columbia for interstate commerce or exportation, and then let each State pass a law of the same kind to reach the cases within its own borders. Of course, you understand that the United States cannot regulate the manipulation and sale of food and drug products in the various States of the Union, but it can control the matter in territories for interstate commerce, and when the goods are intended for a foreign market.

Now, what are the prospects of such national legislation as I have suggested? I may say, in a word, that the outlook for the passage of such a law is very good indeed, and the most important thing for us as bee-keepers and citizens of the United States is to see to it that our influence goes to help forward the work of securing the enactment of such a law, and that we do not waste any of our energies on side-issues gotten up to promote the political interests of some individual.

During the summer I have notice a good deal said about Senator Mason and his