

THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

"The Greatest Possible Good to the Greatest Possible Number."

VOL. IX, No. 1.

BEETON, ONT., APRIL 1, 1893.

WHOLE No. 334.

OF THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

A WORD OF REJOINDER TO MR. HUTCHINSON.

Our friend Hutchinson of *The Review* essays to explain in the last C. B. J. "Why Mr. Pringle's article was not published." The explanation is not satisfactory to me at any rate. I may be obdurate—possibly obtuse—but I am unable to see "eye to eye" with Mr. H. in this matter. He is surprised that I should give the impression to the readers of the C. B. J. that he was not willing to give me a hearing; and suggests that perhaps I had "no intention of giving any such impression." Now I am sorry to have to tell friend Hutchinson that that was exactly my intention, for that was what I believed. If Mr. Hutchinson was willing to give me a hearing why did he not do so? If the *Review* of that issue was full why not have given it in the next or a subsequent issue? I cannot for the life of me see how that friend's letter which accompanied the returned manuscript proves that Mr. H. was willing to give me a hearing. He seems to think it does, and that it was a sort of *supplicatio veri* for me to withhold it. Instead of proving his willingness it appears to me to assert his unwillingness. He returns the manuscript, and says he has "decided that there can be no good in further discussing this sugar-honey matter at present." That is plain enough. But my friend forgot that my article was not on the sugar honey question. It was strictly within the

line of what Mr. Hutchinson had called for in the previous number of the *Review*. He called for articles on what bee-keepers should do to "better their condition." It was in response to that I wrote. The sugar honey question came in prominently though incidentally. I not only told the bee-keepers generally what to do to better their condition; but I ventured to tell our good friends over there particularly what *not* to do in order to avoid *worsing* their condition (I coin that word). This was probably where the shoe pinched. I contend and maintain that my article to the *Review* was entirely in order; and could not, therefore, be reasonably rejected on the ground that the sugar honey discussion was about to stop. Certainly stop it, if need be; but I was writing on the "topic" of the month selected by himself. And, moreover, this was my first contribution to the *Review*. I am not in the habit of having my manuscript returned to me from any quarter, high or low, and quite naturally felt annoyed that the *Bee Keeper's Review* should begin that business. I had been asked time and again by readers and friends of the *Review* to contribute to its columns; but its enterprising and able editor seemed always to have plenty of assistance—lots of exceedingly prolific and entertaining correspondents—and I saw no necessity of tendering assistance which was not needed. If I attended to all the calls on this well-worn quill I might do nothing else, day or night. But there came a time when I felt it a bounden duty to speak through the *Review* on that "sugar honey"