

reply to your strictures, I shall not take advantage of the occasion by attacking any man's religion, or by entering into an argument against christianity; albeit I do think that under the circumstances I would not be out of place in doing so. Moreover, I have nothing to say against what is good and true in christianity or any other religion, and there is more or less truth as well as error in them all. I only repudiate the dogmatic and untenable creeds, and object to the narrow bigotry and intolerance of their devotees, often manifested (as in the present case) by men who are naturally fair-minded, but actually made worse by their religion.

At the recent great parliament of religions held in the Art Palace, Chicago, during the exposition, it is an admitted fact, that so far as charity, tolerance and good will are concerned, so far as the "brotherhood of Man" in the highest and noblest sense is concerned, the pagans—to use a world's fair phrase—"made the best exhibit." It was a christian, Rev. Jos. Cook, not a heathen, who sounded the first note of discord at the parliament—who first manifested the ugly spirit of bigotry and narrow intolerance. The learned and able representatives of the great religions of the east were uniformly courteous and charitable in spirit and utterance. The parliament has taught the western world a lesson, which, however, I fear has not yet reached friend York, and that lesson is, that there are other great religions in the world besides Christianity, embracing great moral truths the same as itself; and that the adherents of these religions, including the so-called "infidels" with their religion of humanity, may be just as sincere in belief and exemplary in conduct as the Christian. All are in pursuit of truth though in different ways and by different roads, and it ill becomes one to call another an "infidel" or a "scoffer." The literal meaning of the word infidel is unfaithful, and I therefore decidedly and emphatically object to being called an

infidel by some one I may happen to disagree with in matters of faith—some one may be just as much infidel to my faith as I am to his—some one whose creed may not be a whit better than, if half as good as, my own, and who might be bothered not a little to give a valid reason for his faith other than that he was taught it and that it is popular.

(To be continued in June number.)

The forgoing is part of a long article from the pen of Mr. Pringle and which will be concluded next month. Properly speaking a bee-journal is not the proper place for an article of this nature, but as Mr. Pringle considers himself aggrieved we do not well see how the proper publicity could otherwise be given. The P. B. K. by its publication of this article does not necessarily subscribe to the opinions of the writer, and in justice to ourselves and Mr. Pringle, we request that no comment be offered until the remainder of the article is published.—Ed.

ADULTERATION OF HONEY.

House of Commons, Ottawa, April 23.

Mr. Sproule introduced a bill further to amend the Act, chapter 107, R. S. C., entitled an Act respecting the adulteration of food, drugs, and agricultural fertilizers. The object was to prevent the adulteration of honey, now extensively practised, and to provide for the punishment of persons who sold as honey, or exposed for sale as honey, manufacturers of sugar, glucose, or molasses. The bill had been urgently asked for by the Beekeepers' Association for several years, and had been drawn up by the assn.

Mr. Mills (Bothwell)—Does the hon. gentleman propose to prevent the sale of imitations?

Mr. Sproule—No. Where the imitation is properly labelled, it may be put on the market for sale.

The bill was read a first time.