

# CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL

PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

NEW SERIES  
Vol. III, No. 2.

BRANTFORD, ONT., AUG., 1895.

WHOLE No.  
366.

There is to-day no one who has made a more strenuous effort to defeat the Pure Honey Bill brought before the Dominion House than Mr. W. F. Clarke.

Some of our readers know that Mr. Clarke brought the matter before the general public through the columns of the *Mail and Empire*. If Mr. Clarke had stuck to the truth he could have done no greater harm than to leave the impression with the uninitiated, general public that honey was probably largely sugar syrup, but unfortunately Mr. Clarke did not confine himself to the truth. He said, in effect, that discussion was so stifled at Brantford that only two spoke against the Pure Honey Bill. We do not hesitate to say that only two in the room were opposed to the Bill, and to lead people to believe anything else is to lead them to believe what is untrue. When we make the above statement we do not forget the incident through which Mr. Clarke made public the fact that he stated that Mr. Ouellette had produced and marketed sugar syrup in sections. We stated privately, *not publicly*, that we heard on the best of authority, but did not, in public, give the name. We believe after Mr. Ouellette's private explanation, that when he employed told him that sugar syrup fed to the bees would produce honey, and Mr. Clarke personally had nothing to do with it, Mr. Clarke believed it. Mr. Ouellette is in favour of the Bill, and we do not require to excuse even him. Again, Mr. Clarke says he

has letters from other bee-keepers, but he takes mighty good care not to say that they are opposed to the Pure Honey Bill, although he evidently writes in that way to lead the general public to believe that these letters oppose the measure. So certain are we that Mr. Clarke has not the letters of more than one Canadian bee-keeper living, that we will give him \$1.00 for every Canadian bee-keeper from whom he had letters at that date, opposing the Pure Honey Bill. He says, in effect, that bee-keepers in Britain know better than not to accept the idea that honey can be produced from feeding the bees sugar syrup, and quotes Cheshire to sustain him, (Mr. Clarke,) in his position. All of this, he knows, is untrue. Again, he says that Canadian bee-keepers are mostly very ignorant, probably because Mr. Clarke has lost all influence with them, but he will have to consider other classes ignorant, for only a few days ago a very prominent press man remarked to us that Mr. Clarke's letter would do no harm, as Mr. Clarke had no influence. We have refrained from speaking thus plainly in the *Mail and Empire*, but Mr. Clarke deserves the strongest censure for his action in this matter. We are pleased that quite a number have answered Mr. Clarke's letter. Some of the replies contain more truth than poetry. We have remained silent as long as we could. The bee-keeping interests demand vigorous measures. To remain silent only encourages Mr. Clarke to boldness, and leads him to believe that we dare not defend ourselves.