

spent with a view to this end. Delegation after delegation have visited the Capital while parliament was in session, and numerous letters have been written Ministers of the Crown and others, that this apparently much desired prohibition might be made law, but up to the present time the energetic men who have had it in hand have been doomed to disappointment. A clear enough proof that the law-makers of our land have not been convinced of its necessity.

I am opposed to the enactment of needless laws. I look upon this "sugar honey" bill as needless. It is needless because we have now, and have had for many years past, a good and salutary law respecting the adulteration of food, that affords bee-keepers, and the public generally, about all the protection the sugar honey bill aims at securing. I have given you the text of this bill; let me now draw your attention to the points in common between it and the Adulteration of Foods Act. The latter act declares: "No person shall manufacture or offer for sale, or sell any food which is adulterated under the meaning of this act," and under the meaning of this act "food is deemed to be adulterated, (1) if any substance has been mixed with it, so as to reduce or lower, or injuriously affect its quality or strength." (2) "If any inferior or cheaper substance has been substituted wholly or in part for the article." (3) "If it is an imitation of, or is sold under the name of another article."

Substituting a cheaper article, making it to assume the appearance of the genuine thing, and selling it under the name of the genuine article is the fraud the sugar honey bill aims at preventing. It is manifest from the provision I have quoted, that the Adulteration of Foods Act fully covers this ground, why then seek after that which we already possess? The bill under review would, I repeat, be but the re-enactment of an existing law, and as such needless. The one aims at amending the other by imposing a heavier fine when adulteration is detected. fifty dollars is the maximum fine in the Adulteration Act for manufacturing or selling food "mixed with that which is not injurious to the public health." Four hundred dollars is the fine here sought to be imposed for precisely the same offence—for no one will aver that the admixture of sugar with honey is injurious to the public health. Understand that the sugar honey bill is an amendment to the Adulteration Act, and if passed we would have the anomaly of a law on our Statute book, one section of which imposes a fine of eight times as heavy as another section of the same act

imposes for the same offence. No wonder the bill in question has not passed into law; but it is a wonder, otherwise sensible men should year after year, persist in "spending their strength for nought" and money "for that which is not bread for bee-keepers."

The Bill is objectionable too, in that it legalizes the sale of "Honey dew" and "bug juice." That which is gathered by the bees from natural sources, is not always honey. Both the above are gathered by the bees and natural sources too. One of them at least is not desirable food.

Mr. McEvoy:—I rise to speak concerning the Foul Brood Act: I like what Mr. McKnight says in reference to Foul brood, I believe he is honest in the matter. We have the best Foul Brood Act in the world. The power that is given to inspect the beeyard is all right if any dispute arises, the proper thing to do is to bring it to the board of directors of the Ontario Bee-keepers Association. That board is comprised of the best bee-keepers of our country, second to none in the world. I have been in twenty-six counties and cities of Ontario, and in five years I have rid the thing out. I have acted as doctor sometimes, and sometimes as a detective and sometimes I have to do the work of a hangman. I claim the power that is given to me to go into the yard and inspect it is the best part of the whole act.

A Member—In Michigan, colonies of bees must be kept 90 feet from the road. I am very sorry such a statute should be on the Michigan laws. I feel that is an injustice to bee-keepers and to agricultural interests generally.

I have thirty colonies of bees and kept them less than 13 feet from the street, in the city of Jackson and have not had any complaint from passers by, although people pass in throngs. Of course I live in the suburbs. It seems to me the law will become inoperative.

Mr. Darling—I followed that paper of Mr. McKnight's very closely. I think he has given us a fair statement of the laws as we have them, and his criticism of the law that we tried to get passed has been in a straightforward manner. He knows I differ from him in one or two points. He mentioned the supreme power that is given to the inspector, but I can scarcely see how the remedy he proposes would apply. How is he going to get a third person? If he gets a third person, that third person is arbitrary. If we have a competent inspector employed, I cannot see that we can better it any. If he is not a competent person, let them bring the matter before the Bee-keepers' association, and it is their