

apart to do well? Also tell me how to enclose a yard to exclude night robbers from pilfering? There are many ways to do it but I want a cheap way. I have used the hen yard and found it good in some ways, there is no grass or weeds growing which others would have to cut away from the entrance of the hive. My health compels me to retire from that work. With best wishes to the fraternity.

Bear Brook, Ontario.

[I may say we intend to revive the old question drawer and I trust any who wishes to take part in this work either by sending in questions or by answering will communicate with the Editor. Warm some one else; write more freely for the Canadian Bee Journal and in your effort to warm others, you will receive warmth and information.—Ed.]

Honey Adulteration and Foul Brood.

The Rev. Mr. Clarke, L'nderbank, in his report of the "Provincial Convention in Montreal Witness, represents, or misrepresents, that the adulteration of honey that the Association is fighting is the feeding of diluted syrup or sugar to bees and not a product of manual skill, ingenuity and labor. He also claims to have a prescription, which when feed to bees not only prevents but destroys "Foul Brood," while Mr. Cowan of the B. B. J. claims that such means only kills or retards the development of *Bacilli*, but only intense heat destroys the *Spores*. Is the reverend gentleman romancing or worse? You might answer in the C. B. J.

Yours truly,

G. G. SHERREFF.

Clarence, Jan. 30th, '97. Sec'y. B.B.K.A.

We have avoided saying anything about Mr. Clarke. He has in years gone by been of some service to bee-keeping, but he is up in years, and bee-keeping is evidently one of the subjects in which Mr. Clarke has not kept up to the times, and it would be better for him and for bee-keeping if he discontinued his contributions to the public press. But we do not think that Mr. Clarke has the power to mislead anyone in the subject, and for that reason we can perhaps afford to remain silent. We do regret very much that a paper such as the Montreal Witness, of so high a standing

should allow such trash to appear in its columns; but the proprietors are certainly not practical bee-keepers and in this subject they are at the mercy of others. And more, we must not look for perfection in anything in this world. Let us be charitable and say as little as necessary about Mr. Clarke.—Ed.

Report of the Ontario Bee-Keepers' Convention.

On page 1004 of your paper may be found the following statement:

"Report of Committee on honey legislation presented and read by Mr. S. T. Pettit, Chairman of the Committee, and referred back for the purpose of striking out certain objectionable clauses contained therein."

Now Sir, The inference to be drawn from the above is that the other members of the Committee are equally to blame with myself for said "objectionable clauses" whether they be real or imaginary; but I beg to say that no one but myself is in the slightest degree to blame, if blame there be. I signed and read the report not on behalf of the Committee but for myself only. It will be remembered that after the work was fairly started it was decided by the executive and by the Committee and concurred in by the Association that I should go to the Capital alone and in pursuance of this decision I was four times to the capital not accompanied by any member of the Committee.

The Committee knew nothing of the contents of the report until it was read. I am very willing to take the responsibility of that report. As the years go by the Association will come to understand that the report was all right.

There is another misunderstanding in that report that I wish to set right. Anyone reading the first column page 1002 would understand that I had tried the two-super system of taking comb honey; but I have not, and it may be that if I should, I would like it better than I imagine.

In our discussions we sometimes fail to make ourselves well understood, but by the use of the papers we can straighten these things out.

S. T. PETTIT

Belmont, Jan. 19, 1897.