

and damaging statements militate against the success of our Bill. I may state right here that I replied through the Press in order to disabuse the public mind of the spurious and misleading statements held forth by our opponent.

Again an effort was made to work up a prejudice against our Bill by stating in a public way that it legalizes honey dew, when such is not the case, for it does not in any way seek to affect the legal status of honey dew. Again one of our opponents sets forth that 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. This statement is not in accord with facts, for the maximum fine for the former offence is one hundred dollars. It would seem that that statement is made in order to prejudicially affect our Bill. I mention these things that all may understand the difficulties to be overcome.

While at the Capital last April I again had the honor of placing our claims before the Premier and nearly all the Ministers and many Members of the House of Commons, and also before some of our Senators, and I came away with the feeling that our Bill would become law if the Members should be privileged with an opportunity to vote upon it and I am seized with the same conviction still.

And now I do recommend that the Association continue to press its claims for the legal protection of our struggling industry and the reputation of Canada demand.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

S. T. PETTIT.

Mr. McKnight.—I opposed the Bill because I considered it needless and secondly because it is unwise to spend money on a needless thing. My opinion is that if you have not a Sugar Honey Bill it is Mr. Pettit's fault.

The Chairman.—Call it a Pure Honey Bill.

Mr. McKnight.—No, I won't call it a Pure honey Bill. Here is the words of the Act itself "what the bees gather from natural sources." We could have had the Bill if it had not been for the opposition of Mr. Pettit himself. Here is an extract from a letter he wrote Dr. Sproule; in this letter he urges Dr. Sproule to oppose Mr. Wood's Bill. He is endeavoring to show Mr. Sproule that Mr. Wood's Bill is not a suitable Bill, not what Mr. Pettit wanted.

Mr. Pettit.—Although the Hon. Mr. Wood's intentions were good his Bill could not possibly be of any use but rather an injury.

Mr. McKnight.—I look upon the Bill now as I did before just like a chip in porridge. I believe we have already all the protection that Bill affords. The cost of the delegations must be somewhere over \$800. I believe this Association was misled last year and because of its being misled this additional amount was taken out of the Treasury. If the honest truth had been stated to the Association last year I firmly believe no delegates would have been sent the work would have been done without incurring any expense.

Mr. Pettit.—I say the Bill would certainly have passed if I had not objected to it, and I did object to it, and because I objected to it, it did not pass. The provisions in Mr. Wood's Bill was that it should be marked on the label what it was, you could go right on producing if you wanted to. If that is the kind of a Bill you wanted, I made a mistake in opposing it, but my opinion is that if we get a Bill at all we must have one that will give us proper protection.

Mr. Brown.—In my neighborhood I supply honey for the dealers. One grocery store that I had been in the habit of supplying honey to I did not fill my order for a few days, and when I came back I found the shelves decorated with honey of this description (showing bottle of honey labeled "Pure Canadian Honey"). I said, "What are you selling honey at?" and he said 25 cents for two or 13 cents for one. He partly refused to buy any from me, but afterwards agreed to take some of mine.

Now it is open for anyone in the audience to see the label on that package. It is labeled Pure Canadian Honey. I purchased two of these and sent one to be analyzed by the public chemists at Ottawa and here is his reply. The package I sent to Ottawa was sent with an unbroken seal and here is the report of the public chemists: "Canada analysis of food number 4937. Office at Ottawa, 2nd Jan., 1896. I, T. MacFarlane, chief analyst duly appointed and acting on and for the Inland Revenue Department, thereby certify that I received from Mr. Frank T. Schult, chemist for the Experimental Farm, on the 13th day of Dec., 1895, by hand, a sample of honey for analysis with label unbroken and I have caused the same to be analyzed and declare it to contain as follows:

Water	26.30
Substance soluble in alcohol including 53.23 reducing sugar	67.12
Dextrine, etc., insoluble in alcohol	6.08

100.00

Optical examination. It possesses right-