

ten years' investigation of crop injuries by insects he could not think "of a single kind of tree that requires the spraying to be done while the trees are in bloom;" and that, as Prof. Webster's were the first scientific ones which had set the disputed question at rest, "we have, therefore, a firmer basis than ever for demanding the enforcement of the act prohibiting the spraying of fruit trees while in bloom." As to the question whether the honey gathered from the poisoned bloom would be dangerous as food, Pro. Fletcher's opinion was "that it would do no harm to the individual eater," but that he would only give that as an opinion—not as knowledge.

Next came the "Foul Brood Inspector's Report." The gist of it was that the Inspector, during 1894, had examined one hundred and five apiaries, and found foul brood in 39 of them, 34 of these being very bad with the disease, two in which the disease had not made much headway, and three where it had. The Inspector found the people more willing than previously to "take hold" and cure their apiaries; nevertheless, the condition he found things in gave him more to do, he says, than "any person he ever knew of."

The wet weather of May and June of that year proved serious to the bees, the honey flow being so suddenly cut off when the hives were full of brood that the unsealed honey was soon used up and then as the bees failed to uncup fast enough for the brood lots of it starved. The dead brood was supposed by the inexperienced to be foul brood, and a panic ensued, which kept our worthy Inspector hustling at a fearful gait, "rushing, here and there over the Province but keeping "pretty well up with the work," so he tells us. He burned 13 colonies in all, 9 in the County of Halton, 3 in Wellington, and one in Oxford. "The Inspector's time, car fare and livery hire came to \$662.25." I have one criticism or suggestion to make in reference to the Inspector's work, which has suggested to me by a careful reading of the Report I have just reviewed. It would seem from the Report that the Inspector made no call on the Deputy during the season, notwithstanding the repeated pressure of the work.

Now I submit that it would be well for the Inspector either to do less doctoring and more inspecting when there is a pressure upon him for his services in different places, or call out the Deputy to assist him. I take this ground for the following reasons: In most if not all cases delay in the arrival of the Inspector must be dangerous to the bee keeper who has discovered that he has foul brood, and has sent for the

Inspector, and would be more dangerous to his neighbors. Now, if the Inspector is not able to go promptly, when he is urgently called for, the reason ought to be that he is simply inspecting and advising, not doctoring, those who were in ahead of the last applicant. That would be a good reason for the delay, provided the Government refused to pay for the services of the Deputy. But I submit that it would not be a good reason for the dangerous delay on the Inspector's part to say that he was "rushing" through as fast as possible, if, in the meantime he were tarrying here and there to doctor as well as inspect and advise. I go even further than that. When the Inspector has more urgent applications for his services than he can possibly attend to promptly, even though he may not be stopping to doctor, but is simply doing his duty inspecting and advising as fast as he can, it is, I submit, his duty to call in his Deputy to his assistance unless the Government positively refused to pay the Deputy under such circumstances. And there should be a distinct understanding with the Department on this point for it is very important. The matter should be brought before the Minister of Agriculture. The Inspector himself, and all of you know the danger of delay in attending to diseased yards, and the injustice of it to the owners of those yards and their neighbors. For such delay there must be a good and sufficient reason as above indicated.

I trust these suggestions will be received by this Association—especially by the worthy Inspector—in the spirit and intent with which they are given in our common interests.

The next paper was, "Will the Future of Bee-keeping Differ From the Past?" by Mr. W. Z. Hutchinson, editor of The Bee Keepers' Review, Flint, Michigan. Mr. Hutchinson thought that the bee-keeping of the future would differ from that of the past, and took a rather pessimistic view of the future. The industry was becoming a failure in many parts of the United States. The only reason that the essayist knew of for this was that "the natural honey pastures are cut away, and the artificial resources are not sufficient to make the business a profitable calling," added to which is "the summer drouth that results from the clearing away of the forests." There are many localities now "in which," the essayist would not, he tells us, "dare to depend for a living upon bee-keeping alone." In such places "bee-keeping as a specialty is doomed." In reviewing this paper I see nothing to criticise unless the author means to include Canada, especially Ontario, in