

there is deep dissatisfaction either with the act or the way in which it is enforced. President Evans also made his remarks in just the right place—his address.

Acts are rarely perfect and after years of experience we need not be surprised if the Government can see improvements, but the Government justly expects such recommendations from bee-keepers', and the association to which it contributes its money, and for which a discerning and critical public will hold it responsible to supply it money only so long as it is useful.

As a result of what President Evans and others on the floor said about foul brood matters a committee was appointed to see if it would be advisable to change the act. We know that the foul brood inspector has never from the day he took office lived up to that act, and every bee-keeper whom he visits could justly have prosecuted him for himself breaking the act—surely an astonishing position for a Government official. Now, I am not saying that the act is right. To tell the truth I am partially with the inspector in the practical value of the instruction of the act. But to what I want to draw attention is the fact that a committee knowing that what is stated above is true, and has been for years, a committee of the Ontario Bee-keepers' Association brings in a report that "the act is all right", and then the highly officered association, which has twice the number of officers there is any need for, and that there are in organizations with a larger membership. Officers who have had their expenses paid year after year to the meeting, when the same money might be used to increase the grants of the local associations and infuse more life into them.

If this report is right and the act needs no amending then the Ontario Bee-keepers Association, and particularly its executive officers, must be in a lamentable condition to allow the inspector to so carry out the act. Let me say that in my estimation the act requires amending and there are things in the act at present not carried out which should be.

Again foul brood should not be left to be treated by bee-keepers during the robbing season, such only enhances the danger of spreading the disease. Our present inspector could be the best man we have were the act in proper shape and he MADE to live up to it. He cannot be everywhere during the honey season. What shall we do? Think of stamping out foot and moth disease by skipping here and there leaving imperfect work behind. Thinking of smallpox, scarlet fever, diphtheria, etc., in the same light we would say it was a waste of money, and the persons who endorsed such action knowingly very wrong.

When the act was passed I doubt not, the Ontario Legislature and the ministers knew not over how wide an area the disease was distributed. What must we do to help the inspector out, to help bee-keepers out, and to guard the interests of the province and Dominion? We must act promptly and energetically. The assistant inspector, well, how is he situated? A Government post office clerk on a mail train, whom I believe, makes a daily run, or if not is so tired that he has to rest between. He has also a large apiary, a good man, but does it show good common sense, does it show ordinary business ability to appoint such a man sub-inspector? Let bee-keepers judge. What it appears to me we want is a sub-inspector appointed in