

controversy between Mr. Clarke and Wm. McEvoy, in the American Bee Journal. As a man who is a government official and has done his duty fearlessly, Mr. McEvoy deserves support. As far as we know bee-keepers everywhere uphold Mr. McEvoy in this case and those who appear to know say the inspector was long-suffering and erred rather in the direction of allowing Mr. Clarke to experiment with foul brood and give too long rather than too short a time to stamp out the disease. Such references are unpleasant, but we think they are simply just to the inspector, even, if not necessary to assist in sustaining him in his work.

* * *

We always like to see a bee-keeper or one who has shown a deep interest in bee-keeping attain to positions of influence. We know that Dr. Montague, M. P., for Haldimand, is now the Hon. W. H. Montague, Sec. of State. But it is not generally known that the honorable gentleman is a member of the Haldimand Bee-Keepers' Association a convention report of which is found in this number, and takes a deep interest in bee-keeping. When Dr. Montague was editor of The Canadian Farmer he was the first one to solicit articles on bee-keeping from the writer of this editorial, thus starting us in apicultural writing for which we have been grateful ever since.

* * *

In the American Bee Journal we find the following: The Illinois Appropriation for the benefit of the Illinois State Bee-Keepers' Association has not been granted. The following from Secretary Stone explains the matter:

DEAR BRO. YORK:—Our hopes of getting our appropriation bill through the House are blighted. Last Thursday, April 11th, the appropriation committee reported it back to the House, recommending that it do not pass. I would think it all right, considering the condition of the state treas-

ury, for them to cut off all appropriations possible, if it were not for the fact that those engaged in the different agricultural pursuits of the State pay the largest share of the taxes, viz.: those immediately engaged in agriculture, those in horticulture, dairying, bee-keeping, etc. And yet, when it comes to making an appropriation for any of these, they fight to the bitter end.

The dairymen fared the same as the bee-keepers, and the horticulturists are not sure of anything much better. Their bill has been twice favorably reported back to the House, and then recommitted each time for the purpose of defeating it, or cutting it in two.

These "public servants" (?) of ours who pretend to work for the interests of the "dear people," think nothing of voting an appropriation to build a monument for some dead man, or of adjourning to go home and spend five days (from Friday morning to Wednesday morning) at a cost to the State of over a thousand dollars a day; but when it comes to voting to help some agricultural interest to spread its information for the good of the general public, I for one fail to see where they represent us.

The three bills spoken of above, are all Senate bills. Ours passed the Senate without any trouble, where two years ago it met its defeat. At that time one of the Senators had promised his aid, and then because the party line was drawn, went back on his promise. The same Senator we invited this year to "stay at home," though he spent much money to get back again. We are in favor of inviting some of the House appropriation Committee to stay at home next year. We will not name them publicly, though we have many bee-keepers in their districts.

JAS. A. STONE, Sec.

So far as I can see, the only way for agricultural and other deserving people to get their rights is to hereafter send only such persons to make the laws as will care more for the interests of their constituents