

been uncapped in every colony I feed sugar syrup to any that need feeding. This system brings forward immense quantities of bees of the most vigorous kind, and by it we get much larger crops of honey.

LEGISLATION FOR BEE-KEEPERS

(By Wm. McEvoy)

Our Spraying Bill Was Very Sternly Opposed

When the Ontario Bee-keepers' Convention was held in London in January, 1892, I moved that Messrs. Allen Pringle, F. A. Gemmill and E. D. Smith be a committee to wait on the Minister of Agriculture to get an Act passed to prohibit the spraying of fruit while in bloom. Some of the best speakers in our convention opposed me on this, and after my motion was carried it was protested and put the second time and again carried, and again protested and carried the third time. After that the yeas and nays were called for, and then the fourth vote was taken, and again it carried. Mr. Pringle was President of our Association then, and Mr. Gemmill was Vice-President. Mr. E. D. Smith was a nurseryman and an extensive fruit-grower. I put Mr. Smith on the committee on account of being a fruit-grower and one that was widely and favorably known. I thought that with his help we would not be opposed by the fruit-growers. The committee met in the Hon. Mr. Dryden's office, and after a careful consideration of the matter he gave them a favorable promise. As soon as Mr. Dryden introduced the Bill into the House it met with a very stormy reception, and on a motion was sent to the Legislative Committee, who, like a jury, were to decide on this from the evidence brought before them. Messrs. Allen Pringle, F. A. Gemmill, Wm. McEvoy, C. W. Post, Professors Fletcher

and Panton, and seven fruit-growers and nurserymen, were called to give evidence. We were all in favor of the Bill but one fruit-grower. After hearing the evidence the Legislative Committee reported the Bill all right, and then we thought that it would pass easily, but we were mistaken, because as soon as it was brought up in the House for the second reading it was opposed in the sternest manner and challenged to a vote. I was much pleased when it was carried by a majority of 27, because we needed an Act of this kind very much then to save the bees from being poisoned by the spraying that was being done in many localities while fruit trees were in bloom. No spraying is done now in any part of Ontario while trees are in bloom.

Mr. Gemmill's Foul Brood Act of 1890 Came Very Near Being Destroyed in 1905

In amending the Foul Brood Act in 1905 a few changes were made, and one among them was to take the power away from the inspector of being the sole judge and giving the right to any one to appeal against the judgment of the inspector to a scientist to decide whether it was foul brood or not. This had been passed by the Board of Directors in this form, and right after it was submitted to the convention for approval. Professor F. C. Harrison was the chief advocate to allow appeals from the judgment of the inspector to a scientist, and he did do his best to get the convention to make the change. I appealed to the convention not to allow any appeal from the inspector to a scientist, but to restore the clause as it was, making the inspector the sole judge so that he could force a clean-up without any delay where other apiaries were in danger. I also said that if appeals were allowed that every "crook" would dispute the judgment of the inspector as

(Continued on Page 153)

THE ENEMY

(By

Probably the man who this keeper asks is out of it?" tion of apiaries cult to answer ing price of h of management on the cash re total number of itably handled: give facts and i ject, but those very illuminatir

In considering not lose sight o two schools of motto of one b while the other tum, "Keep fe better," or, at half of this ada much gain in dis of either method, success of either man, one man h things on a large the genius for tak plan may, of co absurdity. Nobo make a living by the highest state than anybody thin starting more out, sibly attend to.

I venture to thin detailed statement either system of m ple are tempted to cause the initial c returns, as reported are, in many inst holds good so long are kept, and no required. But the co