

Paper received with applause.

The Chairman—Ladies and gentlemen, I am sure you are all very much pleased with this paper. There is a spirit through it that we can all appreciate.

The paper is now open for discussion.

Mr. J. B. Hall—I simply rise to express my surprise that we had a man among us in Ontario with courage enough to speak of the editors of our Bee Journals as Mr. Pringle has. I must say I have taken a great deal of pleasure in listening to the paper, although he, like all the rest of us, is liable to mistakes. There are several mistakes in his paper, but there is so much good in it, I take great pleasure in sustaining that paper almost without exception.

Mr. Clark—I agree in all that Mr. Hall has said in regard to the able paper of my friend Mr. Pringle, and I regret to have to tone that down by an expression of disapproval. Mr. Clark then took exception to a remark in the paper, which he considered was a slur on the Divine Creator of the world. Several members in the audience took exception to Mr. Clark's contention, and Mr. Pringle replied, disclaiming any such intention.

Mr. G. W. York—Our Bro. Pringle criticises Bee Journals. I cannot find any fault with him for doing so. I think it is one of the best essays we have had.

Mr. McEvoy—I think it is one of the finest papers we have heard read in the convention. I was very much taken up with the paper all through, and was very much pleased with what Mr. Pringle said about the sugar question.

#### LEGISLATION FOR BEE-KEEPERS.

R. McKnight, Owen Sound, Ont.—

Our secretary honored me with a request to prepare a paper on the above subject, to be read at this meeting. He simplified the work for me by clearly and concisely sketching what he deemed the best course for me to pursue in treating the subject he assigned me. I would have you (he says) go over the ground and point where good and evil has come from legislation. This implies that he thought me qualified to do what he asked me to do. It is needless to say I do claim to be familiar with the laws of the world bearing on this subject. I think, however, that I know the provisions of all such laws in force in this province, and I believe them to be as full and complete as those of a similar character in force in any other country. Indeed, I do not know of a law affecting bee-keepers (with the single exception of one recently enacted by the legislature of Michigan), the counterpart

of which is not in force in Ontario. In reviewing the Ontario laws then, we will be fully covering the grounds.

Before doing this let us consider the justice or injustice of the laws now in force in Michigan. It provides that bees may not be kept nearer a public highway than ninety feet. This law can cause little, if any, inconvenience to rural bee-keepers, but may compel some apiarists in towns and villages to abandon the pursuit, or move their bees farther afield. The law does not manifest a clear conception of the matter on the part of those who enacted it, or a close scrutiny of their work by those immediately interested. If the legislature had been wisely advised, the public safety might have been fully secured and bee-keepers in no wise inconvenienced. Bees domiciled ninety feet from a public road, with no barrier between the hive and the highway, are a greater menace to the safety of the passer-by, than if the hive stood but nine feet away with a hedge or close board fence along the margin of the highway. The distance ought to have been regulated with this fact in view.

Returning to the consideration of the laws of this province affecting us and our pursuit, I find the first enactment relating thereto an old and important one. It is entitled: "An act respecting the right of property in swarms of bees." I deem this law of sufficient importance, especially to Canadian bee-keepers, to warrant me in quoting it at length. Its provisions are as follows:

1. Bees living in a state of freedom shall be the property of the person discovering them, whether he is, or is not, the proprietor of the land on which they have established themselves.

2. Bees reared and kept in hives shall be private property, and as such shall, to the extent of fifteen hives, be exempt from seizure, debt or for the discharge of any liability, whatever, save and except the amount of their purchase money.

3. Whenever a swarm of bees leave a hive, the proprietor may reclaim them, so long as he can prove his right of property therein, and shall be entitled to take possession of them at any place on which the swarm settles, even if such place be on the land of another person, unless the swarm settles in a hive already occupied, in which, save the proprietor, shall lose all right of property in such swarm. But he shall notify the proprietor of such land beforehand and compensate him for all damages.

4. Any unpursued swarm which lodges on any property whatever, without settling thereon, may be secured by first coming, unless the proprietor of the land objects.