

neil, of the trip of the commissioners, which will give us more particulars than we have yet to hand.

For the Canadian Bee Journal.

SUBSOIL VS. JONES.

A CASE against a bee-keeper tried at sea and successfully defended without aid from the manager of the Bee-Keepers' Union.

ON BOARD S. S. SARDINIAN,

NORTH ATLANTIC, Aug. 26, 1886.

Bee men are noted for being ready to talk about their specialty on every possible occasion; the delegates in charge of the Ontario honey exhibit at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition are no exception to the rule in this respect. Conversations with their fellow passengers on board were often turned so as to bear a reference to bees and honey. Should a passenger tell a story about the methods by which travellers are often blackmailed, Mr. Jones would match it by telling how he got even when the custom house officers and boatmen at Beyrout attempted to levy "backsheesh" on him when bringing bees from the Holy Land to Cyprus. One of his cylinders was so full that he feared the bees would be suffocated. Pretending to abandon the bees rather than submit to their demands, which amounted to about \$25 for two hives, he opened this hive and allowed about a gallon of bees to escape. This caused a general stampede, the bees driving both boatmen and officers under cover. He then deliberately placed his bees in a boat and rowed to the steamer, which had been waiting for him half an hour, the owner of the boat lying in the bow with his head covered most of the time. Before long the Canadian bee men on board were the best known among the passengers. Their statements regarding the benefit of bees in fertilizing the crops of the agriculturist, and the virtues of honey as a food and medicine, were not always allowed to pass unchallenged. The outcome of the opposition was that Captain Hamilton, manager for a shipping firm in Scotland, over the assumed name of "Subsoil" made a demand in writing upon Mr. Jones for \$1,000 for damages done to his pastures by Jones' bees in extracting the honey from the clover, and for annoyance to his family from the stings of the bees, and loss of property caused by the bees stinging his sheep and cattle. Mr. Jones refused to accede to any such demand, stating that the bees were not only not injurious but were a positive benefit to his neighbors' pasture. Here was a direct issue. Arrangements were soon on foot for the organization of a court to try the case.

Capt. Smith of the "Sardinian" was consulted, and he fell in with the idea at once, expressing his willingness to go into the witness box himself and testify against Jones. Soon the arrangements were all complete. Mr. Dennistoun, of Edinburgh, Scotland, arrayed in a fur cloak and ample wig, made by the boatswain for the occasion, filled the position of judge with dignity and ability. Mr. S. Carsley, a leading merchant of Montreal, acted as counsel for the prosecution, and Mr. R. McKnight, registrar for North Grey, Ont., acted as counsel for the defence. Mr. Andrew Allan, of Allan Bros. & Co., Montreal, was chosen as foreman of the jury. Amongst the jurors were a gentleman recently from Hong Kong, China, an editor from London, a banker from Ontario, a stock raiser from British Columbia and another from Manitoba, and a gentleman from Stratford, England.

Mr. Carsley, in opening the case for the prosecution, stated in a clear and succinct manner that his client's land produced the clover blossoms which supplied the defendant's bees with honey, that the secretion of honey in the cloverheads increased the food value of his client's pasture, or it would not be there; that since the defendant established his bee-farm in the neighborhood his client's stock had been failing; that his cows gave less milk and of poorer quality than formerly; that his sheep were poor and therefore less valuable; and that his client's family required medical assistance more frequently than they did previous to the establishment of the defendant's bee-farm. Since these losses were directly traceable to the defendant's bees he claimed that it was only just that defendant should remunerate his client to some extent for the damages he sustained. Evidence was produced to sustain this contention. Great merriment was caused by Capt. Smith, who as Hodge, a servant of the plaintiff testified that his master's stock were failing of late; that this was caused by Mr. Jones' bees, and not by carelessness, especially since he took charge; that on one occasion he took Miss Buttercup, the dairymaid, out for a drive with his master's horses and carriage, that one of Jones' bees attacked the "hosses" causing them to run away and break the carriage; that he captured that bee to show to his master, and that it was about 2½ inches long and was one of those eastern bees Jones brought from somewhere. This evidence was confirmed by that of Miss Buttercup. The counsel for the defence, in cross-examination, labored unsuccessfully to induce her to admit that at the time the accident occurred Hodge