resi-You will see by this that it is not within a thickly peopled part of the rust town. He complained first of the king bees destroying his raspberries then most asso that they were destroying his pears. In the court he swore that the bees came into hisgarden in large num-Mr. ssion bers and destroyed his flowers. He said the bees by sucking the juice dent, out of the sweet peas caused them to any-dry up. (Laughter) He got anoth-is far erneighbor, who grows raspberries, red, I to swear that he lost twenty per cent. ason, of his raspberries by the bees. He that said he considered he had lost ten could per cent. on his sales through realizvas in ing a smaller price and he considered s. I ne lost ten per cent. on the berries nt ex- hat he was not able to ship at all. ently, another witness said that the bees ht an ame around his watering trough ing a and his horses would not drink on We account of the bees. That was about istrate ne substance of his complaint and of

istrate ne substance of his complaint and of nt the ne evidence produced. nately Mr. W. McEvoy : Does Mr. Sparlg belong to the Bee-Keepers' nsider-t was nsider-

nion?

hin th

kirts 0

me 1

100 acr

of lan

ss from

r acres

acres

e, wa Mr. Sparling: No. oosing Mr. McEvoy: I think every bee-xpens eper in the Province of Ontario 1 ther ould belong to the Bee-Keepers' , which mion. It only costs a dollar a year uch is dit is much the nicer way to settle id ar with such men. I here year with such men. I have a case in 1ld or ind where a man brought an action it as soon as he found he was up should ould b er. ainst the Union he dropped it. I us, per ink it is to every bee-keeper's in-circum test, whether he lives in village or of bee wu, to belong to the Union.

Mr. F. A. Gemmell: We had some uble in our town, A party who pt bees came to me and told me he sgoing to be prosecuted for keepa nuisance on the place, and, ng a member of the Bee-Keepers' ion, I sent and got some reading tter concerning the rules and reguons of the Union and what they would do for anyone who belonged to the Union. I sent those papers to the lawyer who had the case in hand and we never heard another word about it. I think it is a good thing to belong to the Bee-Keepers' Union. Although the Union is nearly all Americans they defend their members no matter what country they belong to, whether Canada or the United States. Mr. Post was thinking probably they were rather too goodnatured and we should avail ourselves of an association of our own ; but that Union has done good work in the past and is still willing to do good work for us, providing we are members. Every case they have had in hand has always been won by the Bee-Keepers' Union.

Mr. Sparling : If a man wishes to cause annoyance he can bring a criminal action, as this man did against me, and then it becomes a crown case, putting him to no expense, whereas it puts the other party to expense and annoyance.

Mr. Gemmell: If the lawyer had been served with those papers no doubt, as in the case I have just referred to, the action would have been withdrawn altogether. There was not another word about it.

Mr. Sparling: There is no need for him to do so unless he wishes. It costs him nothing.

Mr. W. Z. Hutchison: The Union is for the purpose of defending its members; that is the main purpose, but there is no line drawn as to where those members should live. The members in Ontario are in the same position as the members in the United States. Mr. Sparling speaks about it being a crown case. I would ask Mr. Sparling, if you had an Association on this side of the line for the purpose of defence, would that prevent them from making it a crown case?

1901 ARY