

though he felt the necessity of doing so. He felt that he had a duty to discharge to his country, and he was determined to discharge it, irrespective of the consequences. Now, let us see what the consequences were! Having to leave the management of his bees solely to others, instead of having them in good shape and wintering them successfully as he always had done, his stopping there attending to the business of others was the sole cause, I believe, of his losing a large proportion of his two apiaries. This loss he could ill afford to bear. Again he had to employ others, who were not so competent as he, to manage his large insurance business, and he had to pay them a large salary in his stead. By this means, his business suffered great loss. Anyone engaged in business knows what sacrifices must be made to leave it in the hands of others for about five months. We suppose that \$1000 would not remunerate him for his loss, and yet he must be insulted because he accepts the small remuneration voted him for labor performed after hours. Such cruel treatment should, and we are satisfied will, receive its just deserts at the hands of the bee-keepers of Ontario.

In reference to the *Pall Mall Gazette* calling the editor of this JOURNAL "President," it ill becomes Mr. Pettit's son-in-law to mention that, when Mr. Pettit knows full well that he accompanied us to the *Pall Mall Gazette* office and that I introduced him to Mr. Stead as "President" of the Ontario Bee-keepers' Association," and that I introduced him to everybody else as the President; that we endeavored as far as possible to have that matter put right; that I requested Mr. Corneil to make the correction, and Mr. Corneil sat up for hours at night to make the correction, which was sent to the *Pall Mall Gazette* but never appeared, thus proving Mr. McKnight's assertion, that they did not consider it worth while.

I understood our main object there was to impress upon the British public the great importance of Canadian honey, rather than the importance of any special member of the Ontario Bee-keepers' Association. I am not so vain that I want the honors of any other but rather prefer to work in the interest of bee-keepers than self aggrandisement.

Mr. McKnight has, I think, given Mr. Pettit's son-in-law the *quietus*, as regards the statements which are attributed to myself with reference to the Heddon hive. As I said *nothing*, it was surely needless for me to correct it. The item was copied by one bee journal this side of the Atlantic and was promptly contradicted by our Mr. Macpherson, immediately he noticed it, knowing full well that I should be insane to make such a statement about a hive only introduced a few months before.

D. A. J.

For the Canadian Bee Journal.

THAT CLIPPING WAS ALL RIGHT.

ON page 392, Rev. W. F. Clarke, in his interesting way, tells a story of a Toronto friend, at whose expense he had "lots of fun" and whom he proposes to immortalize "as a highly successful queen's wings clipper."

Now, Toronto is the one city of Canada which I have personally visited, and my two or three days' sojourn there was so pleasant that I give Mr. Clarke warning that no Guelph man shall attack a Toronto man without my looking sharp to see if I cannot help the latter, at least a little.

I hereby resent the insinuation that the clipping was not well done. It does not take so very large a portion of one of the four wings of a queen to be clipped off to make her incapable of flying, and even if the Toronto friend were careless enough to let a queen go unclipped, his "Mary" had too sharp eyes to fail to notice it. I venture to say that if only half as much had been cut off from the queen's wings she would never have made another flight.

Moreover, there is nothing in the attendant circumstances to show that all four wings were not cut clean off. "The bees swarmed." Of course a clipped wing would, not in the least prevent the issuing of a swarm. "The queen was not found." That does not prove she was not on the ground somewhere near the hive. A person in the daily practice of finding clipped queens sometimes fails. "They clustered on a neighboring tree." So they often do without any queen, and but for the meddlesome Guelph interference after resting there ten, twenty or thirty minutes, they would have gone back to their own hive just as the owner intended they should.

I would like to know the further history of that swarm. Were they hived in the hive without the means to raise a young queen, and did they settle down to work a successful colony? At any rate that queen was clipped all right and you saw it clipped, Mr. C.

C. C. MILLER,

Marengo, Ill., Aug. 8, 1887.