

music ourselves, and all we will ask of the "Union" will be to furnish us with American facts, documents, precedents, and perhaps, a witness or two, as will be presently explained.

Now, how shall the expenses of defending this case to the end be met? My proposition is this: In the first place, let the defendant—Mr. Harrison—who is directly concerned, contribute just what he can afford; then let any and every bee-keeper in Canada or elsewhere *outside* of the O. B. K. A. contribute what they will, more or less. Then let the O. B. K. A. assume the whole of the balance of costs, each member contributing his share—all contributing share and share alike. Surely no member of the society will object to this, as the interests of all are involved; and the future of bee-culture in Canada seriously menaced. I beg to call upon friend Pettit, President of the Society, to give his views on this point, through the JOURNAL, without delay, also the Secretary.

Assuming that there will be no objection made to the foregoing scheme to meet the expenses of the case, the next pertinent question is, what is to be done at once, and how is it to be done? In the absence of full knowledge of the case as well as much legal learning I will state concisely what I think ought imperatively to be done. First, if any legal steps are necessary at this stage to secure to the defendant the right of appealing in case of an adverse decision by the approaching "full court" such steps ought to be taken at once. Second, the best available lawyer in Toronto ought to be retained to argue the case before the approaching "full court." Mr. Harrison's local counsel will not object to this as it is quite customary in important cases like the present. Third, the counsel in the case should be thoroughly posted in the apian facts and principles essential to our side of the case. The favorable British and American precedents, apian scientific reports etc., having any helpful bearing on the case ought to be placed before him promptly so that he can prepare himself to come up to the court with an array of facts and arguments which will be overwhelming. As this is a novel case with no precedent in Canada and few elsewhere, much—very much—will depend on the argument of counsel and the manner in which the side of bee-culture is presented. Fourth, should it be possible to re-open the case for further evidence at the approaching trial this ought to be done, when Prof. Cook and other scientific and expert American and Canadian bee-keepers ought to be put upon the stand. The court should be thoroughly enlightened on all apian points essential to the question at issue, and then we

need have little fear as to the result. And, further, it would seem from the defendant's statement to me by letter that the Jury's finding was directly contrary to the evidence. Is there no legal remedy for this? The Jury seemed to be quite ignorant of bee-culture and the habits of the bee and gave a prejudiced decision contrary to the evidence. In any future hearing of the case it ought to be made clear to the court by expert and competent testimony that the honey bee never volunteers an attack on people, when away from home in quest of forage. In my experience of upwards of twenty years I have never known a case. My apiary of over a hundred colonies is right along a public road with an ordinary "picket fence" between them, some of the hives being within three or four feet of the fence. From the hitching post in the road and the walk leading from the road to the dwelling house some of the hives are only twenty feet distant, yet I never knew a horse to be stung while hitched up or in passing along the road though the milk drawers passed four times a day during the Summer and sometimes drove right through a swarm which might be on wing over the road. Of course if I should find my bees molesting horses or passers-by I would move them back a safe distance from the road. Every bee-keeper is in duty bound to consider the rights of his neighbors and prevent all molestation or annoyance if possible.

And it is always more prudent for the bee-keeper to mollify and placate an unreasonable or irascible neighbor than to quarrel with him or go to law with him. A "soft answer" and a case of honey will go a great way in turning away the wrath and straightening out the crookedness of a captious and unreasonable neighbor. Of course I do not know whether Mr. Harrison's attitude towards his neighbor was prudent or otherwise, but I should judge from his letter that he is a reasonable and fair-minded man. However that may be his case, though personal to himself, has now become of public and general importance to Canadian bee-keepers and it behooves us to face the issue without the sign of flinching.

ALLEN PRINGLE,

Selby, Nov. 26 1886.

THE PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE OF THE N. A. B. K. SOCIETY.

It is not my purpose to treat this theme in a way of sentiment. That has been done very skilfully by another hand, and the harp of a thousand strings has been touched into plaintive strains in view of the lapse of