

this end it was arranged to present that gentleman with some token of their regard. Accordingly on the evening stated they repaired to his residence and presented him with a magnificent gold-headed cane bearing the inscription "Presented to D. A. Jones, Esq., by his employees on his return from England, 1887." Mrs. Jones was made the recipient of an elegant toilet set of six pieces. The following address was then read by F. H. Macpherson, secretary of the Company, on behalf of the employees.

D. A. Jones, Esq.

DEAR SIR,—We desire, on this the occasion of the return of yourself and Mrs. Jones from England, to convey to you the feelings of pleasure with which your home coming is heralded.

We were sorry to hear of your indisposition, but are glad to know that you are again regaining your wonted vigor.

It is gratifying to learn that your mission to the British Isles, publicly as a commissioner in the interests of the Honey Producers of Canada, through the Ontario Bee-Keepers' Association, and privately, as a representative of the company, of which you are president, has been crowned with even a greater measure of success than the most sanguine of us had anticipated, and we trust that the present beginning may be but the precursor of future transactions of greater amount.

We are loath to let this opportunity go by without showing some material mark indicative of the appreciation in which you are held by the employees of your company. We therefore ask your acceptance of this cane, which when you have occasion to use it, will, we hope, bring to mind kind remembrances of the donors, and may you long be spared to fill your present position at the head of the company, as well as, at the head of Apiculture in Canada.

As a small token of our respect to Mrs. Jones, we would ask her acceptance of the accompanying.

With renewed wishes for the continued welfare and happiness of you both.

Signed on behalf of the employees of the D. A. Jones Co. and CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

W. H. MITCHELL, Foreman.

In a few well chosen remarks Mr. Jones acknowledged the unexpected gifts and thanked the donors, after which a social time was spent by all present.

For The Canadian Bee Journal.

SUNDRIES.

ALLOW me to "say my say" on several points but not at much length so group them together in one article.

THE LAW SUIT.

I concur with the C.B.J. in being sorry that the judgment of the court has gone against Mr.

Harrison, but do not subscribe to the opinion that the result will operate "adversely to the interests of bee-keeping." I have long desired to have this question, whether bee-yards are a nuisance to the general public, settled on its merits. It is a pity it has been precipitated upon the country in the way it has. It would have been better that it should have taken the form of a parliamentary enquiry, and been decided on impartial and full evidence taken by a commission. However, "it is as it is," and I for one do not think we should go to expense in order to appeal the case. Ten to one the higher court would sustain the lower one. I do believe if there were a *plebiscite* to decide whether apiaries are nuisances within corporation limits, a majority of votes would be cast in the affirmative. It seems to me we have got to accept the situation and govern ourselves accordingly. One result will be to relegate bees to the farm, where they belong. They are really and truly part of the live stock of the farm. In the long run I do not think it will operate adversely to the interests of bee-keeping. It will check overcrowding, render robbing more uncommon, reduce the risk from foul brood, prevent swarms from different apiaries mixing and be beneficial in various ways. It will rule out small beekeepers who live in villages, towns and cities and tend to increase the number of specialists.

HEDDON'S INVENTION.

It is a curious and lamentable thing to what an extent the spirit seems to prevail among beekeepers that inclines to a trespassing on the rights of others. How mean this is may be seen in the behaviour of some towards Father Langstroth and Prof. Cook. The Prof. nobly deprecated a repetition of the "outrage" on Mr. Langstroth, when lo! we are told in a certain quarter, that the "outrage" was the other way, and furthermore, that Prof Cook, being a friend of Mr. Heddon, cannot, on that account, give an impartial opinion of his invention. Well, it is many years since the facts as to Mr. Langstroth's deprivation of the reward of his invention were brought before the public. A whole generation of beekeepers have come on the scene subsequently and it is well they should know "all about it," and they will before the thing is through with. Then impartial people will see where the "outrage" really was. As for Prof. Cook's friendship destroying his impartiality the thing is absurd, and is contradicted by palpable facts. He is as much my friend as he is Mr. Heddon's, but see how completely he has been "down" on my theory of hibernation. Mr. Heddon is my friend, but I see the absurdity of his pollen theory all the same, and say so. Mr.