

Mr. McEvoy, foul brood inspector for Ontario, made a strong witness on the Patterson side from experience among the bee-keepers throughout the Province. He had also handled Mr. Patterson's bees and declares them to be exceedingly gentle, and that there was nothing in the roof story. Mr. McEvoy also produced a drawing showing the relative position of the bee yard and the Brock residence. Mr. Henry Howard and Mr. Cornell swore to the unkept condition of the Brock property generally. Mr. Galloway swore he had plowed on Mr. Patterson's lot without any trouble. Mr. Draper, an old gentleman with a very decided German accent, said he had lived next to Mr. Patterson for years and had never been troubled by the bees. Mr. R. F. Holtermann, who was present, was called upon to state his experience with bees in a city where thickly populated. Mr. Holtermann showed that he had kept bees in the City of Brantford for many years without any trouble with his neighbors. Mr. Brooking, a fruit grower, who lives about a mile and a half from Mr. Patterson, gave a strong evidence to the value of bees to farmers and fruit growers. He kept some bees himself and wished that there were more in his vicinity. He swore that bees will not attack sound fruit, and it is only when the fruit is decomposing or in an overripe condition that they will interfere with it.

After the hearing of the witnesses the case was adjourned. The two lawyers, Messrs. Long and Staunton, to argue it, on the evidence given,

before Judge Monck at Hamilton.

Later—On Friday, April 4, Judge Monck handed down judgment in the Division Court action brought by Mrs. Sarah Brock and W. R. Brock, her son, for \$60 damages for annoyance caused and damage done by Robert Patterson's 118 hives of bees. The judgment was lengthy, and of importance to bee-keepers. He dismissed the action. From the written judgment the following extracts are taken:

"The keeping of the bees by the defendant made the enjoyment of plaintiff's property less than it would otherwise be. In fact, at times the bees are an annoyance. Beyond this I cannot find that the plaintiff has suffered any specific damage

"I find that the annoyance is not such as to create a public nuisance. In many cases an individual must suffer an annoyance for the public good, and I am in great doubt as to whether in the case the plaintiff is entitled to damages, as he has no remedy of the superior jurisdiction for an action for an injunction. I direct a non-suit to be entered without cost to either party."

Observing scientists tell us that girls are making larger and stronger women than their mothers. Cause? More outdoor exercise, better physical life. And that the boys are more stunted than their fathers of thirty or forty years ago. Why? The deadly cigarette, the "tobacco heart," driving vice instead of virtue in the daily life. Is it not time for young men to call a halt?"