

Chinese people for centuries, but that is no excuse for the looting and stealing on the part of white men. Should not the bee-keeper feed his bees when their natural food is scarce and they really injure fruit? When I neglect to feed my dog at home, and he runs to the neighbor's back yard for food which might feed the pig, have I a right to complain if the neighbor lives up to his legal privilege? My neighbor ought to remember that it was my dog's bark that lured the hide of the tramp that frightened his children, but some neighbors are not built that way. They are like some pomologists who object when the bee tries to take pay for his services in a few rotten fruit. I am not sure that home feeding would keep bees entirely away from the fruit. There are human beings who will run out of the best of homes. In fact the more you feed them the more they run. Bees are much like humans in many respects. It is quite likely that a systematic method of feeding during honey dearths in summer would eventually pay the bee-keeper, just as many dairymen have become convinced against their wills that it pays to feed grain to cows at pasture.

THE BEE AS A LAWYER.

Before the law the bee appears to have clearer rights than any other domestic animal. Recent legal decisions have made the bee's position very clear. In one noted case the bees flew into the orchard and unquestionably worked upon or damaged broken fruit. The jury finally decided, and I think justly, that the bees committed no real damage, yet if a cow or a hog broken into that orchard and eaten that same fruit the owners would certainly have been liable for damages.

After reading the literature of the

subject with great care, I think I am justified in saying that the bee has fuller and more complete legal protection than any other domestic animal. Why should not this be so, since even in its wild state, untrained or directed by men, the bee is led by its very instinct to labor for the benefit of humanity? Certainly no wild animal works for men as the bee does, and no domestic animal accomplishes so much without direct harness or guidance.

Invoking the law against bees is running up against a hard proposition. Laws have been passed against spraying fruit trees while in bloom. They are intended to give the bee legal protection. These laws have actually led some tough old fellows to spray at just that time, so as to kill the bees. The law was a suggestion of slaughter to them. Some men are so perverted that they see a wrong and coddle it as a "personal right." These laws have helped the fruit grower more than they have the bee-keeper, because they have led the scientific men to investigate and tell us why it is a mistake to spray too early.

It appears to have been settled that, before the law, bees are to be considered domestic animals—not naturally inclined to be offensive. A fair synopsis of the bee's legal status is about as follows:

1. Bees kept by regular bee-keeper have become absolute property as domestic animals, and therefore enjoy legal rights.
2. The bee is not naturally savage. It is no more likely to commit serious damage or mischief than dogs, cats, cows or horses.
3. The law looks with most favor upon those animals which are most useful to man. No animal is of more actual service to man in proportion