

inch wide, the same as the thickness of worker brood-comb, which further warrants and secures what Mr. H. calls the "shake-out" function.

Without enlarging further to discuss the merit or demerit, the right or wrong, the wisdom or folly of Mr. Heddon's honey-producing methods and practices, it does seem to me that every posted bee-keeper must know, and every honest one admit, that the constructions in his new patented hive, specially created to carry out the above principles, are quite original. Therefore I failed to find them in bee hives or bee literature. The nomenclature and terminology are also mostly new as therein applied.

These being the facts, it becomes as clear as the noon-day sun to every right-minded man who does not believe that other people's earnings ought to be divided up and handed out to all and sundry, that Mr. Heddon's new, patented hive is *his* property, and that we have no more right to appropriate it, or any legitimate function of it, to our use without paying for the privilege, than to put our hands in his pocket and take his money, or steal his horse out of his stable.

ALLEN PRINGLE.

Selby, Ont., April 25th, 1887.

For the Canadian Bee Journal.

Something More About the Legislative Grant.

PERMIT me a few words in reply to Mr. Pettit's letter in your last issue, after which I shall not again trouble you on the grant question. His reference to my "insinuations," my presumed indifference to the advantages of "a good market," my "misleading" statements, and his sarcastic sneer that "the Association will not suffer much from them." I will only say that I take as lively an interest in the Association's welfare as Mr. C. possibly can do.

I was first led to refer to the question at issue because of the published statement of Mr. Pettit that "the grant was made for this very purpose." Being impressed with the belief that like grants to kindred societies have never been applied to aid in marketing their products I endeavored to avert an innovation of this sensible course by questioning our right to use it as he advocated. I presume there is no *written law* to prevent it being so used and where this is the case "custom makes law." I presume also that in the absence of a written law and in the absence of instruction from the granting power, the Board of Directors—or Executive Committee in this case—has the their wisdom dictates. The Board was called together by Mr. Pettit to take the matter into its

consideration. The Board decided that it was not competent for them to expend it as he desired to see it expended. And what do we find the chairman of this Board do? Rush into print with the declaration that it was made for this especial purpose, and now that his contention is questioned, he endeavors to bolster up his position by a recital of his harangue to the Commissioners of Agriculture on the importance of a market. Not only does he do this but he rushes off to the Associations of Guelph, Parkhill and Brantford—some of whose members doubtless never paid a dollar to the Association's funds, and flourishes their resolutions in the face of the Board, and with these in his hand, asks "What more proof of the wisdom of so using the grant do we want?" I would ask Mr. Pettit, as President of the Ontario Bee-keeper's Association:—

In thus ignoring the decision of the Association's executive body and declaring the voice of unaffiliated local bodies as of more value and weight in his estimation than the deliberate decision of that board over which he has the honor, for the time being, to preside and whose acts he is bound to ratify and confirm. In doing this, is he carrying out his idea of maintaining the dignity and "respectability" of the Association of which he is president?

Mr. Pettit has not ventured to say in his letter that the Commissioner gave him any authority to declare that "this is the very purpose for which it was granted," but takes refuge in the assumption that in having done that which he was not authorized to do, "we will be in a position to convince the Government" of the wisdom of the act. Mr. P.'s notion of his powers to "convince" is unquestionably great. What greater back-down from a positive position could any man make?

He credits me with the knowledge that "big prices cannot be obtained in England in a wholesale way." Yes, I know the prospects of the English market *better* than Mr. Pettit knows them and it is because I know them so well that I am reluctant to see his wild-goose scheme carried into effect, and the funds of the Association lost to it.

Mr. Pettit says "Pee-a-boo's" statement as to the price honey was sold at to the trade while the exhibition lasted is "an error and should have been corrected long ago." Why did Mr. Pettit not correct this alleged error by telling your readers what it was sold at.

R. MCKNIGHT.

Owen Sound, Ont.

BEEES, BROOD AND NUCLEI.

We have decided to sell "bees by the pound" and in another column will be found prices and full particulars.