

interchange brood, horizontally promises nothing but useless tinkering and fuss, without any advantages. I repeat there is very few that will ever want the peculiar Heddon combination. As to mechanical invention, the hive is simply a shallow brood chamber hive, with Quinby close end frames, differing in no essential features from other shallow brood chamber hives that preceded it, excepting the application of set screws to tighten the frames as I have already noticed. Now, as to the "Heddon principles," as Prof. Cook puts it, the inventor claims that to set one of his shallow brood chambers on another of his shallow brood chambers makes *one* brood chamber, in horizontal sectional parts. Suppose we admit this to be true, is it not a fact that to "tier up" one brood chamber on another—a "principle" that has been well understood and practiced for years before the Heddon hive was ever dreamed of—accomplishes the same thing in fact, and in principle. No doubt the new words and phrases invented to describe the new (?) hive has thrown a mystery round about it, perplexing to the minds of many persons, but it is a fact that commends itself to common sense, that words cannot change material substance, neither can they change mechanical action. A hive "tiered up" is the same as a hive in "horizontal sectional parts." Let Mr. Heddon and his friends be content with such improvements as he has, or may make in bee hive construction and he will meet with cordial co-operation. But to compare Mr. Heddon's thumb screw and combination of old and well known features in bee hive construction, to Mr. Langstroth's great invention which underlies all subsequent invention, is perhaps the "keenest cut of all" that the reverend old gentleman will have to endure this side of the grave.

G. W. DEMAREE.

Christiansburg, Ky.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

THE ARMSTRONG HIVE.

I HOPED my last letter would provoke Mr. H. into confessing some things I could not otherwise find out. He went beyond my expectation in confessing to the use of an apicultural writer. As a confession it does very well, as an "experience" guess at my method I denounce it as incorrect. Almost as unexpected was his squarely made confession that the ring was in understood combination for bull-dozing purposes. As to his charge of concert of action among bee-keepers with myself, I believe it's true. I hope it is. I hope it can always be said of our brotherhood that the great majority of them can be depended upon to stand solidly to-

gether for the right. Not by organization as in monopolies, but by that honest instinct or principal that always unites an honest community against a murder or a robber. On this ground I believe I have them, for I am working for even justice, whether it benefits Armstrong, Heddon, or some other man. For the new ideas that go to make up his present system, Mr. H. is very largely indebted to his correspondence with those who challenge his exclusive right to use and sell their ideas, and to the printed statements of those who resist by fact and experience his monopoly claims, and yet I do not recall any public acknowledgment of money rights in these ideas that he has ever made to any of these inventors. Demonstrating by experiment that another man's ideas will work on your machine does not create you exclusive property right in that idea, even though you do advertise it. As to the wrong coat and the statement made in proof of it, I cannot doubt its verbal truthfulness, for he hasn't heard of my hive yet, that is, to know its construction, neither has he forgotten that we corresponded about it last summer, especially the half bee-space, for he speaks of it in this letter. But in view of the fact that I was the only man to whom the department had ever granted a patent on the half bee-space by its present time, the statement I made of responsibility and fair dealing became necessary, fit or no fit. I most emphatically reaffirm the other statements of my previous letters, none of which Mr. H. has seen fit to meet, and have nothing more to offer as they fully cover all points raised in his letters. I lack both the time and inclination, and I hope the talent to engage in a dodging contest that can do no one any good. Mr. Heddon's purpose in dragging in my friends, Kretschmer and Shuck, is too characteristic to be misunderstood. If he is sick of this self-imposed controversy the manly thing is to back out, not shift it. I do not bite at such a poorly concealed bait. I agree with Mr. H. and the Editors that the correspondence is more than personal and that the principles involved justify the use of the space. If no agreement is reached the facts will be before the bee-keepers, and we can depend on them to decide right regardless of sophistry or threats by whomsoever used. In the interest of truth and on the authority of written evidence over the signature of Mr. K. himself I want to correct the supplemental statement of the Editor that Mr. K. came forward unsolicited and manfully, etc. He did nothing of the kind. He says he came hastily, and that much is true. I have not described my hive, nor blowed about it. I am not in the habit of spunging my advertising. In a day or two you will receive cuts and copy