

wants to know if anyone can testify to Mr. Harrison's ability to properly handle bees. I have known Mr. Harrison for a long time and can candidly affirm that he can handle bees as well or better than any man I ever saw, have seen him handle them without either gloves or veil and scarcely a bee would fly off the racks, I have been in his bee yard on several occasions and got bees from him last summer. His bees are fine Italians and are very gentle and quiet. I thought that I could handle bees myself before I saw him handle them; but when I saw him handle his bees I found that I knew nothing about it and I consider what I learned was worth \$50 to me. Mr. Harrison's apiary, all told, consisted of between 140 and 150 colonies before the fire; he lost a great many in the fire.

J. B. JEFFERIES.

We have just received another letter from Mr. A. Bechtel, Saugeen, speaking very favourably of Mr. Harrison as a bee-keeper.

For The Canadian Bee Journal.

HEDDON'S INVENTION.

I AM pleased to read on page 868-9, that Brother Armstrong has no ill will towards me although his article on those pages has an ugly, belligerent tone, I still believe him, for I do not think he worded that article, for it too plainly bears the marks of one apicultural writer who must lie awake nights and study methods by which he can injure me, but so far as I know, has succeeded in injuring no one but himself.

For two years, while experimenting with my invention, before making them public, no one said a word about half-bee spaces nor proposed any hive section containing them. I never heard the term half-bee space till I invented it in January, 1883. Although I did not and shall not patent it, not considering it worth patenting, it serves equally well with which to show up the character of those who think it is worth seizing. Let me repeat, that a patent doesn't create property in invention, but only protects it against he who would seize it. It would require an endless discussion, and an enlavelment of contra assertions, to decide whether or not it was ever heard of before I published it. But I being the first to publish it,—the first to place it where bee-keepers could get any good it may possess, justice, and *known* evidence of priority stand in my favor, and all honorable bee-keepers will so decide, I think, and act accordingly.

I am willing that any person who ever heard of that half bee space *before* I published it, should credit it to the one from whom they obtained the

idea. I must say, that I have not in my "price list," mentioned the name, nor referred to Mr. Armstrong. Every word of my price list was written before I ever heard of Mr. Armstrong's hive, and the coat he adroitly slips on, was fitted to a bee-keeper in the east, but it is well to know that it might fit more than one person.

Mr. Armstrong says I have in my possession, written protests and proofs against the novelty of my invention. I have just two letters, and no more, from men who claim to have used certain arrangements that they think antedate my patent. One of these letters is insanely abusive and without provocation, and both of these writers are evidently so ignorant regarding patent law that they have said in their letters just what would defeat their evidently concerted scheme to break down and rob me of my invention.

You will notice by Mr. Armstrong's statement that he knows I have these letters in my possession and that that statement bears evidence of concerted action or plot.

If I haven't invented anything, why all the enthusiastic testimonials I am receiving? If these good things were in use and being enjoyed by these few parties who claim them, wasn't it almost criminal on their part to keep them a secret and compel me to dig them out by study and experiment before the public could know of them and then claim them for themselves? Patent law considers all these points and the claims of these men which Mr. Armstrong calls "proofs," come about as near anticipating my invention as would the construction of a mouse trap.

Mr. Armstrong censures me because I will not accept as proof just what Prof. Cook denominates "rubbish that does not deserve a critical man's attention."

But why consume more space? I cannot see that Mr. Armstrong answers my last article at all. But if the reader can, why should I write further.

I am glad to learn that Mr. A. is not infringing my patent, am sorry that he is bound to infringe my invention which he was once good enough to ask me to set a price upon.

Mr. Kretchmer writes me that Mr. A. is infringing his inventions, and Mr. Shuck also writes me that Mr. A. is infringing his patent. I think I can afford to withdraw from this controversy as far as my rights are concerned, but our inventions and stimulus toward them are important factors and the journal that discusses them is thus benefitting its readers.

To conclude, I will say that I believe the honorable bee-keepers of America, will uphold us in our claims of my invention, (there are now several owners in the territory) and stand firmly by us if we find it a necessity to compel by law, the