



"THE GREATEST POSSIBLE GOOD TO THE GREATEST POSSIBLE NUMBER."

VOL. II. No. 50.

BEETON, ONT., MARCH 9, 1887.

WHOLE No 102

For the Canadian Bee Journal.

WHAT DOES MR. CLARKE MEAN?

WHILE perusing your issue of Feb. 16th I discovered that Rev. W. F. Clarke, in his article on page 926-7, has referred to me in a connection and manner which I think is unjustifiable under the circumstances. I have had no controversy with Mr. Clarke through the columns of your paper, and it is not supposable that a great many of your readers are aware that I ever had any controversy with him. Why he should use my name in that connection, unless he wants to pick a quarrel with me, I think he will find some trouble to explain. After lamenting with a sad lamentation over Mr. Heddon like a "hire-d mourner" he goes on to say, "Mr. Kretschmer has done himself honor in the manly way he has retracted. Now let Messrs Demaree, Shuck, Armstrong, Aspinwall *et id omne genus* do the same if they want to have the respect of their fellow bee-keepers, and keep their own self respect."

To my mind no greater presumption than the above has ever appeared in a bee journal, nor anywhere else outside of the history of Jesuitry. I have several letters from Mr. Kretschmer in which he shows conclusively that he used the chief feature of the so called "Heddon principles" long before the latter had any existence in history. But if Mr. Kretschmer has been guilty of a crime, or has injured any one unwittingly it was proper for him to "retract," but it was unchristian in Mr. Clarke to hold him up before the public as a reclaimed heretic. I shall not pretend to speak for the gentleman whose name Mr. Clarke connected with my own, except to say that they stand fully as high among bee men as

does Mr. Clarke, so far as I am able to judge, but they are able to take care of their own reputations. As for myself, I have written nothing concerning the Heddon hive that I did not believe to be well substantiated by evidence in history, and I have no honor to sell for the "respect of my fellow bee-keepers," nor do I crave the respect of a man who would delight to honor (?) me as one who has "retracted."

The Heddon hive was thrust before the public in a manner that to remain silent was equivalent to accepting all of its claims, and no one has contributed so much to the disagreeable and absurd features of this controversy as has Mr. Clarke. Right at the start, without any investigation or any qualification to decide practical questions, Mr. Clarke defied the whole army of apicultural writers, after the fashion of the famous Goliath, but unlike his brave prototype he cries out "persecution" at the sight of the shepherd's bag and smooth stone.

What does Mr. Clarke want me to "retract?" In the light of history and well known facts, the Heddon hive, claimed by Mr. H. and his friends to be new in mechanical construction and in "principles," is simply a combination of old and well known features in bee hive construction, except the application of "set screws" to tighten the frames laterally. This last named feature is new as to mere application so far as I have been able to ascertain from history. In a like combination in all its parts I presume no one would claim the right to use the Heddon hive without his consent, and I fancy very few will ever want to use it at all. Thumb screws sticking out at the side of a hive is objectionable and when exposed to the weather is impracticable. Inverting hives is a vain conceit, and to