

objection to the Doctor's position: "There are persons in this village who have kept bees longer than I have, and if by reason of priority, I must surrender the business to them, such legislation might seem more desirable to them than to me." In the *A. B. J.* of Dec. 22nd, Mr. C. G. Beitel says: "Again, when we scan closely a law such as is contemplated, we cannot fail to perceive what a source of litigation it might prove. The question of priority of location would often be as difficult to establish, as that of priority of invention," etc. In the *A. B. J.* of Jan. 26th, p. 57, Mr. J. E. Pond, under the heading "Legislation for bee-keepers," and evidently discussing Dr. Miller's proposition, says: "The question of priority of location of an apiary is one on which my views are so well known, that I need not, neither do I care to discuss it; but the question of legislation on that subject is one on which more light is needed, and for that reason may have a small share of attention."

In that issue of the *A. B. J.*, and after the discussion had been going on for over three months, Dr. Miller for the first time disclaims the priority idea, saying: "And now it is Mr. L. N. Tongue, on page 24, who sets up the priority question in order to knock it down. Has Mr. Tongue not yet found out that nobody ever asked for, or hinted at wanting legislation on the priority question?" I read that with amazement, but not being in the controversy, did not care to bring the Doctor up with a sharp turn by quoting his previous utterances, and pointing out the drift of the discussion as I have now done.

In the *A. B. J.*, of Feb. 2, p. 59, there is a long article of the Doctor's, probably written before the brief reference to Mr. Tongue in the previous number. It is mainly in reply to Mr. Heddon, and mentions "priority of location" several times without any disclaimer of it as part of his scheme. He even says: "In the generality of cases, I believe in the priority right." Further, in reply to Mr. Heddon's remark that "priority of location gives one a natural right, *provided he is fit to hold that location*," the Doctor proceeds to argue again against the natural 'survival of the fittest,' and pleads for legislation for the sake of those who try to crowd in but cannot, and are involved in loss by their futile attempts, which, he says, might have been prevented if the first comer could have said: "This territory I hold in fee simple as my own, and you must go elsewhere if you want to keep bees." Still arguing along the priority line at considerable length, the Doctor winds up by asking: "On all accounts, then, should not every man have a legal right to his own ground?"

In the *A. B. J.* of March 9th, p. 154, Mr. G.

Mr. Alves thus defines the question at issue: "Mr. Heddon thinks that the claims of 'priority of location' are right in morals, but doubts whether legislative bodies could be induced to enact a law for the enforcement of the same. Dr. Miller not only accepts the principle as right, but goes further, and gives it as his opinion that it would be practicable to make it statutory."

In the *A. B. J.* of March 30th, p. 199, Dr. Miller is "aroused." He is replying to Mr. J. E. Pond, and asks that gentleman to name "a single person who has ever advised, requested, or desired any legislation on priority of location" (!) Getting still more "aroused," he says: "Why it is that every one tacks on 'priority' I cannot imagine." Again, as if fearful he has not been emphatic enough, he says: "Allow me to impress the fact, that so far as I know, no one has ever advocated obtaining legislation in favor of priority of location." (!)

I am forcibly reminded of an incident of my juvenile days. Our school was in a second story and the stairway leading to it had a pair of bannisters. One day, some of the boys played a dirty trick on the master. They smeared the bannisters with some filth, and, seated serenely in the school-room, awaited his arrival. Just as they expected, he had run his hands along the bannisters as he came up-stairs, and got them sadly bedaubed. He hastened to his desk, and offered a reward of half-a-crown to any body who would tell him "who had hands in this." A boy volunteered the desired information, and gave it by saying, "Please sir, you had hands in it."

I am at a loss to know why Dr. Miller should wax so warm in his tardy disclaimers of the priority idea. As Mr. Pond very justly says, *A. B. J.* of April 2nd, p. 233: "I cannot see how the question of legislation, as desired by Dr. Miller, can be divided from that of priority."

WM. F. CLARKE.

Guelph, April 30th, 1887.

From our English Correspondent.

MEL SAPIT OMNIA.

SOMETHING ABOUT THE FEEDERS IN USE IN ENGLAND.

UP to the present date April has been rather unkind to us, we have a cold, bleak, nipping east wind with an occasional gleam of sunshine now and again, just sufficient to tempt the bees out for a spin, but they have not been able to gather much pollen as yet. Our spring flowers are also very backward. Stores of course are getting low, mainly through breeding, as strong stocks will generally breed