

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

## THE HEDDON HIVE.

**I** NOTICE, on pages 547 and 589, thoughts concerning my late invention which certainly need a few remarks by the inventor.

While we were experimenting with the new hive, during two summers, before the public knew ought about it, we revolved in our minds conceptions of many difficulties and opposition that would rise up against the successful introduction of the new principles and rights of the inventor. Among those not anticipated, however, arises the one of alteration, under the supposition of "Improvement." Nearly twenty kind friends have privately suggested to me what they, no doubt, believe to be inventions and improvements. All of these suggestions related to the detail construction of the hive, or in other words, methods by which my lately discovered principles might best be clothed; and nearly all of them had been carefully considered, a part practically tested, and all discarded as inferior, during our three seasons experimenting.

While invention always involves device, device, by no means, always involves invention, and among all the devices kindly suggested to me, only the one of D. S. Hall, found described on page 547 possesses the merit of invention.

Now, were we like Mr. Hall and some others, unable to support the frames when the case was inverted, by the use of the thumb screws or were we unable to nail on the sides of the hives so that their pressure would not loosen the nailing, we should be glad to adopt friend Hall's invention, but as we have completely overcome these difficulties, without extra expense, and as thumb set-screws are much cheaper, more easily attached, and much more quickly manipulated, and never swell, rot out, or fail in any manner, during the lifetime of the hive, there is no reason why we should, and several reasons why we should not exchange them for Mr. Hall's invention. I believe that Mr. Hall and others, will soon learn that when our hive is well constructed, the frames being made of good, dry pine, of exact dimensions, the screws being of proper size, boiled in tallow, there is no such thing as failure, and like ourselves, will have no drooping down of frames in their apiary, and will prefer them to any other arrangement.

While I am well aware that the detailed construction of my hive may be wide open to improvement, and while I am thankful for all suggestions in regard thereto, I am confident that nineteen-twentieths of all attempts at such improvements will not only prove futile but a damage to all who adopt them, therefore let us be slow in changing, or breaking away from uni-

formity of construction. Several have wondered why we didn't make the brood and surplus cases of equal depth and otherwise alike.

We went all over this ground during our first years' experimenting and while there are two or three reasons for such construction, there are more than a dozen weighty ones against it.

I believe I am not at all prejudiced in my preferences, for any alterations in the detailed construction of the hive leaves it no less my property, both morally and legally, as in fact is any hive which contains even one of the principles of my invention, no matter by whom made or what may be the name given the hive, but I do feel that there is a great advantage to all concerned, in having uniformity of detail construction, as well as of principles and functions, and I will say to all brother bee-keepers that I believe they will do well if before adopting any alterations in construction, they will await the sanction of the inventor who having discovered the principles of the hive certainly should be able to judge wisely of valuable devices in detail construction, even if we had not the genius to devise them.

In closing this topic, I feel it a duty to express my appreciation of Mr. D. S. Hall's genius shown in his invention, and his kindness in presenting it first to me and then to your readers.

JAMES HEDDON.

Dowagiac, Mich.

The above article will be continued next week under the heading, "Inventor's Rights."

---

## SUNDRY SELECTIONS.

---

### \*A CORRECTION.

A. L. SWINSON.—In my article, page 592, C. B. J., there is an error. The sentence should read, "Five out of the twelve answers affirm my own opinion—that the drones from pure queens that are mated are not as good as the mother stock, and that they are *contaminative*." Should read, *contaminative*, full stop after, and not "certaminative." "Of others claiming them to be as good as queen stock before being mated, (should be *comma* here and not period.) I would ask of them,—" The word as printed "certaminative" and without full stop after it, and period after word mated, when I put comma, destroys the sense of the first part of my communication. Goldsboro, N.C., Oct. 25, 1886.

### ROBBING, FEEDING, ETC.

D. KENNEDY.—I wish you to answer the following questions through the C. B. J., at as early a date as possible, and before putting the questions will give my reason for so doing. I