

that there are no "big prices" to be obtained in England in a wholesale way, and that is the way our honey in future must be sold. And beside all that no one needs to be informed that by relieving our home market all Canadian honey producers are equally benefitted. So, in the name of common sense, I ask why anyone should endeavor to make the unkind and wrong impression that some one is making an effort to steal an unjust advantage over his fellow-members and get "big prices" in England.

On page 31, "Peek-a-Boo" is represented as stating that "what was sold to the trade while the exhibition lasted was sold generally at 12½ cents for extracted." Certainly this is an error and should have been corrected long ago.

S. T. PETTIT.

Belmont, April 25th, 1887.

For the Canadian Bee Journal.

#### A CIVIL QUESTION FROM DR. MILLER.

ON page 70, current volume of the CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL, under the heading "Priority of location," Dr. C. C. Miller writes: "On page 27, C. B. J., in the address of Rev. W. F. Clarke, occurs the following statement, 'Some prominent members of the apicultural fraternity are advocating the passage of a law, to secure to the first comer as a bee-keeper into a neighborhood, the exclusive ownership of the bee-forage within certain limits.' Will you, Mr. Editor, ask Mr. Clarke to kindly give the names of the parties to whom he refers, and also the place, if any, where mention has been made of the matter in the bee-papers?"

A civil question is entitled to a civil answer, and I shall do my best to give it frankly and fully. In my reference to "Some prominent bee-keepers," I had more particularly in view Dr. Miller himself, Mr. Heddon, and Mr. Betsinger. At the outset of the discussion, Dr. Miller was generally understood to advocate legislative protection to "the first comer as a bee-keeper into a neighborhood," Mr. Heddon hailed his utterances at the Indianapolis Convention as harmonious with those previously made by himself in favor of priority of location, but did not agree with the Doctor in trying to secure it by legislation. After the discussion had been going on for some months, Mr. Heddon, in the *A. B. J.*, of March 2, page 138, withdrew his contention with some facetious hits at the Doctor, and said, "I give him the case for the present at least." Mr. Betsinger, who was at first inclined to oppose the Doctor's views, announced himself as a convert to them in the *A. B. J.*, of Feb. 16, p. 105. In reply, therefore, that all three of these gentlemen have advocated the proposition mentioned

in my address, and, as requested, I will now proceed to cite quotations from the "place" where they have done so, viz., the *American Bee Journal*.

The Doctor first aired his pet scheme of legislative protection for bee-keepers at the Indianapolis Convention in October last. There was no verbatim report of his remarks in advocacy of the movement, and I will not pretend to quote him, but the impression made on my mind and on the minds of others, was that he wished legislative recognition of a right of pre-emption to territory in which to keep bees. Thus Mr. Heddon understood him. He says in *A. B. J.*, of Nov. 10th, 1886, p. 709: "Only a few months ago, I wrote on the subject of 'Priority-right of location,' trying to show why the prior occupant had the natural exclusive right. \* \* \* Surely none have forgotten how malignantly my position was attacked. \* \* \* I imagine my surprise at noting that at the Indianapolis Convention a committee was appointed to inquire into the desirability and feasibility of asking our Government to legislate this condition of affairs." In the *A. B. J.*, of Nov. 24th, p. 743, Dr. Miller thanks Mr. Heddon for giving his view on p. 709, and substantially endorses it. He says, "I understand Mr. Heddon to claim that the prior occupant has a natural exclusive right, and that such exclusive possession would result in the greatest good to the greatest number. In this we are very nearly, if not altogether in accord"; and he goes on to specify as the point in regard to which they are not quite in accord, Mr. Heddon's idea of "a natural exclusive right of the prior occupant" securing of itself the "survival of the fittest." Instead of leaving the result to the operation of natural law, the Doctor would secure it by legislation. He says further: "However much thought Mr. Heddon may have given to the matter of rights as to priority of location, I cannot believe he has given much thought to it with the possibility of legislation in view, but it seems to me that without much thought upon this branch of the subject, he has hastily settled upon the conclusion that because there was no legislation there could be none," etc. No legislation on what? "Rights as to priority of location" is the Doctor's own statement of the case which Mr. Heddon would leave to the operation of natural forces, but which Dr. Miller would have regulated by law. In the *A. B. J.* of Dec. 8th, p. 775, Mr. Heddon, replying to the Doctor, contends that the "natural right of priority" is competent to take care of itself without such legislative aid as Dr. Miller proposes. In the *A. B. J.* of Dec. 15th, p. 794, Mr. W. H. Osborne urges the valid and strong