bees in the same hives two years in succession, but in opening out time in spring change them into new or clean hives.

Your argument with Gleanings about disinfecting hives may be alright, but from what I have sometimes seen a painter's torch would do some hives good even if it was put in the hive and left burning there.

Stratford, Jan. 28th.

[Come again, and yet again, friend Davis. Glad to make your acquaintance. Yours is the kind of letter we appreciate. The photo of your yard will appear next month.—Ed.]

PATENTS AND PATENT LAWS.

R. F. Holtermann.

On page 14, C. B. J., Mr. H. S. Showell asks certain questions and from it I judge you are like many others, under the impression that an article patented can be made by a party for his own use. Such, however, is not the law; a thing patented can be made by no one; in fact, a patent in many cases would be of very little use if such were the law. Mr. Showell had already written to me. The hive I designed has a portico. The portico simply cannot be patented, but there is a device in connection therewith, by means of which a screen or double door can be used. This is covered by Dominion of Canada Patent No. 87,381, issued May 24, 1904. A person may make this devise, thinking that he can make such for himself, yet that does not free him from liability to court proceedings. It is, perhaps, well that this point should come up, as I believe the impression in connection with patent law is otherwise and ignorance of the law protects no one. In closing let me congratulate you on the improvement in the Canadian Bee Journal.

[We are very pleased to receive the above from Mr. Holtermann. There is a very general opinion among business men, who have not actually gone to the trouble and expense of getting legal advice on the matter, that any patent can be copied and experimented with by the individual, so long as the same is not offered for sale. We imagine that this general opinion must have arisen sometime, somewhere, as the result of legal advice or action. We have not asked for legal advice. But, on the receipt of the above letter from Mr. Holtermann, we consulted the manager of one of the large industrial establishments of our city, as to what was the general understanding and practice in regard to this matter, He assured us that his firm acted upon the generally approved practice of copying any patent and experimenting therewith, and putting the same into practical use in their own shops, and that no action could be taken that would hold in court unless the article was offered for sale. Personally, we are inclined to accept this view of it. If we were in Mr. Showell's place we would unhesitatingly make the article. Having said this much, let us analyze the point and see whether or not this generally accepted view has its basis in common law or common sense. All inventions are the result of study and experiment. One thing leads to another thing. The first steamboat was a crude affair, but IT gave us the modern steam vessel. The first steam locomotive was a crude affair. We had the pleasure of seeing it at the Chicago World's Fair. But IT likewise lead to and gave us the modern locomotive. Why? Because men took hold of the new thing and improved it. They first built it and then by experimenting produced something better. If men were not permitted to copy patented articles in the privacy of their own workshops, there would be but small progress in mechanics. For eighteen hundred years the world knew nothing about the telephone; simply because the idea had not been evolved. When the idea was born in the