

that the few frames which antedated mine were of no practical account—still the attempt was for many years persisted in (I sometimes shudder now at the bare recollection of those weary years) to persuade the bee-keeping public that my patent was invalid.

On all sides patents sprung up, *using*, BUT NOT CLAIMING the most valuable features of my invention, and one bee-paper, having then the largest circulation, went so far as to accuse me of perjuries, which, if committed, ought to have sent me, in my old age, to the penitentiary. Thus were the feelings of my wife and children outraged, and even where no credit was given to such atrocious accusations, many honest bee-keepers were so misled as to believe that they had a perfect right to the free use of my movable frames, or were induced to pay for infringing patents the money which would have provided amply for me and mine.

I do not think that the bee-keepers of this country will ever suffer a similar outrage to be perpetrated either against Mr. Heddon or any other honest inventor and benefactor.

L. L. LANGSTROTH.

Dayton, Ohio.

For the Canadian Bee Journal

NOTES FROM NOVA SCOTIA.

LIVING in this remote portion of our fair land, and far removed from the prominent apiarians of the day, I am, notwithstanding, more than interested in their welfare and the progress of the science of bee culture. To me it has a fascination above and beyond mere dollars and cents. I take great pleasure in reading the CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL of each week, and would not do without it on any account. I am Canadian enough to prefer our own; especially can I say this of your paper, not merely because it is Canadian, but because of its contents—both editorials, contributions and reports.

Being situated in this part of the continent, I am not personally acquainted with any prominent bee-keepers, but for all that I feel a blood relation to many of them, and often amuse myself in trying to imagine what their respective temperaments are. I suppose that if I were to attend one of your associations (the N.A.B.K.A. for instance), I would require smoked glass eye protectors in order to preserve my unsophisticated optical organs from injury. However, had I the privilege of uniting myself to that association, I have no fear but what I could feel myself at home.

The honey season of 1887 was very poor; did not obtain half a crop, with scarcely any swarming where colonies were given a super of sections.

This winter has been mild so far. The lowest the mercury has fallen was 2° below, and then only twice. The lowest it has been since February was 18° . Bees are in fine condition, and have consumed but little stores. To-day the temperature is 50° , and maple sap is running lively, which indicates an early spring—in fact the sap has been going up for some time past.

Now, Mr. Editor, pardon me if I presume too much, but I would like to speak of some things that have come up in the JOURNAL. What seems to be the matter with Mr. Clarke and the genial doctor? Surely the reverend gentleman has the *bona fide* right to say that he still has faith in his theory—if theory you may call it—without being taken so severely to task for it. Whether this theory is Professor Cook's discarded bantling or not I don't know, and if it is or is not it makes no difference. The facts remain the same. If bees do not hibernate I don't know what you call it. Some colonies will not consume more than their own weight of honey or not even that. Do not these colonies hibernate, merely moving about among the hives?—and opening them carefully does not break up the hibernation. I have moved hives about, thumping them against others and opened them, too, without any bad results. Five minutes after having removed them all was as quiet as before. I have given considerable attention to the subject, and have the same opinion as Mr. Clarke. I have found, too, that when in a proper condition light does not disturb them, and that is the strongest point in the argument. Where light and handling does not disturb, it is evident that they are in a far different condition from what they are in the summer season. I had begun to look upon Mr. Clarke as my doted champion, when lo! these hopes were almost scattered to the winds by reading his criticism upon the first number of Mr. Hutchinson's paper. Surely he wrote that article in a fit of ill humor, and did not mean what he wrote. That was not written in the spirit of a Christian gentleman. But the best have their failings, ministers as well as bee-keepers.

We have been much amused down here by watching the performances between Mrs. Chaddock, Prof. Cook, and Mr. Allen Pringle; but come, Mr. P., that talk about "belligerent ladies" "having their own way," "women not open to conviction," etc., was very ungallant, to say the least. Mrs. Chaddock should be treated with the consideration due to a lady—to say nothing about an equal. But I will defer, and not get myself entangled in a maze of scientific points, and, no doubt, be obliged to beat a hasty retreat before Mrs. Chaddock's sweeping arguments,