

and in some sheep rudimentary ears. The bo-constrictor has little bones under the skin towards the tail, which have no present use, as they are the remains of hind legs and a pelvis. In the case of a certain worm (*Anguis*) we find a set of shoulder bones in the body, but no legs attached to them. Certain whales and fishes have useless bones in the hinder parts of their bodies, which are evidently the remains of hind legs.

Amidst the manifold and wonderful changes which have been wrought in the animal and vegetable kingdoms by the processes of development and evolution, working from the lower to the higher—from the simpler to the complex—our beautiful and industrious little bees have come in for their share.

Prof. Cook is right, of course, about the rudimentary gland of the queen bee; every competent authority will sustain him; but he is hereby respectfully admonished to have the courage of his opinions and stand fast, even in the presence of belligerent ladies.

ALLEN PRINGLE.

Selby, Ont., Jan. 30th, 1888.

For the Canadian Bee Journal.

AN EXPLANATION.

REGRET that I am unable to write anything on the subject of "Hives, frames, etc." without offending Brother Heddon. I wish to explain that I was once a practical mechanic, and am something of an expert with edge tools to this day. I manufacture my own hives, and have indulged in the luxury of "inventing" hives, frames, cases, etc. Some of these inventions have been found wanting when subjected to practical test, while others have been of greater value to me, and to others to whom they were freely given. My slotted top bar frames have been received with much satisfaction by those who have tried them and made report to me. Section cases and store comb cases work with marvellous ease and rapidity over these novel frames. They give the most complete "break" over the upward passways known to bee hive construction, and this without any horizontal division boards to be studded fast to the top bars of the frames. My cylindrical sun wax extractor, which I gave to the public last year, has loaded me with thanks from many bee-keepers. My shallow frame tiering cases invented by me in 1879 for taking honey from the comb with the honey extractor. My section case in which the sections are held firmly in a central position in the case by means of tin supports; my improved section foundation fastener; my wire cone and trap door bee

escapes, etc., etc., have all been offered to those who wish to use them, free of charge. Mr. Heddon has also been at work to improve hives, etc., but he has covered every step he has taken with "letters patent," and many of us believe that he is claiming "royalty" on some things that are not his by right of original invention. I do not disguise the fact that I oppose patents on bee hives. It is impossible to patent a beehive with all its essential parts, under the present condition of things, without imposing on your brother bee-keepers. For this cause "patent bee gums" are justly odious to a greater number of the bee fraternity. Mr. Heddon says that I "echo" his "ideas" as to the best way to use "extracting (?) supers." Well the "echo" has come down through all the years since 1879, when I commenced my tiering case system, which was before I recognised Mr. H. from other contributors to the bee periodicals. Since then I have gathered some very good ideas from Mr. H.'s articles, which I presume I have paid back in the same way. But I think that I can show in "What and How," conducted by Mr. H. in the *American Bee Journal* some years ago, that he opposed my shallow case tiering system, the same thing he now says I "echo" from him. He says that I "echo" his superior wisdom in regard to the true size of the standard L. frame. How could Brother Heddon know this to be a fact? The first movable frame hive I ever owned had the credit of coming from Mr. Langstroth's shops, and the frames in that hive were "seventeen and three-eighths by nine and one-eighth," (17 $\frac{3}{8}$ x9 $\frac{1}{8}$). That hive was used as a pattern from which all my hives were made, and this dates back of my knowledge of the existence of James Heddon. It is true that Mr. H. tried to set the public right as to the true size of the standard L. frame, through the *American Bee Journal*, several years ago. It was to his interest to do so, as he was a supply dealer and was offering the standard L for sale. Still he had my thanks for his efforts though I had no money interest in the matter. But did he succeed in "settling" the matter in the *American Bee Journal*? Let page 8, current volume of the *A.B.J.* answer for him as to whether the editor of that paper is "settled." In his answer (page 8) to A. C. Waldon, the editor says: "The size of the standard Langstroth frame is 9 $\frac{3}{8}$ x17 $\frac{3}{8}$ inches outside measure." Mr. Heddon would be sure of my gratitude if he would make another effort to "settle" this vexed question so that I would know what sort of frames I was to get when I buy a few colonies of bees in "Langstroth hives." Now, Brother H., because a few of your friends honestly believe that your "late invention" is *new*