

literature is in the nature of controversy or discussions, and the man who is behind the shield of a *nom de plume* is likely to be more free with sarcasm, ridicule, and other sharp weapons with which these mental conflicts are sometimes conducted, hence it is better that each writer should be known. There is a feeling of responsibility, of carefulness, with which each utterance is made, when accompanied by the thought that all the world will know who is its author. We are creatures of education, and I doubt not that it is exactly as a "Hallamshire Bee-Keeper" says, "that a supply dealer in England, who writes over his own name is looked upon as having an eye to the main chance" or if not a dealer as "vain and conceited." He lives there and he ought to know! Here, no such sentiment prevails; while he who, after he has written, planks down his "John Hancock" stands higher in the esteem of his fellows than he who, through timidity, or a morbid fear of publicity, hides behind a *nom de plume*. Now, brother "Hallamshire," you ought not to exhibit so much feeling over the matter as to say that "no honest man would insinuate that you were a sneak" and a "coward" for using a *nom de plume*, when you had first insinuated that those who used their own names were "vain and egotistical" and now go so far as to say that if you dropped your *nom de plume* you might be mistaken for "one of those who prostitute their names for lucre." What an expression! Yet its use is significant, it's a pointer. It's characteristic. It couldn't have been coined this side the water, but it shows the sentiment the other side more than volumes could have done.

But we must bear and forbear and I can most heartily say that I bear no malice towards my Hallamshire brother, as he says he bears none towards me.

W. Z. HUTCHINSON.

Flint, Mich., June 25th, 1889.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL

DIVISIBLE HIVES.

IN an English bee-keeper's article on page 280 of your issue of June 19, 1889, I find the following in reply to an article by Bro. W. Z.

Hutchinson. I quote: "He teaches in his journal that friend Heddon invented the horizontal, divisible brood-chamber which has certainly been in use more than 200 years in the north of this country and Scotland."

This is not the first, second or third time I have noticed such sentences as this from English bee-keepers and others; sentences which our American enemies of honesty in apicultural

progress, love to quote. They love to quote it because it indirectly gives the idea that my invention is something old. Now there is no one who really understands patent law and its bearing, but will see instantly that this statement, whether true or false, has no tendency whatever to invalidate either my legal or honorary rights in my invention. Another thing they will see readily will be that there is great reason why the statement may not be true. There is both pride and interest at stake, and some men have so much pride in one direction that they do not have enough in another to prevent their telling falsehoods. The theory of patent law is this: The Government wishes, as a matter of justice, and encouragement to progress, to reward its inventors. Our Government knows full well that the right of property which the inventor has in his invention is excelled in point of dignity by no other property right whatever. It knows that the benefits which he confers upon the public are greater than those which he receives. It knows that he receives from that Government nothing which costs it a dollar or a sacrifice. It is well aware that he receives nothing but a contract which provides that, for a limited time he may exclusively enjoy his own. It is fully conscious that letters patent are not hurtful monopolies. Now, every one of your readers very well know that if my invention referred to by this English writer, were of no value, that there would be no contention about it, as there would be nothing to contend against. This writer has a very good right and evidently does entertain very strong suspicions from the controversies he has seen in the journals on this side of the water, that all this shooting at my invention would never take place were there not a broad mark to shoot at. He very correctly infers when he sees a repetition of the Langstroth robbery attempted, that, like the Langstroth hive, there are features in my own in question which are worth purloining. He does not seem to comprehend the significance of the fact that these old things used in England never did our people any good, that whatever we may have known about them we never cared anything about them, and perhaps he does not know that in England and Scotland these storifying hives, of which he speaks, had gone out of use, Simplicities and other American patterns having taken their place. These, however, are the facts and the divisible brood-chamber hives never existed in that country. They simply had divisible hives and so did we when we had the two apartment hives. They had what was called Stewartson's storifying hives, but they had no well defined division between the brood chamber and sur-