



"THE GREATEST POSSIBLE GOOD TO THE GREATEST POSSIBLE NUMBER."

VOL. II. No. 3. BEETON, ONTARIO, APRIL 14, 1886. WHOLE No. 55

THE INDIAN AND COLONIAL EXHIBIT.

FROM Mr. Alfred Neighbour come the following kind words, relative to our proposed display, and in the name of Canadian Bee-keepers, we thank him for this expression of courtesy:

I see by your JOURNAL that I am deputed to see to first arrival of exhibits for Colonial Exhibition at South Kensington. I shall be happy to do all I can in the matter and as I am well acquainted with the authorities at South Kensington, I think I can be of service. A cordial welcome awaits our honey friends.

Yours truly

ALFRED NEIGHBOUR.

London, Eng., March 20, 1886.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

HEDDON'S INVENTION.

IN response to Mr. Pond's article, on page 821, I wish first to say that this is the first fair, reasonable and gentlemanly controversial criticism coming from any of my Brother bee-keepers, with whom I have formally entered the arena of warm apicultural debate.

I wish to publicly thank Mr. P. not only for the fairness and candor of the article, but for the noble sentiment he expresses when he tells us that bee-keepers should respect the results of another's mental labor, as they would the results of physical labor, and that, too, upon principle, whether forced to do so by law or not.

We do not purchase a patent. Civilized nations grant it, as a natural right. We pay our attorney for properly preparing our application, and our government for recording our invention

so that should we find any who will not do justice unless compelled to, we have a record with which to force them to do right.

It is very evident that Mr. Pond understands and appreciates the spirit of patent laws and as I have studied that branch of law, more or less for 20 years, and also done some soliciting, I will endeavour to point out to him something in regard to the letter, as well as to the spirit of American patent laws, more particularly as connected with my late invention.

It is a well known fact, that nearly all patent claims are for new combinations of old parts.

Further, that many of our most useful inventions and valuable patents are made up entirely of combination claims. All the claims of my late inventions are of this class, except one. I refer to the original and prior manufacture and use of half bee spaces or shifting bee spaces without which no tiering interchanging arrangement can be made invertible, in a cheap, practical manner, and I wish right here, to say, that whoever gives the matter as much experiment as I have done, will not be willing to do without the invertible feature. I have experimented with it for four years on a large scale.

To make this matter clear, let me here record some disclaimers before I explain what I claim.

First.—I do not claim closed end frames. I do not claim invertible hives or frames. It is too late, and I do not now claim my own invention (in which I was original and prior) of slat honey boards, embracing the break-joint principle.

Mr. J. M. Shuck's patent, issued later than mine, although the application was made first, and the fact that his application was never cited to me, shows that there is no interference between us. Each one is working for cherished objects—