

and progress. If patents are desirable why should they be blotted from the budding science of apiculture? It is not strange that patent humbugs should be rife in countries where general ignorance prevails as compared with U. S. How seldom we now hear of anyone in this country being swindled by investing in a patent hive. No one would apply for a patent on something in general use; while something not in use, but previously invented, is of no value, because, tested by practice, it *died*. A revival of it could only fail, and needs more of our opposition. Nearly all bee-keepers read one or more of our bee papers, and, as a class, are well posted regarding inventions, patented and unpatented, and cannot be humbugged by inventions of a worthless character. We know that bee-owners, who knew almost nothing of practical honey producing, have invented and patented hives that were inferior to the one patented by our Father Langstroth: (we cannot estimate the value of a patent simply by referring to its date,) but these worthless patents needed no opposition—the intelligence of our bee-keepers laid them on the shelf. We think we do not over-estimate the wisdom of the readers of our bee papers, when we say that they are aware that there is still room for valuable improvements in hives and implements, that the inventors of these implements should patent them if they chose; and whether patented or not, said readers are well fitted to judge of their merits. Bee-keepers outside of this class will not see any of our "warnings." Combinations of old inventions may and often do, form as useful, original and patentable inventions as any other. This was the case with the most valuable claims of Father Langstroth's expired patent. We believe that original and valuable inventions should be protected, and humbugs exposed; but when such ones as J. M. Shuck, T. F. Bingham, James Heddon, G. W. Stanley & Bro., Dr. G. L. Tinker, and others of this stamp, hold patents on what they believe to be valuable improvements, who shall judge? The fact that Mr. A. I. Root presented \$100 to one of these inventors as a token of general appreciation of his improvements (not patented) of the Langstroth hive, points strongly in the direction of modern valuable inventions. Some of these modern inventions seem of little worth while we have *proven* that others are of great value. Others must do as we have done; carefully "try all things" (that appear worthy of trial) "and hold fast to that which is good." Valueless inventions never need "sustaining," it is the valuable ones, that somebody wishes to break down the protecting patents and purloins. We are aware that but few apicultural patentees have

ever enforced their "rights" by law. Some have lacked stamina; not forgetting the money that Father Langstroth was wrongfully forced to spend in the U. S. courts, and which he now needs in his old age. Others have not the means to protect their rights against the very few bee-keepers that are degraded enough to rob them. Let us not only encourage apicultural inventions, but no longer point the finger of scorn at the man who will not *give* us the product of his brains.

W. Z. HUTCHINSON.

Rogersville, Genesee Co., Mich., Jan. 3, '86.

We agree with you in many points in the above article, and are pleased to know that rights of inventors are being more and more respected as they should be. When anyone like Father Langstroth gives us such valuable improvements in connection with our pursuit, as he has done, why should we not recognize it in a substantial manner, but if we have any invention we suppose to be good it is no sign that we are to hold fast to that and never try to improve on it. We can remember when our first reaping machines made their appearance they were thought to have reached perfection, never dreaming that binders would follow in a few years; note the difference in the first and our present sewing machines and again the improvements and facilities in the mode of communication with distant points. So also it has been and will be in the method of taking honey; it is but few years since it was taken in large boxes, now we have the neat and much more conveniently handled section and the rights of those who have spent time and money and devised those improvements *should* be recognized either patented or otherwise.

Read at Leed's Bee-Keepers' Convention.

WINTERING BEES.

YOUR very kind note of the 7th inst. came duly to hand. I was away to the N. A. B. K. Association at Detroit and did not return for about two weeks.

In my absence a large amount of correspondence had accumulated, that demanded immediate attention. And then too I have been quite unwell since my return. When you read these reasons you will pardon my long delay in answering your very kind note.

Nothing would give me more pleasure than to comply with your cordial invitation to attend your Convention to be held in Brockville on Jan. 8 and 9, 1886. But owing to ill-health and press-