



Vol. XIII.

FEB. 15, 1885.

No. 4.

TERMS: \$1.00 PER ANNUM, IN ADVANCE; 2 Copies for \$1.90; 3 for \$2.75; 5 for \$4.00; 10 or more, 75 cts. each. Single Number, 5 cts. Additions to clubs may be made at club rates. Above are all to be sent TO ONE POSTOFFICE.

Established in 1873.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY BY

A. I. ROOT, MEDINA, OHIO.

Clubs to different postoffices, NOT LESS than 90 cts. each. Sent postpaid, in the U. S. and Canadas. To all other countries of the Universal Postal Union, 18c per year extra. To all countries NOT of the U. P. U., 42c per year extra.

HEDDON'S LETTER.

Moral Patents.

HEDDON'S HIVE, HONEY-BOARD, HONEY-PLANTS, &C.

ON first page of your last issue I find a letter from brother Hatch to brother Hutchinson, from which I gather the idea that brother Hatch thinks that our government sells a monopoly to a person when said person takes out a patent. I think he is in error. What we pay the office is record fees, and the monopoly is only a monopoly of the inventor's own discoveries; a monopoly of what he has produced by the labor of his own brain and hands; a monopoly of what did not exist before his efforts brought it into being. The office gives him the 17 years' exclusive right, charging only fees to support the recording and other office labor.

WIDTH AND SIZE OF ONE-POUND SECTIONS.

Brother Hatch also says, that in my "circular, page 20," I claim that the $4\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4} \times 7$ to-the-foot (or $1\frac{1}{4}$ scant) sections do not average one pound. He does not say whether he means my 1883 or 1885 circular. I can't find a word about it on page 20 of either circular. Neither can I find on any other page where I call that section a scant one-pound section, except when used with separators. Well, be that as it may, I have the fresh fact to state, that the past year we learned how to get this section so plumply filled, attached to the wood *all around*, that the part of our crop stored between separators, in this size section, averaged almost or quite exactly one pound per section, gross weight; that is, section and all. We can also average one pound with $1\frac{1}{2}$ -inch wide, $4\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$, when used without separa-

tors, if I recollect correctly. Regarding the system of management, I will give that at a future time.

PRICE OF CASES.

Brother Hatch says he could also furnish my cases at half my price, and make money. Has he seen my 1885 circular, where, on page 4, I quote these cases, in quantities of 25 or over, at 16c each? This includes handles and the five tin strips. I should like to buy of him at 8c each. No doubt he thinks he tells the truth. Does not much depend upon the quality of the material given? But suppose, for argument's sake, he could. Suppose he has the advantage of very cheap lumber and cheap power, and cheaper laborers. Must I, on that account, go entirely without any remuneration for my invention and introduction of this case? I infer that brother Hatch is a "Christian," and I think he should have seen these moral points sooner.

MOORE'S RACK.

This, I think, is properly named. I do not see that it is like, or fills the place of my case. The tin strips at the bottom are not original with me. They are very old; so neither are the wood partitions. I claim them only in combination with a case that is to need no outside covering; that uses open-top sections; is bee-space taller than said sections, and adapted to the tiering-up plan (a splendid plan of manipulation), and taking the cover of the hive in the same manner that the brood-chamber does, and so arranged at the bottom as to be adjustable to the ordinary hive with bee-space above the frames, or my honey-board with bee-space in its upper side. Is brother Moore's like that? I think not. If so, it could not be made of material $2\frac{3}{4}$ inches wide, unless $2\frac{1}{2}$ -inch sections were used. I think that the difference in the popular growth between the rack

and the case is illustrative of their difference in construction. I don't think that brother Hutchinson, Cook, Sears, and a host of others, use a case or any thing else, just because I tell them to or ask them to.

HUTCHINSON'S HEDDON HONEY-BOARD.

I see you published my letter (by permission) on page 98. All right, only I don't see the clause wherein I said that brother H. did not claim the honey-board, only the queen-excluding feature. Did I put this sentence in the other part of my letter, or how? I know such to be the case; and as the letter reads, some might infer that I reflected upon brother H. in the matter, which is far from correct, as I place the highest confidence in his keenness of moral sense and vision, as well as the most sterling integrity in all his acts and speeches. Would that the world were all like brother H.! Think of the comfort and economy!

Accept my thanks for your generous gift of \$100, which is thankfully received. I appreciate it, and will say I can't help but feel honored by your appreciation, after these years of toil. I am not done yet. A word about—

HONEY-PLANTS,

And I will close. I think we should avoid all plants not indigenous to our climate and soil, or readily adaptable to them. I am quite sure that *Epilobium*, or willow-herb, will not prove a success so far south as we are. I hope you will prove or disprove this statement. I can see no returns for labor, land, and seed, unless a plant is tough, generally sure of secretion, self-sustaining, and I am not sure but I may add, will thrive, spread, and increase in waste places, with only just starting. I know of no plants that combine these successful points except

MELILOT CLOVER AND PLEURISY-ROOT.

I have watched the latter closely for three years. It has never "shied" once, but every year is covered with bees all through basswood bloom, or that latter part of it which it laps on to. One great advantage that it has over melilot clover is, that it is a perennial plant. Another is, that it is a perfect success on the poorest soil. I am of the opinion that it might be made to settle the problem of reclaiming worn-out land, or land so poor that nothing else could be made to shade the ground till other fertilizers could get started. Melilot clover will back out of this poor soil. Try pleurisy-root, brother Root, and report. The plant that will grow well, and reclaim worn-out land, at the same time yielding a honey dividend, or take possession of grassy and weedy fence-corners, is what I want, and what I think I have.

JAMES HEDDON.

Dowagiac, Mich., Feb. 4, 1885.

We do not find the sentence you mention, friend H., and nothing was omitted from your communication, by mistake or otherwise. You may have put the sentence in some other letter.—In regard to the epilobium, you will see from our last issue, page 86, that it does flourish as far south as La Salle Co., Ill., and Medina Co., O., friend Green being just west of us. We will sow some of the pleurisy-root seed in the greenhouse to-day. It is noticed in GLEANINGS for Sept., 1880. Three reports are there given in regard to it. Its botanical name is *Asclepias Tuberosa*. Prof. Beal there describes it as follows:

The specimens sent are *Asclepias Tuberosa*,—But-

terfly-weed or Pleurisy-root. I have received it before as a bee plant. It is one of the milkweeds, and thrives in dry hill-sides and fields, but does not contain much milky juice. It is a very pretty plant, and is sometimes cultivated.

W. J. BEAL.

Michigan Agricultural College, Lansing, Mich.

Probably friend Hatch did not know you had advertised these cases at 16 cts. each, and very likely the Moore rack will answer his purpose; if so, he can, of course, advertise them at what price he chooses; but he would, to be sure, call them Moore's rack, instead of Heddon's.

SABBATH OBSERVANCE AND THE NEW-ORLEANS EXPOSITION.

WHAT SORT OF A STAND SHOULD A CHRISTIAN TAKE IN THE MATTER?

THE decision has been rendered, and the Sabbath-breakers have won the day! The New-Orleans Exposition is to be opened on the Sabbath, during the whole period of its continuance. Not only open, but special attractions are provided, and special privileges granted to induce a large attendance on that day. The conduct of the managers contrasts sharply with that of the directors of the Centennial, who firmly and persistently resisted the demands of the godless, to open the gates on the day of sacred rest. It is not only an outrage upon the moral sentiments of the best part of the nation, but a dethroning of Jehovah, and the consecration of his day to Mammon. This act deserves the severest rebuke from every God-fearing, Sabbath-loving citizen. The *Methodist Recorder* says:

Exhibitors who respect the Lord's day should utterly refuse to exhibit their goods on that day, or entirely withdraw from the Exposition; and religious people everywhere should decline to visit and patronize such a Sabbath-breaking institution.

Are not A. I. Root and myself included in the last sentence? Yes.

If the managers of the Exposition are determined to violate the Sabbath, religious people should with equal determination refuse in every way to countenance the desecration.

JOS. SOMERVILLE.

Brady's Bend, Pa., Feb. 4, 1885.

Friend S., I am very, very sorry to receive the above. On first reading your letter it seemed to me as if I could hardly attend a place of that kind, where no respect is paid to God's holy day; but after a little further reflection I concluded it was one of those questions that often come up, that every Christian ought to pray over before making a positive decision. I should not want to decide for others; but so far as I am concerned, I think it is my duty to go, all the same. Of course, I should not go on the grounds on Sunday, neither should I want any thing belonging to me open to inspection on the Sabbath-day. Of course, many perplexing questions come in. If the grounds and buildings are full of visitors, somebody must be there to look after the goods; and while there it would seem hardly courteous to refuse to explain things, and answer questions. It seems to me if I had any loose valuables there I would take them away Saturday night, and take them back Monday morning, if the regulations permitted it. If they did not, I would do one of two things: Withdraw all such loose valuables, or let