

impression, but I'm not afraid of you if you have worked in the Woolwich Arsenal with "12,000 men and boys"; and instead of being an Englishman are Irish. I do like "Observers," A. E.'s etc., but I don't like such names hitched on to such readable articles, and I most gratefully acknowledge the kindly compliment he pays me as president, and it sets me to wondering if he can't make it convenient to be at the next meeting of the International American Bee Association at Brantford, so that we can shake him by the hand "in spirit and in truth."

If he'll come he need not bring his knife, for every thing shall be out ready for him, so he needn't waste any time in that business, and he being an Amateur will only make us feel the more anxious to make his visit both pleasant and profitable.

If I should go to Paris to the exhibition I should most assuredly try to avail myself of the use of "a bed and a knife and a fork" under the roof that covers A. E.

I am glad indeed to have him let me know that he always reads what I say about him, but that isn't enough to satisfy him, he must mix me up in a cartoon with Mr. McKnight, "and a very dear old friend for Scotland. (What's the name please?) and John Bull, and put the said John Bull in the wrong place, and "put the wrong words in my mouth." It is all right to have Canada "cartooned" as claiming to have the best honey in the world I suppose, and I believe they claim what is true when they claim "Linden honey is the best in the world!" for that is produced in the U. S. and Canada; and I am pleased to add A. E.—to my list of witnesses that some persons beside Mr. Pettit did so claim, notwithstanding Mr. McKnight's assertion to the contrary.

I notice on page 1005 of the C. B. J. for Mar. 18th that Amateur Expert asks: "What's the matter with Dr. Mason and 'Nom de Plumes'?" Please inform him that Dr. Mason's "all right" with the exception of occasional attacks of rheumatism that make him put on as much "style" as any "blasted Hinglishmen" would dare attempt to put on, and that if he wants anything of the Dr. just have him make his wants known, but to do it with the "modesty"—characteristic of his countrymen.

I don't know why he should put "Nom de Plumes" in the same sentence with me, for I am not acquainted with the gentleman. I've seen his name in the bee journals and have taken him to be "vain and egotistical", and share the usual opinions of Americans (that includes Canada I believe) and look upon him as Mr. W. Z. Hutchinson, says "as a coward—as one who

has not the courage to put his signature to what he has written—as a sort of a sneak." If A. E., Observer, and A. Hallamshire Bee-keeper are this kind of men we would like to know who they are so as to know just how much of credence to give to their statements. I feel quite confident that A. E., is all right on these points, but his "free trade" notions are "too thin" to hold water" and I may touch up his free trade notions "a bit" so he won't be so "free". But how about Observer, "and a Hallamshire bee-keeper; as he has no objection to all the world knowing his name", just for short let's call him "John Hewitt", and ask what his standing is among British bee-keepers? Will some one tell us in the C. B. J., and if any body cares tell us who A. E. is, who lives so near the Tweed; and if, as I've sometimes thought, Observer's sayings are tinged with that which "does—inebriate" I shall feel inclined to give him another name ere long.

I wonder if it was him who at Toronto about two years ago said that the contention at the Colonial exhibition in London, about the "superiority of Canadian honey was all rot," and that "these statements were made in England for a purpose, but when we come home we should get down to rock bottom, our people should know the truth."

"Ye editors," I had it in my mind to request you to keep O's, A. E.'s, etc., from being too hard on me, but when I saw that O. had advised you to lick Dr. Mason because he objects to fictitious writers when writing on bee culture, and then a little farther on goes farther than I ever did, and says, "we want to know who the writer is, and we have a right to know." I thought you might just let him "waggle." "He's no 'count any how; contradicts himself within nine lines, but then I "read between the lines" as he does.

If you have one or more correspondents anywhere on this earth who think I can be so "licked," or have the fun so shaken out of me that I am not ready for another licking or more fun, let him put in an appearance.

Yes, there! I've put my foot in it again and have wasted four pages of time and an hour of paper to go in the waste basket. See what the editor says in the last paragraph on page 826. "In our opinion, when one of these gentlemen who, under an alias, gets into a controversy with one who uses his own name, the discussion loses all interest, for the first man is an irresponsible non-entity, who strikes his opponent in the back on behind the *nom de plume* wall." Now just look at that. It's a good deal harder on "them air fellers" than I've been, and may be they have given "ye editors" fits, and the fits fell into the