

contents of which did not commend itself to their judgment and approval, they would most assuredly fail. The general intelligence of our Association is such as to destroy any such inference. Their continuous membership and thorough knowledge of the business of the Association forbids the supposition that they acted in the dark.

You express your surprise "that now one of the Committee of the Ontario Society should join in the Report which says the rest of the Committee cared little for his opinion." Doubtless the consummation of your pet scheme led you to practically ignore the existence of your fellow committee men. Had you taken them into your confidence, as you might and should have done, a better understanding would have been arrived at and a more satisfactory result secured. The express wish of the Keokuk meeting might have been deferred till a fuller discussion was had, and the views of more of the representative bee-keepers of the United States secured.

You will admit, I think, that the Keokuk meeting was not a representative gathering. A score would include all present who could properly be so designated. I submit, therefore, that its hasty action was not the expression of a general wish. The meeting at Albany stood vastly higher as a representative body. But you may retort: The Albany Convention endorsed the action of the Keokuk meeting. True, but it was not duly considered. I mildly sought to introduce the matter, but feeling the peculiar position I occupied, I refrained from pressing the question. I don't think you can fairly claim lack of opportunity to personally consult your Committee, or blame me for believing my opinion was of no consequence to you. If I mistake not, a quorum of that committee rode on the coach with you from Keokuk to Chicago. Here you had an excellent opportunity of doing what you failed to do. Add to this the fact, that you wrote the report, signed it on behalf of the Committee—entrusted it to a gentleman who was not a member of the Committee for submission to the meeting, and that your colleagues did not know its contents till presented for adoption,—and you must acknowledge there was at least a lack of courtesy on your part. The only privilege you vouchsafed to us, was to ask us by letter to name the men we wished to see figure as incorporators.

You appear to labor under the delusion that you favored my opinion above that of my fellows in refraining from including the name of Mr D. A. Jones among the incorporators. If this were so, I should most assuredly feel flattered, but its force is destroyed when I quote you as

follows: "The 'form' to be signed by the incorporators reads: 'We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, &c.' Therefore *no one* but a citizen of the United States could be included." If this be so, how then could Mr. Jones' name be left off on my recommendation? He is not a citizen of the United States, but he is one of the only two life members of the association at the time the motion for incorporation was carried, the other being yourself. See proceedings of 1890. The fact that I pointed out at that early date that Mr. Jones was ineligible, is, I think, evidence that I knew something of the situation, although we are charged with ignorance of the subject, "narrow mindedness," and what not.

You say you "have sacrificed your own feelings and interests to the gentleman who signed the document." I am certain it would pain every one of them, if they should put you to any inconvenience or cause you to sacrifice either of feeling or interest, but they will have to rack their brains to discover wherever you have done so in this matter.

There is one thing that pains me above all else in connection with this affair, and that is that Mr. Dadant feels that his *bone fides* are questioned in our Report. I can assure you, sir, Mr. Dadant never occurred to my mind, in connection with his work in reporting the Keokuk meeting, while our report was being written or under consideration. I would be the last man to sanction anything reflecting on his character, because I have the highest respect for him, believing him to be one of the most independent, outspoken and honorable men in the ranks of American bee-keepers, and in saying this I feel certain I but echo the sentiments of my fellow committee men. I know, too, he enjoys the confidence of Canadian bee-keepers who have the privilege of knowing him, or who have had business transactions with him. His reputation amongst us is that of a sterling, high minded gentleman. Mr. Dadant must know, however, that as the business is done, it is impossible for any one except the Secretary and the publisher to know what the Official Report contains until it is put in the hands of the members in pamphlet form, and then corrections are out of the question, and what the speakers may have said has escaped the memory of the reporter. It was the comparative meagreness of the report in respect to what was urged in opposition to incorporation in connection with other strange things, that led to the insertion of the paragraph complained of.

And now in conclusion, permit me to assure you that nothing which has transpired has