

Keokuk. I suppose the best of men sometimes do bad things, even with the best intentions.

"To err is human."

Mr. E. R. Root's editorial paragraph calls for fuller notice. It sets out with the statement that "a few of our Canadian friends took umbrage because the beekeepers on this side of the line thought it good to have the N. A. B. K. A. incorporated under the laws of the State of Illinois." Is this a fair and truthful statement of the case? It was not "a few" Canadian beekeepers who "took umbrage," but the entire body of them. The action taken by the O.B.K.A. on the subject was unanimous, and I have yet to find a solitary Canadian beekeeper who thinks we were justly treated. Mr. E. R. Root makes the statement worse a little further on by saying,—"As a few of the Canadians seem determined not to understand properly our motives," &c. Here, not merely are we told that only "a few Canadians" object to incorporation; but that they do it from wilful perversity. This is not very charitable, and hardly squares with the declaration, that the motion for postponement was prompted by the principle, "if eating meat cause thy brother to offend," etc. The whole spirit of this paragraph is patronizing. "Poor weak brethren! Perhaps, as a stretch of good nature, we may rescind; but we should not wonder if the Chicago convention votes to retain incorporation." It is hardly likely the action will be rescinded at Chicago. It would have been a graceful thing to have done it at Washington. There it would have seemed an act of international courtesy, performed at the seat of government; but that Chicago will forego what gives it a sort of prestige as the hub of beedom is hardly to be expected. If Mr. E. R. Root could have broadened himself sufficiently, to have said at Washington:—"There has been misunderstanding about this business; our Canadian brethren feel aggrieved over it; we do not wish to hurt their super-sensitive feelings; let us rescind our action of last year for the sake of harmony and good fellowship;" who can doubt but

the thing would have been done *non con*. I think better of the other three composing the "big four," than to suppose that either of them would have objected.

Mr. E. R. Root says:—"It may be asked why should we consider the matter at all?" Well, if I have not given good and sufficient reasons in my remonstrance and protest, respectfully submitted to the Washington convention, let the matter go. Neither Dr. Miller nor Mr. E. R. Root seem to consider that there is any question of right or justice involved. This is where the shoe pinches. Apparently we have no rights that United States beekeepers are bound to respect.

WM. F. CLARKE.

Guelph, Ont., March 9th, 18 93.

THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL.

ADULTERATION.—BEEKEEPERS' UNION, ETC.

I was surprised, upon receiving the last issue of your periodical, to find on page 352, the erroneous statement of John F. Gates concerning myself.

The matter concerning adulterating honey with glucose in the Michigan convention report was written by Mr. W. Z. Hutchinson and published in the *American Bee Journal* eight months after I had sold it to George W. York & Co., and long after I had ceased to have any control of its columns. I never saw the item until I read it in that published report, so that Brother Gates' charging it to me was inexcusable, and his generous remark—"We'll let Brother Newman off this time," is meaningless. I have always been unflinchingly opposed to adulteration in every form, and have spent nearly all my energies for twenty years in that direction, and do not now thank anyone for charging me with inconsistently apologizing for it, or allowing anyone to do so where I had any control or authority to prevent it.

While I fully agree with Mr. Gates in his condemnation of the matter in hand, I wish it to be distinctly understood that I have made my record in that line; and even in my retirement from apicultural journal-