

with another man is through the workings of his mind. If the Section be divided we shall, to a large extent, fail in this respect. Most of us who are biologists have only one opportunity in the year to mingle with geologists. In the past I have found this helpful and would not like to be deprived of it. As this movement seems to have originated with some who have attended comparatively few meetings I would ask them to be moderate—perhaps I may say modest—in urging their views at the present time.

I regret that through illness I am unable to be present to discuss this important question. The matter seems to me to be of such gravity that the change should be made only if there be some approach to unanimity on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) WESLEY MILLS,
per M. B. M.

HALIFAX CLUB,
June 23rd, 1909.

DEAR MR. ERROL BOUCHETTE,

Allow me to thank you for sending me Mr. Wesley Mills' answer to the enquiries sent out respecting Dr. Adami's resolution.

As I am leaving for England in a few days and there will be some danger of these replies going astray, I think it may be best for me to return this, the only one I have yet seen, to you and request you to keep all that you may receive, or hand them to Dr. LeSueur for next meeting of the Council.

Yours most truly,

SANDFORD FLEMING.

P.S.—Personally I am inclined to agree with the view taken by Mr. Wesley Mills.

POINTE AU PIC, MURRAY BAY,
QUEBEC, July 3rd, 1909.

MY DEAR BOUCHETTE:—

I should favour subdivision of existing Sections rather than new Sections or Sections which would increase the numbers. There are already too many immortals in Canada! Is even formal subdivision necessary? Could not the purpose be effected by putting on the programme such subjects as it might be desired to emphasize, and, if necessary, enlarging the general scope of the Section so as to include such subjects? If