

When judges, who are looked upon as Christians and upright and honorable citizens and whose characters should, like Caesar's wife, be above suspicion, stoop to these things, it is time that radical changes were affected.

Brantford vs: Buffalo.

SINCE our issue of last week we have received several communications regarding the proposed change of the coming International Convention, from Brantford to Buffalo, and all are opposed to it.

Sec. Holterman writes us as follows:—

Yours just to hand. When I received friend Ernest Root's proof sheets I was staggered. Nothing had been said to me about it and I hardly knew what to think. I could not see that it was in the best interest of the International. This morning however I wrote to Gleanings and friend Newman of the American Bee Journal, stating that Brantford was selected because the International was invited there by Brant beekeepers, not because the secretary lived there. I should be sorry to have any Association have a convention in a certain place because a certain journal was published there. This would surely mean failure to anything but a local Association. Constitutionally it is of no value to have votes of members on change of place of meeting. But you give the same reason in your letter to Mr. Root that I gave; it is entirely too late to think of such a step so many wires have been pulled and arrangements made. It would mean every arrangement being made in a few weeks afresh. Prof. Cook says rightly "we all only wish the best interests of the society." I maintain these are against changing the place and more unless for the very gravest reasons, the work of the members of a society in annual convention should not be hampered with. But if nothing else prevented a change the lateness would. Then as you say the delegates appointed all over Canada cannot go under present appointment. Bee-keepers should come to Brantford, it promises to be one of the brightest that grand old continental organization has ever had. Already sufficient have promised to make it safe to predict this. R. F. HOLTERMAN.

Romney, Oct 12 '89.

The American Bee Journal and Gleanings both appear with articles similar to that which we published as the advance proof from the latter. Editor Newman's comments we append:—

In the above article Brother Root asks for opinions of bee-keepers to be sent to us relative to changing the location of the International Convention to Buffalo next December. This was done without consulting us, but we will attend to the matter with pleasure. We favor the change, if it receives the endorsement of Mr. Holterman, Mr. Jones, and other Canadians. They should have been consulted first.

LATER.—Since the above was put into type, we have heard from several Canadians—among them being Messrs. Macpherson and Holterman—and as they do seriously object, there can be no change from Brantford for the next International Convention—but for the sessions of 1890, Buffalo is just the place. The suggestion came too late. Let us now dismiss the subject, and work faithfully to make the Convention at Brantford a successful and interesting occasion.

The editor of the American Bee Journal favored the change provided the Canadians were satisfied, and he does not prohibit Canadian bee-keepers who are not members from speaking their minds. It will also be seen that he falls in with our suggestion that the sessions for the International convention of 1890, be held at Buffalo. We heartily concur with his closing sentence: "that we now dismiss the subject and work faithfully to make the convention at Brantford a successful and interesting occasion."

Gleanings prints our letter which was forwarded, and comments in this wise:—

"Well, now, friend M., may be I have put my foot in it. If so, I shall try to draw it out as gracefully as possible. Let's see: It seems to me that your original editorial is a little ambiguous, or, rather, it conveys pretty directly the impression I got from it. After mentioning the fact that you had invited your American friends to be present at Brantford, you insert a "by the way" clause, which seems to be somewhat of an after-thought to the preceding. The clause in question, and the one which gave me the impression that you desired to change to Buffalo for 1889, reads as follows: "By the way, would it not be mere justice to place the holding of the next convention at Buffalo?" The underscored word is mine. Now, the question hinges on the little word next. I can not get any other meaning from it than that you meant the coming convention, for the close of this year, 1889. I do not see how the next convention could refer to the year 1890, when there is yet a convention to be held in between now and then. The reasons you give for holding it at Brantford are good; but would not these delegates be willing to pay a little more for the sake of the privilege of seeing the Falls in winter? and is it not a fact that some of the delegates are nearer Buffalo than Brantford? and would not the general expense be thereby somewhat equalized? I am still in favor of Buffalo, though I am willing to accede to the wishes of the majority