

all of the United States and Canada." Does that look as though they supposed incorporation would throw out Canada? It is true, that Mr. Clarke objected that incorporation would affect the international character of the society; but his thinking so did not make it so, and it was explained that there would be no abridgment of its powers or limitation of its scope by means of incorporation.

The Ontario report complains that at Albany the committee on incorporation vouchsafed no information as to the terms, conditions, or effects of incorporation, but confined themselves to the bald statement that they had done as they were bidden. Why should they say anything more? They were directed to do a specific thing—to get an advantage for the society. They did as instructed, and then came saying, "We've got the advantage." What more was necessary?

The Ontario report recites that at Albany one of the committee, in answer to a question, was told that the association was now local, but its influence would be national. This does not agree with the printed minutes, in which E. R. Root replied to Mr. McKnight's question, "It is incorporated under a State law, but its influence is national."

Objection is made to the word "national." Now, if the mental machinery of others is like mine, they would think of Ontario, New York, Illinois, etc., as all one, when speaking of the society, and the word "national" in that case would have just the same meaning as the word "international." I feel pretty sure that Mr. Root and Capt. Hetherington both used it with that signification, and still more sure that Mr. McKnight so used it in his question, "Is not incorporating it under a State law making a local society of what was a national body?"

The Ontario committee says it has "come to the conclusion that Canada has no rights under the new state of things, and that it was not intended she should." The committee has simply come to two very false conclusions. I don't believe that a single man that favored incorporation believed that it would take away any of Canada's rights, and I fondly hope that some of my Canadian friends have still confidence enough in my word, vile offender though I am held up to be, to believe me when I say that I had not the most remote intention or desire to do any thing to make the rights of Canada less. I am very confident that the rest of the vile few were of the same mind.

The hint is given that the States other than Illinois suffer from the same limitation as Canada. Most assuredly they are affected in the same way, and yet it has not come to my know-

ledge that a single word of protest has gone up from any one of them. Surely, the committee ought to find in "the great body of American bee-keepers, which it believes are not responsible," and to which it tenders "assurance of continued fraternal good will, high consideration, and cordial regards"—surely among these there ought to be found not a few ready to rise up in earnest protest against any wrong done to Canada and the States outside of Illinois.

Now, in all candor, let me ask what harm has incorporation done? What right, just tell one little, lone right, that Canada had before incorporation that she now lacks? In what way is the North American any less "broad and international" so far as the society itself is concerned, than it was before? Will the meeting at Washington be any more local than its predecessors? What single thing has ever been done by the society that it could not equally have done if it had been incorporated at its first organization? What single thing is there that it cannot do in the future that it could do if it were not incorporated? Will any one of the four gentlemen who signed that report answer these questions? I am sure that room for their replies will be given in the same columns that admit the questions.

I have too high esteem for the sound heads and kind hearts of Canadian bee-keepers to believe that any misunderstanding, as I am sure it is a misunderstanding, shall lead to any permanent estrangement. The truth will come uppermost, and we shall know each other better.

C. C. MILLER.

Marengo, Ill.

FOR THE CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL

Mr. McKnight Cracks the Incorporation Nuts, and Pronounces Judgment upon the Kernels.

SIR, In *Gleanings* of 15th Feb. Dr. Miller steps into the breach caused by incorporation with the sword of defence in one hand and the pipe of peace in the other. He has polished up the former to an extent that its sheen throws the calamut in the shade. The material to burnish his blade has been gathered by him from the inception of the North American down to the present day. He invites us to a "pow-wow" upon ground we decline to occupy. "The same columns that admit the questions" is not the place in which we choose to meet him. We were once lured there by this suave "medicine man" only to be buried in oblivion, and we will not again "Listen to the voice of the charmer, charm he never so sweetly." We prefer to stand at a distance and "crack the nuts" he has thrown at us with the view to ascertain the character of their kernels. These nuts as they lie before me are six in number.

Nut No. 1 is "What right—what lone little right that Canada had before incorporation that she now lacks?" I answer: Before incorpo-