

“Gleanings” Comments on the Report of the Committee on Affiliation.

We reproduce from *Gleanings* its remarks on the Report of the Committee on Affiliation presented at the Annual Meeting of the O.B.K.A. held at London. The Report appeared in our issue of Jan. 15th ult. *Gleanings* printed the Report in full, and the comments thereon which appear below called forth Mr. R. McKnight's letter. The A.B.J. also printed the Report, and commented on it. It also reproduced the remarks made by *Gleanings*. The A.B.J. editorial note on the Report follows that of *Gleanings*, and also the editorial note on *Gleanings*' comments.

“The above came to hand from the secretary, and his language is couched in such a form that one *might* get the impression that in the sending of it he was doing a disagreeable duty and simply acting under instructions. We were greatly surprised and pained upon reading it—surprised, because we are certain that none of the members who were instrumental in having the N. A. B. K. A. incorporated had the *least thought* that that action would cause the Canadian brethren to withdraw. We were pained, too, because of some statements in the report that are calculated to carry the impression that we desired to put out from the N. A. B. K. A. the Canadians and break down their “national dignity,” etc. Nothing could be further from the real truth. We have since received a private letter from one of the members of the committee to the effect that the grievance was not against the U. S. as a body, but against a *few* of the leaders, and mentioned Thomas G. Newman, Dr. A. B. Mason, Dr. C. C. Miller, and the two Roots. We know that every one of the gentlemen named will be as much surprised as ourselves; but they will doubtless speak for themselves.

We greatly regret that the two members who were present at Keokuk should still misunderstand (we cannot believe intentionally) the purpose of incorporation. Although it has been explained heretofore, it seems they have entirely overlooked the fact that organizations in the United States that are national or international in their character and influence, are, or should be, incorporated under the laws of some one particular State; and, as was also ably explained by Capt. J. E. Hetherington at the Albany convention, incorporation *does not* make the association local, but a legal body politic amenable to the laws, with special functions, rights, duties, and liabilities; capable of suing

and of being sued—in short, transacting business. It is quite probable that the members of the O.B.K.A. as a *body*, not being familiar with the laws of the United States, were not in a position to appreciate what incorporation on this side of the line means. We could not incorporate under both the national governments, nor under the laws of the United States, but under the laws of some one State. But, we repeat again, the North American is not less international now than before. Let us give one illustration of what the society now under incorporation is capable of doing:

As a body it can sue any packing-house in any State where the laws are strict enough, that may be engaged in the adulteration of honey. It is in better position also to protest against injurious legislation from national or State governments, because it is an incorporated body.

Nine-tenths of the bee-keepers of the North American are residents of the United States; and Chicago, the place of incorporation, is the most central of any point for those bee-keepers. The great mass of them in the United States are in the North. This our subscription books show very decidedly. Nothing was more natural than that the State of Illinois should have been selected; and it seems to us, to speak plainly and in all kindness, that nothing but a partisan spirit or a silly quibble on technicalities on the part of the committee could make any objection to it. We have no grievance against the body of the Canadians who voted for the adoption of the report, for they were acting in good faith. Some of our warmest and best friends we number among the Canadians.

The report goes on to say: “We have reasons for believing that the official report of the Keokuk meeting, in the matter of the protest made by your representatives there, is largely characterized by a *suppression veri*; that communications sent by them to two leading bee papers . . . were not published.” We have before us the report of the Keokuk convention, as written by the secretary, C. P. Dadant. The report had to be necessarily brief on almost every subject that was discussed; and yet it seems, as we look it over, that the Canadian brethren were given a fair hearing. “Gleanings” was one of the leading bee publications designated that is *said* to have suppressed one of the communications. The matter at the time was “not available;” and moreover, we were sure that the writer did not properly understand what incorporation meant on this side of the line, and we thought it useless to stir up discord or partisan feeling over misconception or misunderstanding. We were not aware, until we read the report as