

people, seeing what party politics have done with "organs." For myself I never liked "organs" of any kind (i. e. literary organs, not musical organs.) They are essentially narrow.

The question now up among Canadian bee keepers, or rather I suppose among the officers and members of the O. B. K. A., is whether they will have an "organ" in future, and if so what will be their organ. And as I with others am called upon to express an opinion on the subject I will now give my views for what they are worth.

In the first place I may say I think the *Canadian Farmer* and its successor the *Rural Canadian* have both faithfully and well performed their "organic" functions towards us. Any defects in the special department so liberally allotted to us were owing to our own shortcomings and neglect and not in any way to these papers so far as I know. Therefore, in parting from them—if part we do—there is no reason I know of why we should not part in perfect amity and friendship. So let it be.

Now to business. Why should we have an organ, that is an "official organ?" What do we need now in the shape of an organ more than we have except indeed the empty "official" stamp which is as "sounding brass and tinkling cymbal?" What is an "organ" but a medium of communication between a party, a confraternity? What was the object of the "official organ" of the O. B. K. A.? And what function did it perform? Why, its object was a means of instruction and communication between Ontario bee-keepers, and the function it performed was simply to open up this means of instruction and communication and keep a standing announcement of the names of the officials of the O. B. K. A. Now, it does seem to me that with the first issue of our CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL the necessity for an "official organ" then and there ceased. I may be wrong but this is how the matter appears to my mind. Why and how did the necessity cease with the establishment of our *Journal*? Simply because the CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL fulfils the conditions then required; affords the desired means of instruction and communication amongst Canadian bee-keepers,—in fine performs all the functions of the late "organs" and on a much more extended and enhanced scale. When the O. B. K. A. was organized there was certainly necessity for an official organ: there is none now. True, the same necessity exists now for an organ as did then, and we have it. Our organ has everything now but the official stamp, and that makes no difference one way or the another. The best stamp any journal can have is the stamp of approbation by its readers and

supporters. On this principle the C. B. J. is already stamped, for if I mistake not it has the hearty approbation of Canadian bee-keepers in general and the whole of the officers of the O. B. K. A. in particular. This is sufficient. So long as the C. B. J. continues to be published, and performs the same function for Canadian bee-keepers which it does now and in the same spirit of fairness, friendship and fraternity, so long will Canadian bee-keepers have all the organ—official or otherwise—which they require. Should the *Journal* cease to exist then it would be timely and necessary for Canadian bee-keepers to again seek an organ—that is a medium of instruction and communication.

In the rather tangled premises, I beg to make the following suggestion as a way out to open sea:—Our present name "The O. B. K. A." is too narrow. Let it be changed to "The Canadian Bee-Keepers' Association" so as to include every Canadian, bee-keeper from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I would not call it "the Dominion of Canada Bee-Keepers' Association" as has been suggested; that is too cumbrous a cognomen. It is not best in these days to lumber up titles any more than contexts with unnecessary words. The word Canadian covers the whole ground. Local associations could be affiliated with the Central organization on a judicious basis to be decided upon at annual meeting. The membership fee of the general organization ought to be reduced from \$1. to as low a sum as possible—just what would be necessary for the expenses of the organization. In the interests of the "Canadian Bee-Keepers' Association" (its growth and permanency) I do not think it would be wise to exact a large membership fee—larger than necessary—and then undertake to return a *quid pro quo* of any kind, whether a bee journal, an Italian queen, or anything else. What bonus would suit one would not suit another, and every one wants to spend his money as he sees fit. Why should bee-keepers be babies that they must have taffy offered them in the shape of discounts, queens, or anything else to induce them to join an association the advantages of which are obvious. The following single advantage of membership accruing to each and every member ought to be sufficient in itself to induce every prudent bee-keeper to join: In case of unjust legal proceedings against any member on account of alleged damage by his bees similar to the cases now pending in the U. S. let it be understood and provided that such member shall receive the united assistance of the Association in the unjust litigation forced upon him, and let it also be understood that any bee-keeper who does not think it worth while to join the Asso