

ration the bee-keepers of Canada at the annual gatherings met with their brethren of the United States on common ground and on equal footing. The pleasure and the privileges of those meetings were common to both. They were essentially meetings of "kindred spirits." The society was not then legally responsible in its character, and, notwithstanding its elaborate constitution, might embrace bee-keepers from England, Hong Kong, or Honolulu, so long as they paid their membership fee, and secured the enrollment of their names, and this, I apprehend, any respectable bee-keeper from either or all the aforementioned places would have had no difficulty in doing. Will Dr. Miller say the society's platform is as broad to-day as it was then? "None but citizens of the United States could become incorporators." The inference is, none but citizens of the United States can claim its privileges.

Nut No. 2.—"In what way is the North American any less broad and international, as far as the society itself is concerned, than it was before?"

My own impression is Dr. Miller is in doubt on this question, and wants "any one of the four" to clear it up for him. Let me try to do this by putting the question to him: Suppose the bee-keepers of New York, Michigan, Iowa, or any or all the States from Maine to Florida should organize as a legal body by paying their three dollars, and take out a certificate of incorporation, and each call itself the North American Bee-Keepers' Association, (I suppose they have the right to do this), where then would be the superior status of the Illinois Association? Its title I presume is not a trade mark it can monopolize. It has no patent right upon it that dare not be infringed. Granted it has the exclusive right to the title. Is it not competent for any other State to organize under the more comprehensive name of the "Universal Brotherhood of Bee-Keepers, and still another under that of the Ecumenical Council of Apiarists, and so on all along the line, and each include in its constitution the whole world? Could they not do this with as much reason as the present Association can include Canada? Whatever jurisdiction it may claim in its constitution, the North American is now essentially a State Society, and this newly blossomed "rose by any other name would smell as sweet." I view the Association as a State Society, so do my associates, I believe. What wonder then that Canada has withdrawn? She has no wish to come under the wing of Illinois as a suckling, and seek what favors the illustrious parent may have to bestow. She fancies she is as big as her would-be foster mother, and she "swarms out."

Nut No. 3.—"Will the meeting at Washington be any more local than its predecessors?" Its predecessors had a name but no "local habitation." The present Society has. No one should object, however, to its members going on an excursion to the Capitol. I predict for Washington the best bee-keepers' meeting ever held in the country, and the succeeding one at Chicago, better still; but do not forget to give *Washington* the credit in the one case, and the *World's Fair* the credit in the other.

Nut No. 4.—"What single thing has ever been done by the Society that it could not equally have done if it had been incorporated at its organization?" Nothing. But in like circumstances

—"What single thing could it have done, if it had been incorporated at its first organization—it has not done as it was? If incorporated at the beginning it could have sued its debtors, but no one owed it any money. It might have been sued, but it owed no one any thing. It might have purchased land, and built a hall to hold its meeting in, but it had no balance at the bank or money in the treasury to do this; so its life was as happy and useful in the one state as it would have been in the other.

Nuts Nos. 5 and 6 are "blind"—there is nothing in them.

We never had any objection to our brethren across the border incorporating. We have no right to dictate to them what they should do. When I discovered a disposition at the Keokuk meeting to incorporate, I advised they should go to Congress for their charter, and thus make their Society a National Institution, with all the powers and prestige the nation's authority confers. but Mr. Newman then stated, and Mr. Root has subsequently reiterated the statement, that this could not be done—that incorporation must be effected under a State Law. I thought at the time it were a strange thing if this be so, but not being conversant with the laws of the United States, I took it for granted they were right. I am pleased to find, however, my suspicions then were well founded, for I find it stated in the *A.B.J.* of the 11th inst., page 218, under the caption *Congress*, that "Mr. Hatch, of Missouri, is seeking incorporation of the Society of American Florists." If the florists of the United States can secure incorporation from the supreme law, making power of the land, why not the bee-keepers? Dr. Miller, Mr. Newman, Mr. Root, and all the others concerned, will admit, I think, that the bee-keeping industry of the States is quite as important as that of the flower-growing industry. Nay, more, that the number engaged in growing flowers for market, and the commercial value of their annual output, sinks into insignificance when compared with that of bee-keepers'. They have more bee-keepers engaged in the extensive production of honey than any other nation on the face of the earth. There is as much brains in the business, too, as will be found elsewhere. There is more honey harvested in the States than there is in any other country in the world; and it is a marvel to me they have not ere this organized themselves into a National Society worthy the name, and put themselves in a position to exercise a combined influence commensurate with the importance of the industry in which they are engaged. It is not yet too late to do so. Let them take a hint from their neighbors the florists. Let them go to Congress, secure incorporation, organize a Grand Central Association around which the lesser bodies can cluster—thus strong and united they will be in a position to demand and enforce their rights. With such a Society, we, in Canada, would be delighted to affiliate if that privilege were secure to us. If not we would not grumble, but be glad to see such a society; we could not but benefit by it, if that benefit only came to us from reflection. Let them cease to content themselves with that impotent makeshift, the North American, which is very much like a chip in porridge—little good, little ill. My idea was, is, and ever will remain—the advocates of incorporation at the Keokuk meeting did