

Again, a coöperative association is working at a disadvantage in having to handle honey that is not first-class. With fruit it is another matter, for a barrel of No. 2 may be just as good value—eat as well and no difference in value for cooking—as No. 1, and an association does not lower its standard of good goods by selling any grade of fruit. Not so with the honey, however, and an association that sells inferior honey, except for manufacturing purposes, would never build up a trade for their output, and the manager who would expect to would be counted a fit subject for an insane asylum. Not only must a co-operative association be a failure from a financial standpoint, but it should be discouraged, from the simple fact that it would have a tendency to encourage the production of inferior honey, because it would be lost sight of in the general mix-up.

The other thing Mr. Chrysler comments on is what I stated about prices. Just here, again, he falls into error by supposing things, and by believing all that is told him. He is not the first one, though, who before to-day has worked out a line of argument on supposition. He says: "If I am correctly informed, he paid as little as 3 cents per pound less than the market price." If Mr. Chrysler, in the Farmer's Advocate or any as good, can prove the truth of that, I wish he would. I deny such allegation, and when either abuse or personal matters are brought into an argument, while not pleasant, I take it as an indication of weakness in my opponent's position. I think Mr. Chrysler has got things mixed again. It may be this he refers to: Last year I bought in advance a bee-keeper's crop of honey at a stated figure. As the price of honey advanced I paid him just \$52.80 more than I promised for only 1,920 pounds. If his proposed coöperative association will do better than this, it will be to their credit.

As to Mr. Chrysler's explanation as to bee-keepers becoming shareholders, at \$25 per share, the limit being ten shares, he does not say what the inducement is to take more than one share, nor why he limits it to ten shares, unless it be that prohibited things are frequently more valued, and the more shares, I suppose, the more "say," because one would hardly invest more than necessary, unless he had votes to correspond; and if this be the case, then it is worse for the "other fellow" who has small investment in shares, but possibly more in honey, as he would have to fall in with the majority.

Mr. Chrysler's plan of engaging salesmen to work on commission is on a par with the rest of it. Would not a producer better sell his own honey and make this commission? Or how much commission would compensate one? As Mr. Chrysler has in view the great West in disposing of honey, how much, suppose you, would a producer get for his honey after paying one to go out under such much expense, to say nothing of the expense of the manager and others at home. And who, think you, would make the most bad debts, the bee-keeper selling his own honey, or a salesman whose commission was according to amount of sales made? I venture to say that business done the first year must be at a loss. A coöperative association is at a disadvantage here, as their remaining in business from year to year depends entirely on the supply from their members. With private individual handling honey, it is quite different. He can spend his capital as he chooses, and if he cannot sell honey procured from his own province he can import it, so as to hold his customers from year to year. This fact alone with his freedom to accept or reject any honey offered—something an association cannot do—is what Mr. Chrysler has apparently overlooked entirely.

One more question asked by Mr. Chrysler, which is entirely foreign to the subject,

May 1908.

ject, is: "Who have been advantaged to come out of this? They are they want?" Within the year, of the quality and possible value, he expected to be expected to be advertising with that; in fact, that advertising, as it is indication that a sale of honey. I would have to fall in with the majority, advertising on the who has it to sell such an advertise columns of the I ducer better sell his own honey and make the only four this commission? Or how much commission in C mission would compensate one? As Mr. Chrysler has in view the great West in disposing of honey, how much, suppose any reader of you, would a producer get for his honey to sell, advertise i after paying one to go out under such much expense, to say nothing of the expense of the manager and others at home.

Huron County,

Mr. Chrysler

In replying to Mr. Chrysler's letter, I am sorry that lack of time prevents me from replying to the subject, but his reply will answer a few of the first items he referred to. I approve his statement that capital should not accrue from the sale of apples when Mr. Deadman's statement is worthy of a man making a goods business. I am sure both have been in the market who knows how to prove, that