

ly "helping  
lower, we  
at glad that  
visible toes,  
ve us a real  
pe that your  
is we believe  
intimate to us  
ll again pro-  
will take the  
xt time, if it  
Ed.]

## SALE OF

wish to refer  
s Advocate of  
r. In this he  
er's Advocate  
no attempt to  
at the benefits  
ion in the sale  
m cooperation  
Mr. Chrysler  
contradict my  
must come to  
atements were  
as a leader in  
re known this  
has been mis-  
o always bring  
of his scheme  
led cooperation

[stated that he  
ne impossibility  
ading of honey,  
Who grades it  
ation going to  
' and, without  
sary, he says:  
s bought honey  
rts of the Prov-  
ould expect to  
Mr. Deadman  
oney satisfactor-  
factorily. If he  
he must surely

have that miserable, unripe stuff, as he calls it, to sell to his customers." In the first place, I must say that I am surprised that Mr. Chrysler should try to avoid the question at issue by making such an explanation as that. I am afraid he will have to get better posted about some things, at least. He should know that when one handles first-class honey there is no grading to do, and as I will not buy unripe honey at any price, I have none to sell. Easy, is it not? But it is just here the weakness of a coöperative association comes in. A coöperative association that would only handle first-class honey could never be launched, much less exist. When a honey producer pays his \$25 or more into a coöperative association he does it to help to sell his honey, and just so soon as you reject and attempt to grade and classify his honey, just so soon will he want his money back. If it could be shown to his satisfaction that his honey was inferior to some other—a very difficult matter to do—he might remain with the association; but to reject his honey—well, I can hardly conceive of one being so foolish as to invest his hard-earned money with that possibility in view. I think Mr. Chrysler, instead of asking questions so easily answered, should have been more to the point to show how he would make a success at grading. As briefly as possible I will endeavor to show that it is impossible to have a satisfactory and understandable grading of extracted honey. It was attempted once, and proved a failure, and always will be. For example, we will begin with clover honey, and, in order not to make matters more complicated than we can help, will call the best No. 1 and the worst No. 4. Now there will be another lot, nearer No. 1 than No. 4, which we will call No. 2. Then another sample is not as good as No. 2, but better than No. 4; this we will designate as No. 3. Those who are at all familiar with honey know that this is not overdrawn;

in fact, it does not go far enough. The same can be said of buckwheat, or of basswood. Then comes the combination of clover with just enough buckwheat to spoil it, both as to flavor and appearance. Then there is other honey, known as spring bloom, that there may be a surplus of, and that may get mixed in and render the very best honey inferior, and that would make it impossible to grade satisfactorily, and that could be described and understood, the same as when speaking of apples as No. 1 and 2, etc. For instance, a prospective buyer writes to the manager of a coöperative association for honey. He is told that the association has some No. 1, 2, 3 and 4 in clover, also as many grades in basswood, and as many grades of either of these, either in combination with each other or with some inferior. Now does Mr. Chrysler pretend to say that a standard for each of these could be set up so that it could be bought and sold the same as apples are? The prospective buyer would have to have a sample to be sure of what he is getting. He writes back for this. As I said before, our association is in a worse position than the producer to sell from sample. We will suppose that samples are sent. Then whose honey are these to be taken from?—for we must reasonably suppose that several members will have honey that is graded the same number, and a close record would be required to be kept so as not to get this sample business mixed up. In a coöperative association, every pound of honey that is short of being first-class must be graded in some way, or an injustice is being done to some one. It is just here that a coöperative association is working at a disadvantage. In the first place, a beekeeper who produces only a first-class article is better out of it, because what is gain to some one who has inferior honey is loss to him, as his honey, by mixing with some not as good, would render the inferior saleable.