which bad debts play in the entire proposition is so small as to be practically negligible. Losses are inevitable in any country and under any system. They must, therefore, be allowed for. The causes of failure are many, and often complex. It is impossible to ascertain exactly to what extent wholesale losses come from failure to collect accounts, but they have not been important in so far as the fixing of the price to the consumer is concerned.

TENTH. Manufacturers have certainly not been handicapped in buying raw material owing to improper credits given to farmers. No such instance can possibly be adduced. The financing of manufacturing concerns is a matter which is entirely dependent upon the successful conduct of their business. Their losses from sales to jobbers have been practically nil.

ELEVENTH. The farmer, except in isolated cases, where he is the victim of unscrupulous retailers, does not pay more than a fair price for his goods. I am now speaking of present conditions. I admit that some years ago in too many localities the farmer was taken advantage of by the local merchant, but it may be asserted that today, (and we are not talking of ancient history), the farmer, with the assistance of the mail order catalogue, knows about as much about what goods should cost as the retailer himself. As it stands now, as I have said before, he pays on the basis of cost of production, plus distribution, as does everyone else.

TWELFTH. It is admitted that there is an absolute need for country storekeepers. I believe that today they are prepared to do business on a legitimate basis, and I do not think that they should be forced to meet the competition of farmers' organizations when they so conduct their business. The question is really one of the survival of community life among us, and that is a matter in which the farmers themselves are as much interested as anyone else. It is to the interest of the farmer that his local village shall be live and prosperous.

THIRTEENTH. It is suggested that the farmer should benefit by acquiring the profits from the sale of merchandise. This, of course, depends upon considerations which have been adverted to, but it may be gravely doubted whether the farmer could not use his capital to better advantage in the way of acquiring and cultivating more land, of improved roads, better school facilities, etc., than by investing ... capital in enterprises which are outside of the scope of his legitimate business, and endeavoring to make or save money in that way.

Another thing: Is it fair that local merchants shall be compelled to go out of business, when they are giving good service to the public, through the competition of farmers' co-operative associations. Do not the farmers believe in the maxim: "Live and let live"?

FOURTEENTH. So far as I am aware, there is no bitter opposition evidenced by either the wholesale or retail interests to the trading operations of farmers' organizations. If such organizations are along legitimate lines, if they are established for the benefit of the community as a whole and not of any particular class, if they are not mere distributing agencies for a few classes of goods to a favored portion of the community, there is no reason in the world why they should not come into fair competition with businesses already established where the necessity arises, but if the converse be the case, then such organizations can hardly come within the scope of fair business dealings. Certainly it cannot be said that they will be boycotted. They will simply be attempting to perform a function for which, under business usages, they have not laid a proper basis.

FIFTEENTH. It is suggested that the farmers will, in certain contingencies, manufacture various lines of goods themselves. It will be interesting to have this propostion elucidated in detail. Considering the fact that manufacturing is necessarily dependent upon huge aggregations of capital, with corresponding plants, access to raw materials, skilled workmen and staffs, it is hard to see how