

## Letters to the Editor

### THE CO-OPERATIVE SALE OF HONEY

Owing to the fact that I am neither an orator or a writer, it is rather difficult for me to offer any remarks, as requested, on the matter of coöperation in the sale of honey. But I assure you the several articles from the pens of Messrs. Chrysler and Deadman are read and appreciated by your readers, as also by the readers of the Farmer's Advocate. Of course, it is a well-known fact, to those who had the privilege of attending our last annual meeting, that Messrs. Chrysler and Deadman were not dead men in any sense of the word, and that it seemed far from their intentions just at that time to beat their swords into ploughshares. So, Mr. Editor, it might be dangerous ground for a fellow like me to tread.

However, in my humble opinion, the day for successful coöperation for the sale of honey in Canada is far distant; in fact, a myth only.

Mr. Deadman says in one paragraph: "A Coöperative Association that would handle only first-class honey could never be launched, much less exist." Then he goes on to enumerate in another part of his article a number of grades of honey, and how it would have to be disposed of, which would require an expert like himself to do it. Mr. Deadman concludes his article by telling your readers to advertise their honey for sale, and they will not require the help of a coöperative society to dispose of it. Right you are, Mr. Deadman. The producer, as a rule, is the proper person to dispose of his own goods in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. This may not be good grammar, but it is good business.

Mr. Chrysler's article in the same issue of the C.B.J. is simply a reply to Mr. Deadman's article, given very sincerely, from his own point of view, from which every reader of the C.B.J. can draw his

own conclusion. He says in one part of his excellent reply that a salesman could sell the product of several producers, or the whole Association, with less comparative expense, when making a specialty of it, etc. But, my dear Mr. Chrysler, admitting all you say along these lines, where are you going to get a salesman worthy of that position simply for the fun of it? You would have to pay him well—not only his time, but his travelling expenses as well—and where are you going to get the money to do it with? Now, think a moment, and see if the expense of keeping that salesman would not cost you more than the profit there would be in it. I am sure Mr. Chrysler is perfectly right when he says at the close of his reply to Mr. Deadman that there is something wrong when the producer does not receive more than one-third to one-half of what the consumer is paying for it. That one paragraph alone of Mr. Chrysler's reply to Mr. Deadman goes to show the utter uselessness of a Coöperative Association for the sale of our honey. Let the producer and consumer get acquainted with each other, shake hands and be good friends, and both will get along together O.K., like the two farmers who had a dispute over some trivial affair, and were about to resort to the courts to settle their little dispute. Finally one of the farmers went to a city lawyer with his case, and after hearing his story the lawyer told him that he was already engaged by the other farmer, but would give him a letter of introduction to another lawyer, whom he was sure would take the case. This agreed to, the farmer left the lawyer's office to go to the other, but decided he would read what that lawyer had said to the other. The letter of introduction was brief:

"Dear Mr. So-and-So,—Two fat geese. You pluck one, and I'll pluck the other."

So the farmers settled their own little case out of court, which, I think, in the