

the joint stock company. This peculiar arrangement was adopted by an Ontario society that for several years worked quite successfully, but unfortunately a large quantity of the stock was held by townspeople who were not growers, but were interested in promoting the advancement of the neighbourhood. The spirit of dividend-making crept into the management. The rental for the warehouse which was owned by the company and the expenses as determined by the company, were considered too large by some of the growers. The dissatisfaction spread and finally the company, composed largely of non-producers, found itself with a warehouse and nobody using it. The company, of course, went into liquidation. Unfortunately the fruit growers associated this mismanagement with co-operation and no efforts have been successful since in establishing a purely co-operative selling association in that neighbourhood. It is quite probable, however, that with the numerous examples now in existence of successful co-operative associations, several places similarly situated will organize again but on better lines. Practically all the successful associations in Ontario that are incorporated, are simply joint stock companies and they owe their success to the fact that the influential members have adhered to co-operative methods as far as possible and have not taken advantage of the powers which joint stock incorporation gives them to turn the association into a dividend-making concern. Indeed one or two of the associations have gone to the other extreme and have paid no dividends on the capital invested. This, however, was so manifestly unfair to a few individuals who had furnished capital much beyond the average, that part of the proceeds of the business is now distributed as dividends upon the stock limited to 5 per cent.

CO-OPERATIVE LEGISLATION.

None of the provinces have special Acts that provide for strictly co-operative incorporation. There are, however, means by which farmers' associations can be incorporated. New Brunswick and Ontario have each a joint stock company Act which, however suitable for industrial concerns, is not at all suitable for co-operative purposes.

The Prince Edward Island Association was incorporated by an Act of the local legislature. The Nova Scotian Act for the Incorporation of Farmers' Associations is drawn up along the lines of the usual joint stock company organization and is of course objectionable on that account. It, however, serves the purpose fairly well.

The United Fruit Companies of Nova Scotia was organized co-operatively by a Special Act of the local legislature. Quebec has an Act under which farmers' associations can incorporate with some co-operative features, but with share voting. The Act for Incorporated Farmers' Associations in British Columbia permits associations to organize conveniently on the joint stock principle.

PROPAGANDA.

A most notable feature of English distributive co-operation is the very large sum of money devoted to educational purposes. In the year 1910 this amounted in round numbers to one hundred thousand dollars. When the societies were few and the wholesale organization was struggling for existence, it was of vital importance to organize more societies. But now that the societies have become numerous and the wholesale society unassailably strong, little individual benefit can come either to the societies or their members by new organizations. The educational fund of the British co-operators is conceived in the purest benevolence and with a cordial recognition of co-operative fraternity.

In the case of Canadian apple selling associations we do not need to appeal to this spirit of altruism alone. Further organization is absolutely essential for the material interests of the industry. The numerous plantings that have been made in British Columbia of late years are now beginning to put fruit upon the market.