

the customer usually pays cheerfully for the package.

Louis Maples.—I fail to see the difference whether you tell a man he pays for it or whether you do not. I have been trying to work up a home market for my honey, and I have been out a little with a horse and wagon. I say 10 cents a pound, and I have 5-pound pails and 10-pound pails. If they ask if the pail is theirs, I tell them you pay for the pail when you pay for the honey. I weigh pails and all, and I find it is more satisfactory. It is hard to get that 10 cents out.

Mr. Couse.—I have had considerable experience along this line. As a rule when I get my tins back they are not worth half what I gave for them. Now I am gradually getting into the practice of marking the whole thing gross weight, and I do not fail to tell this to whom I am selling. I shipped a few crates of honey a few days ago to one of the best groceries, and I marked it 5 pounds gross. I do not want to deceive the customer at all. I get paid for my tins now, and I don't want to get them back.

Mr. John Newton.—As far as I am concerned, I think both methods are right. For my part I have tried both, and for the last two years I have put some up in both ways, and I have some customers that won't pay for the pails and do not want them. I tell them it is ten pounds of honey and the pail is 10 cents extra. If they just want the even money, they get 9 pounds of honey and pay for the tin. I tell them we do not get these pails for nothing. I do not think it is right to say here is ten pounds of honey, and then they find out it is only 9 pounds. As far as my experience goes, they are willing to buy 9 pounds of honey and pay for the can. I think it is just a matter of how we explain it to our customers.

Mr. Chryster, Chatham.—I have used both kinds. As for the 10 pounds in pails, I find the same trouble as Mr. Newton. You are getting back 25 per cent. of the pails you send out. You might tell them the price is \$1.10, and they will say, "I do not want the pail." If they are well acquainted with you, they will take the pail for \$1.00 and say they will return it. Ninety per cent of them do not return it. I have used the 10-pound gross pail, and will explain to them that it was ten pounds gross and the pail weigh about $\frac{1}{2}$ of a pound, and I find that the most satisfactory way.

Mr. Newton.—I had considerable success with the 20-pound pails. They do not object to paying for the 20-pound pails.

Mr. Heise.—When I retail I sell a 5-pound pail or 10-pound pail, and when I wholesale, I sell so many pounds net. Those customers who say they have no use for the package, I say to them you return it in good condition, I will take it back; and when they do not return it in good shape I say I have no more use for it.

Report of S. T. Pettit on efforts to secure an Act, to Prohibit the Production and Manufacture of Spurious Honey in Canada.

It will be remembered that soon after the session of Parliament for 1895 closed, that I reported through the CANADIAN BEE JOURNAL that the Bill had not been reached. Now if there is any consolation in it I will state that there were over 30 other bills in that session that had shared a like fate. But I believe the failure in our case came about largely through the fact that we have in our Association an opposition of two members; a small opposition but a very vigorous one. When it was announced that the House of Commons would meet in April, 1895, I at once wrote T. S. Sproule, M.P., to introduce our Bill at the earliest possible moment so that it would be sure to get through. Mr. Sproule answered that he would do so, and that I had better come down to Ottawa about the second week of the session for the Bill would likely get its second reading about that time. So in compliance I went down.

During the year 1894 as well as previous to that there was an under current of opposition that did not come to the surface very distinctly, but it did harm all the same. But during the session of 1895 beside the under current there was open and virulent opposition waged in the Press against our Bill. From the many misleading statements set forth in the Press I select the following, viz:

That "the nectar of flowers and cane sugar are one and the same." That "it has been accidentally discovered that the best granulated sugar is converted by the bees into a honey which cannot be distinguished by experts from the best grades of honey." That "no sooner was this discovery made public than a hue and cry arose among ignorant unscientific, narrow-minded bee keepers against what they alleged to be threatened adulteration." That "this law is sought for selfish ends, it is wanted as a weapon and a menace to keep an upstart clique in power." That "unfortunately our Parliaments have too often passed Acts in the interests of monopolists and combines rather than for the good of the general public, the anti-sugar honey Bill is one of this kind." Now you can all understand how these untruths