

there be any considerable loss to the farmers, on the 4,000,000 bushels of barley that are not exported to the United States ?

A.—I do not think that there would be. The brewers and maltsters in Canada use, as a general rule, the darker colored barley, being more particular about the weight and condition than about color. Out of the 4,000,000 bushels consumed in Canada, a considerable quantity is damaged every year, and unfit for brewing and malting purposes, and is chopped and used for feeding. In regard to the price of the balance, I am satisfied, that with the land devoted as it probably would be, to raising more stock, the value of barley for feeding purposes, would be equal to the present value of dark colored barley. For the last few years the American growth of barley has largely increased, and the average price of barley in Canada has been steadily decreasing. It was undoubtedly a question with the farmer this spring as to whether he should sow barley, owing to the very low prices obtained during last winter, and there is no question that a great deal of the barley this past winter was chopped and fed by the farmers, in preference to selling it at the price which could be obtained. At the present time good feeding grain is generally worth over a cent a pound. For instance, to-day in Toronto, oats are worth 42 cts. for 34 pounds, and barley for feeding purposes would be worth about the same proportion per pound.

Q.—Then some very low estimates, that I notice, of 40 cts. a bushel, as the value of barley used for feeding purposes are, you think, absurd ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Mr. Howland, it is just possible that the question may be asked, how you can consistently advise the farmers to go on growing barley for the American market, and still vote for prohibition in Canada. Can you give good ground for justifying the giving up of the growing of barley by farmers, except what may be required for occasional rotation of crops, and feeding purposes ?

A.—Yes, I thought it advisable first to show the mis-statements in the circular, as to the loss on the present growth of barley in Canada ; but at the same time, I am perfectly satisfied that the country would be a great gainer, the farmer particularly, if the Scott Act were adopted, even if he abandoned growing barley altogether, as a crop on which he put any considerable dependence, except for feeding purposes.

Q.—Upon what grounds would you state this ?

A.—On two.—1st, on the direct loss to the country, that the liquor traffic has hitherto produced annually, in which the farmer is most seriously interested. 2nd, on the direct gain to the country, and to the farmer particularly, in diverting the expenditure arising from the consumption of intoxicating liquors to more beneficial productions.

Q.—How do you establish the first position ?

A.—In the following manner : The total quantity of beer, wine and spirits manufactured and imported into this country and consumed here in 1882 was 17,255,970 gallons. If we allow very moderately for the large increase in spirits, which are taken at proof, and the general watering and increase of quantity by adulterations, the total quantity sold will not be under 25,000,000 gallons. Now this produces, sold at retail over the counter, something over \$3 per gallon. When we allow for what is sold in large quantities by grocers, I think it safe to take the cost of the liquor which this country drinks annually at \$2 per gallon. This makes the annual cost to the country for drink consumed, \$50,000,000. I do not think that this is generally realized. This money, of course, is, as we all know, wasted and gone, and is absolutely unproductive of any good, and I am satisfied that it is the waste of this enormous sum of money every year that brings about the ever-recurring seasons of pressure and hard times. If this \$50,000,000 were invested, in sound and beneficial ways, it would be a power and value in the country

which would, I think, prevent, to a very large extent, the financial distress and trouble which come about from every three to five years. It is impossible to waste such a large sum as this without its telling seriously on the resources of the country ; and my own impression is that there would be no necessity for a public, foreign-held debt in Canada if these moneys were free to be utilized here for public purposes. The country would be able to hold its own securities, and thus save the enormous annual drain for interest.

And this really is the least serious aspect of this expenditure of \$50,000,000 per annum ; it is the secondary cost which is the most serious. The calculation, as made in England by Mr. Hoyle and other careful economists, whose figures are not questioned by good authorities, shows that the secondary cost in jails and criminals, on additional police, and the enormous loss of time and labor, owing to the evil consequences of strong drink, are equal to the amount expended for it. When we consider the value of the work—the services of the men, who are at present confined in our jails, and prisons, and asylums, the result of strong drink, or who are utterly useless or worse than useless outside, we can readily see how the amount can run into gigantic figures, it is almost impossible to over-estimate the seriousness of the evil financial results arising from the consumption of drink in this country.

Q.—Well, as to the second point, of the value of the direct gain to the community, but to the farmer especially, if the Scott Act were adopted and this expenditure prevented.

A.—I think that is easily shown. We will say that the brewer pays 65 cts. a bushel for his barley, and puts this money in circulation ; and when he sells his beer he draws the money in again. There are two points about this that require to be noted. The brewer certainly pays the 65 cts. to the farmer but he draws from the working man, as I shall show afterwards, indirectly through the tavern-keeper a sum enormously out of proportion to the amount which he invests with the farmer. My experience of the wages paid in Canada is this :—That it requires every dollar that the workingman makes to support his family in reasonable comfort, and that he cannot afford to spend anything on an unnecessary and expensive thing like strong drink. Every dollar that he does spend in this way is so much which ought to be, but is not, invested with the grocer, the butcher or the clothier. Now let us look at the other side. If the barley and the other articles which are produced by the farmer, instead of being sold to the brewer and consumed in liquor in Canada, were exported the grain buyer pays the farmer his 65 cts., and he receives back again from the place to which the grain is exported the 65 cts. plus the exporter's profit. In this case the money paid to the farmer is in the country, the money from the exportation of the barley returns to the country, and the workingman's money is in his pocket for the purchase of the other articles which he needs and which are produced so largely by the farmer. Let us see if we cannot give some figures on the question which will help to show how much it is to the farmer's interest that the workingman should spend his money with him and not with the brewer, and how much better it will pay the farmer that he should do so, and how fully it will cover any possibility of loss arising from the farmer changing the article of production, and standing ready to provide the workingman with the other articles for which he has the increased means to pay. We will say a workingman spends 10 cents a day in buying two glasses of beer and it takes about two glasses to the pint of the size which are sold ordinarily at that price. This certainly is a very moderate estimate for a moderate drinker. These two glasses a day would cost \$36.50 per year. To make the beer for which the \$36.50 is paid would take about three bushels barley for which the brewer pays to the farmer 65 cents, equal to \$1.95. Deducting this from \$36.50 leaves \$34.55. Now supposing we make up a list of what the workingman could buy with this \$34.55, of articles produced by the farmer, putting down for :—

50 pounds additional meat at 10c.....	\$5.00
10 " butter at 20c.....	2.00
2 barrels flour at \$5.50.....	11.00
10 pounds cheese at 13c.....	1.30
5 bags potatoes at 90c.....	4.50
Woolen clothes, wool from farmers sheep.....	10.75

Making a total of..... \$34.55