

COST OF PRODUCTION.		PROCEEDS.	
Rent.....	\$ 3 00	30 bushels at 65 cents....	\$ 19 50
Ploughing.....	1 50	Straw.....	3 00
Cultivating and Sowing ..	75		
Harrowing and rolling....	50	Total proceeds....	\$22 50
Seed (2 bushels).....	1 30		
Harvesting	2 00	Profit,.....	\$5 00
Threshing	1 50		
Marketing	1 00		
Manure.....	5 00		
Total cost....		\$16 55	

Following Mr. Howland, I have taken 30 bushels an acre as an average crop. The Agricultural Commission of Ontario Report of 1881 (vol. 1, page 369) puts it at 25 bushels, and the Bureau of Industries' report of 1883 at 24 bushels. My own average for last year was 23 bushels, but I think that, take one year with another, 30 bushels is a fair average. Now let us compare the returns from barley with those from other spring crops. Professor Brown, of the Provincial Model Farm (Ag. Com. Report, vol. 1, page 265-369) estimates as follows:

Roots, profit per acre	\$ 34 80
Wheat, " "	26 90
Peas, " "	17 25
Oats, " "	11 72
Barley, " "	9 70

The yield on my own farm last year was:

Wild Goose Wheat, 31 bush. per acre, 85 cents	\$26 35
Oats, 50 bushels per acre, 35 cents.....	17 50
Peas, 30 bushels per acre, 75 cents.....	22 50
Barley, 23 bushels per acre, 65 cents	14 95

The straw from the four principal grain crops, Prof. Brown (Ag. Report as above) values as follows:

Wheat straw	\$ 5 00
Oat "	6 00
Pea "	5 00
Barley "	3 50

I think most of my fellow farmers will agree with me that the above estimate is too high all round, but certainly the straw off an acre of barley is seldom worth more than half what we get from an acre of any other grain. Summing up, then, it would appear from these estimates that barley is one of the least remunerative crops that a farmer can raise, whether we consider the cash returns or the exhaustion of the land caused by taking off so much in the way of grain and returning so little in the way of straw. But, however, we may differ about exact figures, I think most practical farmers will endorse the following statements:

1. That continual cropping with any one kind of grain is injurious to the land, and should be avoided, especially by any man who owns his farm and intends to remain on it.
2. That the farmers of this county have during the last ten years grown or rather sown, too much barley.
3. That if three-fourths of the acreage devoted to barley during the last ten years had been given to meadow and pasture, and to peas and oats *to be fed on the place*, we farmers would to-day have as much money, and vastly more productive land than we have.
4. That we in this county are blessed with a good honest soil which generously responds to generous treatment, and that we are therefore not dependent upon any one crop for our living.

While on the dollars and cents side of this question I must notice the statement recently made that "by maintaining the interests of the brewers and malsters the farmers support their own interest." Let us see how this will work on the old rule of "tit-for-tat," "you buy my barley and I buy your beer." I am a farmer, and get from the brewer for my crop of 300 bushels of barley \$195. Mr. Double X is a brewer, and makes from my 300 bushels of barley 73,000 glasses of beer, \$3,650, which I buy, and lose

on the transaction \$3,455. In other words, for every 65 cents which the farmer gets for his barley (and only about 15 or 20 cents of that is profit) he supports the brewer to the tune of \$12.16. It would take him a long time to get rich if he had no one but brewers to deal with, wouldn't it? I fear I cannot give our friends credit for much "forethought." They are about as wise as the little fish (was it a "mullet," or a "sucker?") who called all his brethren together and implored them to support and encourage the fishermen, for, said he, "you all know how they supply us with worms." In my opinion the proportion of bait to hook is about as large with the brewers as with other experienced anglers. But perhaps farmers do not buy all the beer made from our barley. Well, if we buy it and lose twelve to one, how is any one else to buy it and lose less? If on 300 bushels raised by one farmer the loss is \$3,455, what is the loss on 13,000,000 bushels raised by all the farmers in the country? I make it as nearly as possible \$148,700,000. Of course this is reckoning that the barley is all made into beer, and sold at 5 cents a glass, but as a great portion (say one half) is used for other purposes, the real loss is only about \$75,000,000. To sum up:—if we farmers can't live without the brewers, and we can't stand up like men and drink enough beer to support these gentlemen who support us, but have to call in our friends and neighbors to put their hands in their pockets and some seventy-five millions deep to keep the men who own—I mean keep—us, then we've come down from the most independent set of men on earth to a poor lot of hangers-on to the coat-tails of the men who have subscribed \$1000 each to pay professional agitators to pull the wool over our eyes, and make us afraid to do our duty to God and man.

So far I have only tried to show that we as farmers need not be afraid of prohibition, but I think I could easily go further and prove that we should gain. The temperance reform is spreading faster in England than here. There the rule has been that the mechanic and the laborer must have his beer, whether he had his beef or not—and he had *not*. Now he is giving up his beer, and he will take our beef instead. Our own people too will use more beef, more milk and butter, more of all our farm products, when they give up their "support" of the brewers and distillers. Then there will be more cases like that of a neighbor of Mr. M's, who a few weeks ago turned out ten head of fat cattle for which he received \$1000, and rejoices in the possession of a grand heap of rich manure, which will go to enrich his farm and make it produce two bushels where an over-cropped farm would produce one.

WHICH IS THE FOOL?

The beer or spirit drinker is wont to look with ill-concealed contempt upon the simple water drinker, and as he tosses off the glass he has just paid his money for he imagines he has swallowed something far better, and performed an action far more sensible. Yet if he could stop a moment to ask what he has just taken, he might think quite differently. Let us see. A barrel of beer contains about five hundred glasses. The seller gives about eight dollars for it, and sells it for five cents per glass, or twenty-five dollars. His profit is two hundred and fifteen per cent. The drinker drops in ten times per day and takes his glass of beer; in fifty days he has consumed the five hundred glasses, and paid twenty-five dollars therefor. What has he swallowed? Scientific men say that in the five hundred glasses of beer there were four hundred and sixty glasses of mere water, twenty-five glasses of pure alcohol, fifteen glasses of extracts and gums. So the beer drinker has paid twenty-three dollars for four hundred and sixty glasses of water, and impure at that, which he might have had at the nearest spring for nothing, and pure as nature made it. He had in addition twenty-five glasses of pure alcohol, which is a poison,—at enmity with every function of the system,—no food nor heat producer. And besides all this, he has taken fifteen glasses of extract of malt, sugary matter, indigestible gums, etc.

Surely there is no absurdity so absurd. To pay twenty-three dollars for four hundred and sixty glasses of impure water, when he could have it pure for nothing, and two dollars for forty glasses of poison and mostly indigestible drugs! But it pays the brewer and saloon keeper to sell water at two hundred and fifteen per cent. advance on all their trouble for barreling and bottling it.—Prof. George E. Foster, M.P.