

trious farmers of that section, with the push and energy they exercise every day, with the skill and talent they display in the management of their farms, fall behind each year, they pick up stakes and go to a foreign land. Has that been the case? Yes. I have known farmers in that section, as every hon. gentleman has known farmers in some other sections of the Dominion, to leave this country. It is no use keeping back the facts from the people. It is just as well to tell the country that the people are in a depressed condition, and putting aside politics and partisanship, we should come together and see if we can devise some method by which the farmers can be raised from the state of depression in which they now are, and placed upon a higher level of prosperity. Well, Sir, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Welton) told us the other night that property was not depreciating, and he took up a book and he read there the testimony from Mr. Blue, Deputy Minister of Agriculture in Ontario, that in 1882—I think that was the year—the estimated value of lands in Ontario was \$632,000,000, and in the year 1888 the estimated value was \$640,000,000. That is true, but the report for 1889, as the hon. gentleman said, showed that the total value of land in Ontario in 1889 was only \$12,000 more than it was eight years before. Do you think that the 300,000 people, working day in and day out for eight years, going to their work early in the morning and leaving it late at night, putting forth their energy and skill for the purpose of enlarging clearings, and improving their farms and reclaiming waste lands during these eight consecutive years, do you think that the efforts and energy of these 300,000 people did not increase the value of their lands more than \$12,000 in eight long consecutive years? Then, Sir, go up into the Rainy River district; some of our people have gone there and made large clearings and extended the acreage brought under cultivation. Go into Muskoka and into Algoma, and you will find some of our people who have wandered out there, and made new clearings and cultivated the land in various ways since 1882. Can any reasonable man contend that all this energy, all this skill and all this application of industry and perseverance by 300,000 people, for eight long years, only increased the value of land in Ontario by \$12,000. Sir, if the value of the land was \$632,000,000 in 1882, and if you consider all the improvements which have been made, and the expenditure which has been laid out on these lands since then, you will find that they have depreciated nearly \$100,000,000 from 1882 to 1889. If the land increased by that sum, then the farms of Ontario are actually worth \$100,000,000 less, and of whatever proportion each farm has in that \$632,000,000 of total value, each farmer loses that proportion as soon as the farm goes into the hands of another man. It may be said that if a farmer is left in possession of his farm, it is his homestead, and it is as good for cultivation as it was many years ago; but whether that can be the case or not, the fact remains that the value of the farm has decreased, and that if the farmer wants to realize upon it, he loses money. But, Sir, let me give some of my own knowledge as to the sales of farms which have taken place within a circuit of thirty miles of the neighborhood from which I come. I need not mention the names of the farmers, for it will suffice to indicate them alphabetically. Farm "A" sold fourteen years ago

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

for \$5,500, two years ago it re-sold for \$4,200; Farm "B" sold three years ago for \$4,500, re-sold two years ago for \$3,500; Farm "C" sold four years ago for \$4,000, was re-sold two years ago for \$3,200; Farm "D" sold five years ago for \$5,150, re-sold two years ago for \$3,200; Farm "E," comprising 214 acres, sold six years ago for \$15,000, was re-sold two years ago for \$11,200; Farm "F" sold five years ago for \$7,500, re-sold two years ago for \$6,200; Farm "G" consisting of 150 acres, sold six years ago for \$11,000, and was re-sold two years ago for \$7,500; Farm "H" sold five years ago for \$4,000, re-sold two years ago for \$2,700. The total aggregate value of the farms I have mentioned sold during the former period was \$49,650, and the total aggregate of their re-selling was \$41,700, or as near as possible, \$1,000 loss on each farm, or \$10 on every acre. Now, Sir, that is the condition of things in the best section in the Dominion of Canada, and if such depreciation takes place in such a section as that, how much more the depreciation must be in the poorer sections of the country. In many places where farmers are unable to make a living they sell their farms for almost a bagatelle, and move off to the Western States and settle on the prairie lands of that country. That is largely, although not altogether, the effects of the National Policy. But, Sir, the National Policy has done worse than that. I am sorry to learn from the official records that the farmers of our country are mortgaging their lands and chattels to an alarming extent. I am not one who would make incorrect statements before this House or any other place. I know that every word I utter is taken down in *Hansard*, and the public and the farmers of this country can peruse these statements, and easily correct them if they were wrong. If I feel that the Government should relieve the condition of the farmers of this country in some way, then it is my bounden duty as a representative of the people to tell those in authority, that the farmers are suffering from over taxation, and if they can improve their condition in any way, it will be a great blessing to the farmers. We have a statement of the chattel mortgages in Ontario, prepared by the various county clerks, as ordered by the Legislature of Ontario. Let me tell you that a chattel mortgage is about the very last thing a farmer or anybody else will give. When you find the farmer going into a store and buying his goods for the year, and at the end of that year has to give a chattel mortgage upon his personal property, it shows that the farmer is in a very bad condition indeed. If he had any credit, if the farm stood behind him, the storekeeper would not require a chattel mortgage because his credit would stand upon the books, as the farm would be an equivalent for the debt. I was told recently by a practical business man, not far from where I live, that he went to the registry office in the town of Goderich for the purpose of ascertaining the condition of the farmers within a circuit of eight miles of the place at which he was doing business. He examined into the circumstances of thirty-seven farmers, and he said to me: How many out of the thirty-seven do you think have their farms mortgaged? I said: I cannot tell you; I suppose half of them, and he replied: Well, there are thirty-six out of the thirty-seven who have their farm mortgaged, and he told me further, that there was no mortgage standing against a farm for less