

"Enormous loss to the foreign imported immigration." "Enormous decrease in the value of property in towns, villages and farm lands." "The Finance Minister has been monstrously injudicious." "His, the Finance Minister's ideas are excellent, but his works are detestable." "It is the absurdest nonsense to talk about per capita reduction, or a per capita anything else, in connection with the National Policy." "There has been an enormous shrinkage in values." "Canada is an enormously taxed country." "The tax is enormously increased by the middleman." "Our general scale of expenditure is monstrously extravagant." Everything is enormous, from his point of view. Then the hon. gentleman continues to decry this country, not only here, but in the country from which we draw our immigration. Writing to the "Economist," the hon. gentleman says that during thirteen years Canada has trebled her taxation; that there exists a tremendous exodus and very great depreciation in farm lands; that there has been an immense increase in the aggregate debt of this country; that the great mass of the people, notably the farmers of Canada, are distinctly poorer than they were twelve years ago; that the census shows that Canada lost, in the last ten years, 1,500,000 of her people; that the agriculturists of this country have been simply bled white, and that \$60,000,000 are taken annually out of the pockets of the people for federal taxation; that it is utterly impossible for Canada to prosper under the present condition; that if there is no change Confederation must perish, rotten before it had time to become half ripe, as a result of the vice and folly with which its affairs have been administered. That is the information the hon. gentleman gives the world through this English journal, which is circulated in the country from which we hope to draw immigrants. Let me show how true these statements are, and how far they are justified by the facts. He states that the farmers of this country have decreased in wealth during the past twelve years. I have not the statistics which would enable the House to judge in reference to the whole Dominion, but as the province of Ontario is noted for its farming—and, of course, for its manufacturing—I have, fortunately, for that province figures which can be appropriately quoted in this connection. What do we find, from the report of the Bureau of Industries for 1889, published by the Ontario Government? The hon. gentleman told us that the farm values in Ontario have greatly decreased in recent years, but, in contradiction of that statement, we have the evidence furnished by this report of the Ontario Government, furnished by a source over which the Conservative Government has no control, and furnished by the Mowat Government, which is hostile to the Government here, and, therefore, very unlikely to make the figures in any way favourable to the con-

Mr. SPROULE.

tentions of the Conservatives. From that report of the Ontario Government, I find that, in 1882, the values of farms in Ontario were, in round numbers, \$632,000,000; in 1883, \$654,000,000; in 1884, \$625,000,000; and going on to 1889, without giving the intervening years, I find that the farm values are set down at \$632,000,000, the same as they were in 1882. This is the land, without the buildings or crops or cattle. Some hon. gentlemen may say: Yes, but the farmers have been improving their farms since. I admit myself that there has been a shrinkage in the value of farm lands in Ontario, as there has been all over the world, but I distinctly and emphatically deny that it is of serious import to the farmers of Canada, or to the farmers of Ontario, who are living on their farms from year to year and who do not intend to sell. What matters it to a farmer if his farm is worth \$10,000 or \$5,000, if he makes as much out of it when it is worth \$5,000 as when it is worth \$10,000, or makes as much out of it when it was worth \$10,000 as when it was worth \$5,000? What matters it to the farmers if there is a reduction in the value, so long as they are not parting with their farms, when they are getting the same return from them and when they are getting sufficient returns to enable them to carry on the operations of life? It is a matter of very little concern to them whether the value of the farms go up or down, except, of course, unless they want to sell out and leave. Now, let us take the value of the farm buildings, and it will give us an idea as to whether the farmers are getting richer or poorer. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated in his letter to the "Economist," that the farmers are bled white and that they are distinctly poorer than they were twelve years ago. In answer to that, I again take the statistics of the Bureau of Industries and it shows that, in 1882, the farm buildings in Ontario were worth \$132,000,000, while in 1889, they were worth \$192,000,000. I have not quoted the values for the intermediate years; but that increase of \$60,000,000 in these seven years proves conclusively that the farmers are not getting poorer in respect to the value of their buildings. Now, with reference to farm implements. Some hon. gentlemen say that implements are getting dear, but, as a matter of fact, the very reverse is the case. Implements are 25 per cent cheaper to-day than they were in 1879, but notwithstanding that they are getting cheaper every year by virtue of the active competition in their manufacture. I find from this same report of the Ontario Government, that, in 1882, their implements were worth to the farmers of Ontario \$37,000,000, while they were worth, in 1889, \$51,000,000. Surely with implements \$14,000,000 more valuable in 1889 than in 1882, the farmers are not poor in regard to the implements they are possessed of. Let us see now as to the value of the live stock owned by Ontario farmers. Again,