

tickets issued—not only for the output, but for the collection of them, I think this is probably as fair a way as we will ever be able to devise, in order to reach a determination of this vexed question. He says further:

“If we test the figures at the two points of Sarnia and Detroit by the figures of the Grand Trunk system referred to, we have the following results:—

Net outs at Sarnia (Port Huron).....	38,657
do Windsor (Detroit).....	36,312
Total.....	74,969
Net ins at Sarnia.....	31,411
do Windsor.....	39,338
Total.....	70,749
Difference, showing net loss by Canada at the two ports named.....	4,220

In dealing further with this question, I have only to say that in the Lower Provinces it is not possible to arrive at the facts in connection with these figures; but if we allow a very large margin, in order to reach what the Americans claim as being over 60,000, I think it would be easy for hon. gentlemen to show what the Dominion has lost as against the number which the Americans claim have gone into their country. I say that if the Lower Provinces have suffered a depletion of nearly 40,000 people, they will have little difficulty in proving to the entire satisfaction of members on this side that an exodus did exist. Now, Sir, permit me, for a few moments, to deal with another matter which has been brought before this House. My attention has been particularly directed to it, from the fact that the hon. member from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) dwelt upon it the other day to a very great extent, and I fancied at the time that he was taking his facts from his own imagination. I had not at that time looked at the report of Mr. Blue, of the Bureau of Industries, but my attention has been drawn to it, and what do we find is the position of Ontario to-day? It was said that the agricultural interests have not been benefited, that the price of grain has not been improved, that the value of our farms was diminishing, that the position of the farmer was altogether worse now than it was under the Administration of the Reform party, and that, in short, our policy had proved to be a humbug. Now let us see what the authority of the Reform Government of the Province of Ontario says on that subject. He says that the increases in the value of farm property, in 1883 over 1882, are as follows:—

	Increase.
Farm Lands.....	\$22,450,525
Buildings.....	30,319,100
Implements.....	6,492,715
Live stock.....	19,341,645
Total for Province.....	\$78,604,985

Or an increase of over \$78,000,000 in one year, and we take the authority from the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Good authority.

Mr. HESSON. Yes, good authority; because I believe they would have put the worst side forward if there had been a worst side. I think these figures are an answer to my hon. friend, as to the position the farmers are in to-day, and the position they found themselves in when the Reform party unfortunately were in power. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to take the failures in 1879, the year of the inauguration of the National Policy, and its indorsement by the people of Canada, and he said that the failures in that year were the largest they ever had. Now, Sir, I have taken the trouble to investigate that question somewhat further than my hon. friend thought it advisable to do—I have gone a little further back, and have not simply taken the first year, when

the shrieks of the dying industries of the country—the shrieks of manufacturers and workmen of the country were still in our ears, on the winding up of the policy of the late Government. The hon. gentleman, in taking that year, gave us an illustration of his opinion of fair play, and he threw out the figures as an index of what the National Policy has produced in the country. If he had gone a little further back he might have given more information to the House and country, which would have been equally valuable. I will begin with the year 1875. I will not go back to 1874; I will do them the justice of saying that they may not have held themselves responsible for the results of that year any more than we did for the results of 1879, as it was not at all likely that the policy of the Reform Government could have fairly taken effect in 1874. I therefore take 1875, not because I think it would do my argument any harm to throw out the previous year, but because I think it is fair to begin with 1875. The failures, in number and amount, for the years 1875 to 1879 were as follows:

Year.	No.	Amount.
1875	1,968	\$28,843,997
1876	1,728	25,517,991
1877	1,892	25,523,903
1878	1,697	23,523,803
1879	1,902	26,347,937
Totals	9,187	\$133,142,505

Sir, the average during all that time was \$26,500,000 a year. Now, Sir, we come to the succeeding five years, and we find the number of failures, and the amount in each year, to be as follows:—

Year.	No.	Amount.
1880	907	\$7,988,077
1881	635	5,761,207
1882	787	8,587,657
1883	1,284	15,872,000
1884	1,308	18,939,770
Totals	5,021	\$47,138,711

against 9,187 failures, and a total amount of \$133,142,505 during their period. I give that statement in answer to the hon. gentleman, and if he doubts it, let him go and look at Dun, Wiman & Co.'s report in the *Monetary Times*, and he will find it to be strictly correct. These figures have been correctly copied by myself, and I know whereof I speak. If hon. gentlemen claim that we are responsible for the failures of 1874, what do they amount to? I have the figures here, and I am not afraid to put them before the people. In 1874 the total failures, if they are chargeable to the Conservative Administration which held office up to 1873, were 991, and the amount was \$12,324,191. I give that, Sir, as the condition of affairs in our worst period, against their \$26,500,000 yearly average during the period that they were in power. Now, Sir, I heard the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) the other evening ask, What has this Government done for Canada? Well, Sir, I have been endeavoring to-day to tell the hon. gentlemen what they have been doing. I feel that they have first protected our farming industries. They have levelled up, as I have shown by figures this afternoon, the prices of the products of our farmers, by giving us our own markets, which are always the best. But my hon. friend says: O, what of that? Look at Bangor; see how they are taxed in Bangor! I say they have protected the industries of this country; they have increased manufactures for our own industries. Then he says: Look at Amsterdam; they have many industries there. Then, I say, the Government have given us cheaper and better goods than we have ever had before, and our own products at that. But the hon. gentleman says: Look at Akron, Ohio; and see how little they are taxed there. I say again, we have given employment to more laborers and mechanics than ever had employment in this country before. But the hon. gentleman says: Go to Baltimore; they have low taxes