

*The Budget—Mr. Fansher (Lambton)*

Electoral district—	Number of townships	Loss in population 1901-1921	Gain in population 1901-1921
Norfolk.. . . . .	8	4,342	
Northumberland.. . . . .	8	4,816	
Ontario North.. . . . .	6	2,068	
Ontario South.. . . . .	5		1,142
Oxford North.. . . . .	5	2,497	
Oxford South.. . . . .	6	1,742	
Peel.. . . . .	5	551	
Perth North.. . . . .	5	2,967	
Perth South.. . . . .	6	3,149	
Peterborough East.. . . . .	9	2,701	
Peterborough West.. . . . .	7		313
Prescott.. . . . .	7	2,176	
Prince Edward.. . . . .	7	1,830	
Russell.. . . . .	6	442	
Simcoe North.. . . . .	5	3,844	
Simcoe East.. . . . .	5	5,509	
Simcoe South.. . . . .	6	2,504	
Waterloo North.. . . . .	3	744	
Waterloo South.. . . . .	3	880	
Welland.. . . . .	8		10,019
Wellington North.. . . . .	6	4,764	
Wellington South.. . . . .	6	2,248	
Wentworth.. . . . .	8		10,150
York North.. . . . .	5	1,404	
Total.. . . . .	385	177,744	27,311
Net loss.. . . . .		150,433	

It will be seen that the total decrease in that twenty-year period is 177,744, while the increases in a few townships total 27,311. But those increases are due entirely to the overflow from cities like Hamilton, which have extended into the townships.

Mr. ADSHEAD: What was the net loss?

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): The net loss is 150,433; but I believe that the increases are due largely to the overflow. Now, to obtain a correct idea of what that loss in population means, I would point out that it represents more than one-third of the population of the city of Toronto in 1921, the last year for which we have a return; it is more than the entire population of the cities of Hamilton and London combined; it is 70,000 more than the entire population of the city of Ottawa as recorded in 1921; and it is larger than that of a dozen cities in Ontario combined. It is no wonder then that the farmers, so far as Ontario is concerned, are alarmed at the problem which faces them.

Judging by the budget one would think that we had not a real problem to face in this country, that all that was necessary was to levy taxation to meet the required expenditures and that no adjustment of taxation should be made to alleviate some of the conditions which, as we see, have been prevailing in Ontario during this century. I venture to say that when the next census is taken we shall find that the loss has persisted

[Mr. B. W. Fansher.]

in about the same degree as it continued from 1901 to 1921, and it will then be readily understood why the farmer is concerned about the taxation proposals of any government. It is on account of this loss that he is so insistent in his demand that tariff taxation shall be reduced; because ever since the national policy was forced upon this country agriculture has been made the pack horse for all other industries. Or, to change the figure of speech, agriculture has been the big brother who has had to support all other infant industries; and although they have become strong he is still looked upon as the big brother. But as these records show, we are faced with a diminishing population and the agriculturist is not standing up under the burden.

My hon. friends of the Conservative party say, increase the tariff and protect the home market. If there is any place in the Dominion where the result of that policy should have proven satisfactory it is right in the province of Ontario, where we are closest to the largest markets which the Dominion furnishes. Yet in these twenty years for which I have given figures we have witnessed a decrease in population to the huge figure I have indicated.

Mr. DUNCAN SINCLAIR (North Wellington): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few observations on the budget I wish first to congratulate the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) on his wonderful address. He has placed the condition of affairs