

Now, the total duties collected on these five commodities, leaving out sewing machines, amounted to \$1,209,280, and the protection provided represented \$14,912,756, or a ratio of 1 to 12. Why do I mention these commodities? Largely because they are required by the immigrant and by the settler, and it seems to me that the protection afforded has a direct bearing upon our immigration problem. For years past this government and its predecessors have in their efforts to attract settlers given assisted passages to intending immigrants from the old country and in some cases provided what may be termed ready-made farms. We have gone to this expense to bring in immigrants, but we have failed to tell them that when they proceed to furnish their homes with these necessary commodities, no matter whether they buy imported goods or goods made at home, they will be taxed at the high rates that these figures disclose. It seems to me that as a complement to our immigration policy it would be advisable to place these commodities on the free list or as nearly so as possible and thereby reduce the purchase price to the intending settler.

We have heard a good deal in this house about prosperity. Some say we have it, some say we have it not; some want to know what it is and others, where it is. It depends a good deal on whom you ask as to what answer you will receive. If you ask the

banker, he will say yes; ask the broker, he also will say yes, we have prosperity; ask the manufacturer and he will say the same thing. But ask the farmer and he will invariably say, no. I am glad to notice that in this house there has been somewhat of a change in attitude towards the farmer and farmers' rights. I well remember that during the fourteenth parliament the members in this section of the house were termed calamity howlers because they persisted in pointing out the plight agriculture was in. Some were termed the Jeremiahs from the west. But I observe that to-day large numbers in all parties in the house are agreed that the farmer is not enjoying that degree of prosperity which he should. On that, most of the members of the house are agreed. And with that idea in mind I turned to the census report, secured from the Bureau of Statistics, and published after the enumeration of 1921. I went over the figures given for the ridings of nearly the whole province of Ontario, taking all that portion lying south of Muskoka, Victoria county and Renfrew—what is known as old Ontario. In that area I find 385 townships, scarcely a single one of which has not witnessed a decline in population. The following table, which gives the figures from 1901 to 1921, will show the decline that has taken place, with increases in a few instances.

Electoral district—	Number of townships	Loss in population 1901-1921	Gain in population 1901-1921
Brant..	4	950	
Bruce North..	9	7,131	
Bruce South..	7	7,605	
Carleton..	8	3,268	
Dufferin..	6	5,050	
Dundas..	6	3,975	
Durham..	6	3,425	
Elgin East..	4	909	
Elgin West..	3	3,999	
Essex North..	5	1,977	
Essex South..	10	1,418	
Frontenac..	16	4,138	
Glengarry-Stormont..	6	3,071	
Grenville..	5	3,321	
Grey North..	7	6,860	
Grey Southeast..	9	10,743	
Haldimand..	10	2,651	
Halton..	4		722
Hastings East..	13	4,017	
Hastings West..	10	3,990	
Huron North..	8	6,507	
Huron South..	8	5,791	
Kent..	8	3,905	
Lambton East..	7	6,017	
Lambton West..	5	5,171	
Lanark..	14	4,519	
Leeds..	10	4,675	
Lennox-Addington..	14	3,991	
Lincoln..	8		4,965
Middlesex East..	5	2,301	
Middlesex West..	10	5,191	