

Mr. PATERSON. Because of what I have laid down now—that the argument was as to the cause of the prosperity; and I have established beyond a doubt that in 1879 you had not the prosperity though you were occupying the Treasury Benches, but that you had a depression greater than ever before, and therefore, the hon. gentleman had no right to take that year. Let me give the hon. gentleman this table, and if he had even taken that table, and added in the year 1879, and taken those four years, he would have an average annual increase over the five years which he gave, of \$6,710,564; but if he leaves out the year 1879, as he is bound to do in making a fair calculation taking the three succeeding years, he will find that the average annual increase over the years 1874 to 1878 will be \$11,766,526, and, therefore, the statement he made that the increased prosperity could not be due to the largely increased exports, would fall to the ground. To say that a country is not richer which sends out a larger volume of exports and brings back gold for them is to make a proposition which, I think, will not commend itself to the intelligent understanding of any hon. member in this House or out of it. Last year the hon. gentleman took credit to himself for the prosperity among the farmers, because he said he had enhanced the value of what they had to sell. Last year, the hon. gentleman told us that when the people asked for a change in the Tariff, it was given to them, and he said the people of the country paid into the Treasury more than he expected, because he had found employment for them at higher wages. He said that men who were working half time are now working full time; farmers who found sales difficult and prices low, are getting high prices, and ready cash. And then he congratulated himself again that he was the man who had done it. For this occasion I will hold him to it, that he was able to do it, and that he had done it. But I ask him now, having that power which he claims to have exercised, and for the exercise of which he must be held responsible, why, during the past year he has allowed the magnificent crop of 1882, greater in its proportions than Canada ever had before, to decline in price nearly one-quarter of its value, thereby taking \$8,000,000 out of the farmers of Canada? Why did he allow fall wheat to be sold for 24 cts. less than in the ruinous years when the hon. member for East York led the Government? He has allowed fall wheat to fall 24 cts. per bushel from last year; spring wheat, 31 cts.; peas, 6 cts.; barley, 14 cts.; oats he has kept where they were; butter he has kept where it was; pork he has allowed to fall 26 cts. per hundred weight; wool 4 cts. per lb. Why has he allowed all this? He cannot say, "Why ask a silly question?" though I admit that it would be a silly question if asked of any man except the man who declared in this House that he had the power to do these things, and that he had done them. I tell him that from this time forward he will be watched in this House and in the county. He claimed that he had the power to make good times, and that he had made good times. He has claimed credit for the opening of every factory, and at his door will be laid the blame of the closing of every factory. He has claimed credit for the enhanced price of wheat, and at his door will be laid the blame for the low price of wheat. As I heard the hon. gentleman hesitate to-day, I had a strong suspicion that he recognized the fact that the state of affairs was about to be changed, notwithstanding his seven years prediction. I believe that he saw in the failures which are taking place, not by ones or twos, but by scores, in the neighboring cities, that the tide is turning. We heard him to-day using the term cycles of depression, but that is a word which we should not hear from the other side of the House. The hon. gentleman told the people that if they would only put him in power he would banish these cycles and give them perpetual prosper-

ity. I hold him to that statement, and I charge him with being derelict in his duty in having allowed the price of farmers' produce to fall for months. If he does not waken up soon the lumbermen of New Brunswick will find themselves in a difficult position, because there are indications that the market for the products of the forests are going down in England, and that if he does not wave his wand and keep up the prices heavy losses will fall upon men who work in the forests of his native Province. I tell him that if he does not see that the crop of the Mother Country is blighted again this year, there is danger that prices here will go down again. The hon. gentleman will say, admitting that they have gone down a little, "One thing I deserve credit for, and that is, that I promised that I would make the farmers prosperous, because I would give them a home market for their perishable commodities—eggs, butter, and cheese, and other articles which cannot well be exported." Let us see, by the figures given by the hon. Minister of Customs, how much of the perishable products of the farm he has found a home market for by his Tariff. If we take horned cattle, we shall find that he has allowed 32,188 head of horned cattle of the value of \$2,103,996, to leave the country during the past year, more than went in 1878, because they could not find a market at home. In swine, sixty-two head had to leave the country more than left in the last year of the Mackenzie Government. In sheep there were 68,680 more exported, at a value of \$529,620; in poultry \$82,356 worth more. We all remember the hon. Finance Minister telling us last year how in going through the country he was met by the delighted farmers, who said to him: "You have conferred blessings on us; well do we remember the days of Mackenzie, when we came and exposed our chickens for sale in the rain and could not sell them." Yet we find that \$82,356 worth more had to find a market outside of the country than in the last year of the Mackenzie Government. In butter, 2,155,213 lbs. more, valued at \$553,919, had to find a foreign market. In cheese, 12,752,955 lbs. more, valued at \$1,503,347, had to be sent away. No less than 5,226,162 dozens of eggs, valued at \$997,135, were exported last year more than were exported in 1878. Surely the manufactories that were opened ought to have consumed all the eggs; they are certainly a perishable article. The hon. gentleman will not claim that his Tariff has caused the hens to produce more eggs. In hides and skins, \$6,171 worth more were exported last year than in 1878; in meats of all kinds, including bacon, beef, &c., \$125,808 lbs. more, valued at \$129,625; in green fruits, a very perishable article, which it was said would be bought from the farmers by the manufacturers at higher prices than they could get abroad, 159,313 barrels more were exported, valued at \$391,131, than in 1878. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will claim that he made the fruit trees bear more.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No insects on them this year.

Mr. PATERSON. Then, the hon. gentleman has developed into something more than a financier; he has developed into an insect-killer. In potatoes, which are an exceedingly perishable article, and which are very bulky for exporting, 2,737,933 bushels, valued at \$1,907,635, had to find a market abroad more than did so in 1878; and in other vegetables, \$169,419 worth more had to be exported. Last year the hon. Finance Minister took credit to himself for having provided a home market for what the farmer had to sell; but he has wisely abandoned that position this year. That calculation was like many others of his calculations. He took the year 1877, because it was, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, the only famine year we had—the only year in which we did not grow as much wheat as the necessities of the