

and other stocks in September, 1878, and in September, 1879, were as follows:

	Sept. 12, 1878.	Sept. 11, 1879.
Commerce Bank.....	113½	112½
Federal Bank.....	104½	98
Hamilton Bank.....	99	97½
Imperial Bank.....	103	95
Montreal Bank.....	170½	130
Dominion Bank.....	117	110½
Toronto Bank.....	138	111
Merchants Bank.....	95	
Canada Permanent Loan.....	181	172
Canadian Government Debentures, 6 per cent. sterling.....	101½	100
Dominion 6 per cent Stock.....	101½	100
County Debentures.....	102	101½

There was a fall in all these stocks, although one year had elapsed after the Mackenzie Administration had left office, and hon. gentlemen opposite had taken their places and months after the National Policy had been put into vogue. If it was the producing cause of the prosperity we enjoy, why do we find such a decline in these stocks, and no enhancement in the price of other articles? Because it was a year of depression and there was a fall in our exports of that year.

Mr. BOWELL. I will send the hon. gentleman the price list of this year if he likes.

Mr. PATERSON. The following show the extent to which prices of farm produce fell from September, 1878, to September, 1879:

	12th Sept., 1878.	11th Sept., 1879.
Fall Wheat, No. 1.....	\$1 06 to \$1 77	\$1 02 to \$1 04
do No. 2.....	1 02 to 1 03	1 00 to 1 02
Spring Wheat, No. 1.....	1 02 to 0 00	0 98 to 1 00
do No. 2.....	0 97 to 0 98	0 96 to 0 97
Oats.....	0 28 to 0 30	0 31 to 0 32
Barley, No. 1.....	1 00 to 1 05	0 60 to 0 00
do No. 2.....	0 83 to 0 85	0 50 to 0 00
do No. 3.....	0 70 to 0 75	0 40 to 0 00
Pease.....	0 68 to 0 70	0 63 to 0 65
Butter, choice.....	0 09 to 0 12½	0 10 to 0 12
Cheese.....	0 08½ to 0 09½	0 05 to 0 07½
Dried apples.....	0 06 to 0 07	0 04½ to 0 05
Mess pork.....	13 00 to 14 00	12 50 to 13 25
Hams.....	0 12½ to 0 13	0 11 to 0 12½
Lard.....	0 08½ to 0 10	0 08 to 0 09½
Eggs.....	0 09 to 0 10	0 09 to 0 10
Hops.....	0 05 to 0 09	0 05 to 0 07
Wool, fleece.....	0 23 to 0 24	0 20 to 0 00

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have gone through a list of bank stocks and of produce; I have shown hon. gentlemen that in all these items of produce that the farmer had to sell, there was a fall in prices months after the National Policy was the law of the land from what they were during the last days of the previous Administration; and these figures point out this significant fact, that prices were lower because the depression had not passed away in the markets of the world, and that when good times came and we had the produce of the field, farm and forest to export, bringing wealth into this country and increasing the purchasing power of the people, prices advanced until to-day we are in the enjoyment of the blessings we have, and which hon. gentlemen opposite verily seek to claim as the effect of the Tariff they have introduced. Now, Sir, I have not indulged in personalities, and do not intend to indulge in personalities; I have not read up other men's records; I have not attempted to point out inconsistencies in other men. I might, indeed, point out that there has been a remarkable change of opinion in sentiment and action on the part of many hon. gentlemen opposite, which is perfectly within their right, and I do not think it is a part of my duty to take up the time of the House regarding the opinions of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I might point to the President of the Council. I might read extracts from his speeches in which he admitted himself to be, what I never admitted myself to be, as out-and-out

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

free-trader. I might read extracts from speeches of other hon. gentlemen much more able on trade questions than the hon. gentleman who addressed the House this afternoon and quoted extracts so largely. I might quote extracts from speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken, if not in this House, in other places where this subject has been as intelligently discussed, who took precisely the line I now take and have always taken; I could do that, but I think it is not necessary I should do so. That hon. gentleman (the President of the Council) could give reasons why he supported a Tariff at a higher point than he was willing at a former period to support; no doubt he could give good reasons, and I will not take up the time of the House to point out changes of sentiment and action on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. It must be borne in mind that if I were to do so there is scarcely an hon. gentleman opposite whose votes could not be pointed to as having voted down a protective policy; but I do not desire to do that, it is not necessary. A question may be debated on its merits, and in that way some good may be obtained and we may ascertain what views hon. gentlemen on both sides hold in regard to it. We have been charged with a want of patriotism because we do not submit to the National Policy in quietness and peace. Hon. gentlemen opposite often make the charge. I do not, however, think that charge is fairly to be levied against us. I do not think it exhibits want of patriotism on the part of a man to object to excessive and undue taxation being levied upon him. Let me call the attention of the House to an article I found in the organ of the Government in this city, yesterday, an article that afforded me some little amusement, an article that places the party to which I belong in the light in which hon. gentlemen opposite are continually endeavoring to place us as being the enemy of manufacturing industries. What did I find? I found there an article reciting that the Princess of Wales and a great many of the first ladies in England attended one of the late drawing-rooms of Her Majesty dressed in silks and satins made in England, and the reason why these ladies appeared in this wise was because the English silk and satin industries were in a depressed condition, owing to French silks and satins having taken possession of the market. The ladies seeing that such was the effect determined that they would support English manufacturers, they adopted the plan of wearing English silks and appeared in them at Her Majesty's drawing-room. And we are told that those ladies, if they had been here, would have been ridiculed by the Reform party, for its policy was to crush out manufacturers. But it would not be so. The most ardent free-trader on this side, and the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) will go as far in that direction as any man, never objected to anyone wearing Canadian-made goods, but simply to a law that compels him to do so or pay 30 per cent. by way of fine into the Treasury. If hon. gentlemen opposite are the patriots they claim to be, I will give them clearly a solution of the whole troubles in regard to the National Policy. We are told that we are a remnant of the people of the country, and that the overwhelming mass are in their favor. Let them carry their principles into effect and let them see to it that they obtain nothing for the household or for their personal wear, except such as is produced in Canada; then will they benefit and foster our manufacturing industries. Is that the position hon. gentlemen opposite take? Look at the Finance Minister; my eyes may deceive me, and I am not a good judge of dry goods, but if I see correctly the hon. gentleman's portly form is enclosed in a coat made from cloth bought from the hated foreigner. The hon. Finance Minister knows that there is cloth made in this country which is good, substantial and sound. The hon. gentleman knows that this industry, or he tells us that he knows this industry was in a depressed condition. Would it not be more patriotic to follow the example of the Eng-