

April 1, 1873

Trade, and if they should get into power it was quite possible that the protection would be removed.

He said while there might be some persons engaged in manufacturing in the city of Hamilton who would no doubt like to see a higher duty placed upon some articles, yet he thought he was safe in saying that generally they were well pleased with the existing state of things. Hamilton was becoming a great manufacturing city. The population had increased within the past few years from a little under twenty thousand to over thirty thousand, and in all branches of industry there was generally prosperity.

The hon. member for Waterloo South had referred to the perambulations of the hon. Ministers, but if his memory served him right the hon. member was himself given to perambulations of this sort, and during the contest in Hamilton, whether through invitation or not he was not prepared to say, he had visited that city and had undertaken to lecture the electors with regard to whom they should elect. He was not sure but that his colleague and himself owed their election quite as much to the visit of the member of Waterloo South to Hamilton as to the visit of the hon. Ministers, but rather than there should be any trouble as to whom the honour belonged he for one would be quite willing that the honour should be divided between them.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY replied briefly to the various criticisms upon his speech, observing in reply to Mr. Wilkes that if he followed his advice, and increased the duty on imported cloth, it

would increase its price and thereby be a burden upon the poor man.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE followed, and replied to several statements made with regard to his own position on the question of free trade. He asserted that it was altogether incorrect to say that he or his party was in favour of free trade, and challenged the member for Hamilton (Mr. Chisholm) to find anything in any speech he had ever made that could be so construed. He touched upon several other points that had been referred to in the course of the debate, and wound up by asserting that he was prepared to prove that in spite of the denial of Hon. Sir Francis Hincks (Vancouver) that gentleman's financial policy had a great deal to do with the disasters the Upper Canada Bank and the miserable state of the Grand Trunk.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN did not rise to make any lengthened statement, but he just wished it to be understood that in doing so he was not giving his quiet consent. He could not say that he approved in any measure of the policy of the Government, and he would take a future opportunity of expressing his opinions.

The House then went into Committee and adopted one resolution.

The Committee then rose and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again on Friday.

The House then adjourned at 11.30 p.m.