

Mr. COCKBURN. I am something like the Minister of the Exterior—I am not in the secrets of the Government. I must, however, close my remarks, and though I have taken more time than I should have taken, I felt it my duty to give my views; and though they have not been presented very glibly I felt that I should present my impressions whether they were appreciated or not. And, Mr. Speaker, you will be glad to know that I have not prepared a highfaluting peroration, and so I shall without further remark resume my seat.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I feel that I should apologise to the House for prolonging this debate, but, as is well known, I am not one of those who have, during this Session, taken up much of the time of the House. And I do not know, Sir, that I would be induced even now to say anything on the quest on before you, if it were not for what has fallen from some hon. gentlemen opposite. I have had the satisfaction of listening to and reading a great number of speeches delivered by Finance Ministers on the opening of the Budget, and I must say that I have never listened to or read one with greater satisfaction than the able dissertation which was given to us by the hon. Finance Minister on the opening of his Budget. He had an opportunity then of referring to the progress of trade and commerce in this country for the last five years, and he could do so with great satisfaction, not only to himself and to this House, but to the country generally. Sir, all that the Finance Minister said is capable of being verified, notwithstanding what has been alleged on the other side. I do not purpose, as I stated a moment ago, to enter into a general discussion of all that has been presented in that address; but I mean to offer a few remarks in reference to what has fallen from some hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, we have learned that if those hon. gentlemen have no other policy to present to this country, they have certainly a policy of detraction. That has been their policy, not only since the time they were consigned to the cold shades of Opposition in 1878, but those of us who are old enough to remember how they conducted themselves in Opposition for 17 or 18 years before they got into power in 1874, will remember that that was the policy they indulged in during that time. It was a policy of detraction, a policy designed to make the people believe that this country was not governed in an economical or proper spirit, but against the best interests of the people; and so long had they harped on that string that the people at last were induced to think they were really sincere, and that the country was not governed so well as it would be if it was governed by those hon. gentlemen. Well, the people gave them a chance to show what they were made of; they had five years of power, and what was the result? They came into power under most favorable circumstances. They assumed the government when the exchequer was full and overflowing; they came into power when this country was in a high state of progress; they came into power shortly after the American war had ceased, a war which had all but exhausted the best energies of that great people, and one which had materially crippled their manufacturing industries, which gave a great advantage to the manufacturing interests of this country. But notwithstanding all that, Sir, before these hon. gentlemen were in power three short years, their policy had such an effect upon the country that it began to go back; and until they were driven out the country suffered. Well, Sir, the people having given these hon. gentlemen a chance to try their hand at governing this country, so soon as they got an opportunity to reconsider what they had unfortunately done in 1874, rejected them and ignominiously turned them out of power, and they are now in the cold shades of Opposition, having had in the meantime another opportunity of getting back into power, but the people thought them unworthy of their confidence. I predict that so long as the generation is in existence which was in existence while these hon. gentlemen occupied

the treasury benches, so long will these hon. gentlemen be kept in the cold shades of Opposition. Until the people can be educated to forget all that took place from 1873 to 1878, so long will these hon. gentlemen remain exactly where they are. Now, Sir, I propose to examine some statements which have been made by some hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this subject. I would not condescend to do so, if some of these statements had not come from one who aspires to be a bright particular star in the Liberal firmament. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not merely considered the question from a national or Dominion point of view; they have not only dealt with the question of trade and commerce as it affects the whole Dominion generally; but the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who I regret is not in his place—because I always like to say to a man's face what I would say behind his back—in fact, I would say more to his face than I would behind his back—the hon. member for Bothwell, I say, descended from Dominion politics down to what might be called the local affairs of the city of Hamilton. Sir, I have the honor to represent that city, and proud I am of the honor; and I have to say that the only new thing that has been said on the other side in this debate was the astounding statement put forward by the hon. member for Bothwell with reference to the city of Hamilton. The hon. gentleman said—and I read from the report of his speech in *Hansard*:

"The Hamilton *Speciator* is the organ of the Tory party. It is a paper friendly to the Administration; it advocates the doctrine of protection, and it describes the condition of the manufactures in Hamilton at that time. It says: 'The Empire foundry of Copp & Co. had been enormously increased in capacity, and its business has increased.' It mentions the fact that the Wanzer Sewing Machine Co. had greatly extended their business, and were employing a much larger number of hands than before. It mentions that the Gurney Co. had also greatly increased the capacity of their factory, and were giving employment to a greater number of men than before. It also describes the manufacturing establishments of Sawyer & Co. and of Burrows, Stewart & Milne. It describes several other establishments in Hamilton that had enlarged their capacity, and employed an increased number of hands. And, Sir, it is well known that the progress of manufactures in Hamilton was greater between 1873 and 1878, notwithstanding there was a depression existing, than it has been between 1879 and the present hour."

It is that astounding statement, Sir, that has been the cause of calling me to my feet; and it is on account of that that I have to ask the indulgence of the House in order that I may give it a flat and blunt contradiction. I say the facts do not warrant the assertion, and I submit that it is an extraordinary thing for any member of the House, occupying the position that the hon. gentleman presumes to occupy, to make such a statement in the broad face of day. Sir, it is true, that Hamilton was a flourishing city in 1873 and 1874. There is no doubt of it. Hamilton has always been, comparatively speaking, a flourishing city. Its people are energetic, enterprising and enlightened, and desirous of making their city what it should be, a great manufacturing centre. They are engaged chiefly in manufacturing industries, and have that spirit of enterprise which all good citizens should have, and which I am happy and proud to say, abounds in the city of Hamilton. No doubt, for some years, up to 1873, 1874 and 1875, Hamilton wonderfully increased its manufacturing establishments. This House understands that Hamilton has long been looked upon as the seat of the National Policy. The people have long been in favor of a policy which would foster and protect the native industries of the country; the people had but one opinion on that point, and the hon. gentlemen who represented Hamilton before my colleague and myself had the honor of seats in this House, were elected on the express promise and pledge that they would give their utmost support to a protective policy. Had they not given that pledge, they could not have been returned, and they said to the people: "You had better by far return us, who are supporters of the Government, than to return our opponents, who would be in Opposition, and could do nothing." Well, the people believed them. These gentlemen were returned in 1874 by a majority