

may not with advantage be yet more extensively applied, and whether it may not be in your power, after a careful review of the existing duties on many articles the produce or manufactures of other countries, to make such further reductions and remissions as may tend to ensure the continuance of the great benefit to which I have adverted, and by enlarging our commercial intercourse to strengthen the bonds of amity with foreign powers.

Here is a direct recommendation by Her Majesty, in the Speech from the Throne, asking Parliament to consider the propriety of extending further that policy upon which they had entered, to further reduce the taxation on foreign articles, and by that reduction to extend the commerce of the country, and to increase the bond of amity existing between foreign countries and the United Kingdom. This is a declaration in Her Majesty's speech exactly on all fours with the amendment moved by my hon. friend. In the Speech of 1847 Her Majesty says :

It will be your duty to consider what further measures are required to alleviate the existing distress. I recommend to you to take into your serious consideration, whether by increasing for a limited period, the facilities for importing corn from foreign countries, and by the admission of sugar more freely into breweries and distilleries, the supply of food may be beneficially augmented.

Now, this is a specific declaration with regard to two articles, and it is clear from the paragraphs which I have read, and I need not read any others, that what the hon. gentleman says is an objection on principle, is one which is not well founded. I would like to know, if my hon. friend's motion were to carry, or if the Government had accepted it, what would be its effects upon the commerce of this country? In what way could it injuriously affect any particular class of the community? My hon. friend has not specified any articles. He has simply declared that the burdens of taxation ought to be lightened and that they ought to be lightened in the public interest. That is a clear and specific declaration as to a general course of public policy. But, as I have pointed out, in 1847, in the United Kingdom, the Government there went much further than that, declaring in favour of reducing the taxation upon certain articles which were specified. That being so, it is, I think, plain to the House, that the objection which the hon. gentleman has made, has no foundation on any constitutional ground. Now, Sir, having said this much with regard to the propriety of the motion, I wish to say a few words in reply to the observations which have been addressed to the House by the hon. First Minister and by the hon. Minister of Finance. These hon. gentlemen tell us that it is true that the National Policy has not prevented the exodus; it is true that the exodus continues, but it is unreasonable to expect that it would stop as a result of the National Policy. Why, they say, you yourselves admitted, in defending your policy in 1877, that this would not be the effect, and

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell)

so you are asking us to accomplish, by this line of policy, what you predicted in advance would not flow from its adoption. Well, Sir, the objection would be well founded if the hon. gentlemen had taken the same view. But how came they on the Treasury Benches? How did they succeed in getting there in 1878? It was by a declaration that this would be the effect. They said in 1877 and 1878, that the people were leaving Canada by tens of thousands; that you, sitting on the ministerial benches and drawing your salaries, are flies on the wheel; you are utterly incapable of coping with the situation; give us the opportunity of taking your places, and we will make such alterations in the fiscal policy of this country as will put an end to this state of things. That was the position hon. gentlemen took. Why, Sir, we were told by one hon. member in the House on that occasion, Sir Charles Tupper, that it was not to secure prosperity during the general period of the world's prosperity that was required of the Government, but what was required of them, was to secure prosperity to the country when every other country was anything but prosperous; and he declared that if they were permitted to take charge of the affairs of this country, they would accomplish that result. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Finance has made a statement which, I think, is not borne out by facts. The hon. gentleman this evening has talked a great deal about facts; but what fact has he produced to show this House or the country that the exodus from Canada was greater in the period from 1874 to 1878 than it has been since? Why, Sir, both the returns of the United States bureau of statistics and those of Canada, prove the contrary. The United States returns show that from 1868 to 1874 the emigration from Canada to the United States was equal to 43,000 a year, while from 1874 to 1878 it averaged 23,000 a year—but little more than one-half of what it was during the previous six years. How has it been since? In 1879 it was 35,000, in 1880 56,000, in 1881 85,000, and so on; you have an accelerated increase in the exodus from Canada, out of all proportion greater than it was during the period a revenue tariff was in operation. The hon. gentleman says that the relation of cause and effect does not exist between the high tariff and the exodus; but, Sir, I think it does exist. It is quite possible that two things may exist together in point of time, and one may not be the cause of the other; but I think there will be no difficulty in proving that the increased exodus is due to the increased burdens imposed on the population of this country. So long as the people of Canada were more lightly taxed than the people of the United States, the emigration was proportionally small. When the people of Canada became more heavily burdened than the people of the United States, as they are to-day, then the effect of the higher taxation was to drive the people from