

Tariff has been, by promoting manufactures, largely to increase the revenue of the Dominion, I would like to call attention to the fact that the whole policy of those hon. gentlemen was to stop the importation of dutiable goods. They alleged that the enormous importation of dutiable goods was a great evil, that we imported far too much. They were to institute manufactures here, which were to take the place of a large portion of the goods then imported. Now, just by so much as the hon. gentleman's policy has been successful, in causing our own manufacturers to make those goods we formerly imported, just by so much must they be *ex necessitate*, unsuccessful in helping the revenue. You may give employment to 10,000 persons producing goods to the value of a million and a quarter, which you formerly imported and on which you formerly received duties, but you cannot at the same time stimulate the manufacture of such goods and yet increase the revenue received on the same class of imported goods. I think it will be better, as the First Minister has stated, to reserve, until the Trade and Navigation Returns are in our hands, a discussion of how far the manufactures of this country have been promoted by the Tariff. As far as my observation goes the effect has been that certain of our leading manufactures have been largely discouraged by the operation of the Tariff, while certain others have been benefitted. You have not added one penny to the wealth of the country, but have taken out of the pockets of the large mass of consumers considerable sums of money, and, instead of putting it into the Treasury, have put it into the pockets of a favored few. The effect has been, as correctly stated by the hon. member for Lambton, that you have discouraged those leading industries for which Canada has special advantages, and which have hitherto flourished, and that it is in no small measure to this cause that we may attribute the exodus which we deplore.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to make an observation on a statement of the right hon. gentleman as to the un-British character of the proposal of the leader of the Opposition about acquainting the country with the contents of the measure about to be submitted upon the Pacific Railway. The position taken by the right hon. gentleman seems to me a very extraordinary one. He says that the proposition of my hon. friend—that the Government should have disclosed the contract made with the Syndicate—is incompatible with our system of government. Well, that is not the general opinion of statesmen on the other side of the Atlantic, nor was that the opinion of the hon. gentleman himself when he made known the terms of the Washington Treaty, some months before Parliament met. He will find, upon enquiry, that Lord Beaconsfield made known to the people of England the fact of the purchase of shares of the Suez Canal, and also, that when Lord Beaconsfield returned from Germany, although Parliament was in session, he did not hesitate to declare, in general terms, what had been done at the Conference of Berlin. Moreover, the position taken by the right hon. gentleman is wholly inconsistent with his accepting office in September, 1878. He thought, at that time, that the hon. member for Lambton and his colleagues held office longer after the elections than they ought to have done, but if the views the hon. gentleman entertains now are sound, the Government ought to have continued in office until Parliament was convened and until an adverse vote was pronounced in this House. The position taken by the Government of England in 1868 when Disraeli resigned office was, that the opinion expressed by the country was a sufficient notification to the Government that they did not enjoy the confidence of Parliament. And why? Because it was supposed that in appealing to the country upon a particular line of policy adopted by the Government, the votes of the people formed a sufficient indication to the Government as to whether they enjoyed the confidence of the country or not. I know that some years ago views were put

forward by Lord Brougham and others somewhat in the line of those expressed by the First Minister to-night. But what were the facts upon which these opinions were founded? At that time there were many close boroughs sending members to Parliament. Some members had not a score of constituents, although representing populous cities, and Lord Brougham, in his "Political Philosophy," expresses the opinion that the views of the electors, looking at the smallness of their numbers, and at the fact that that a large portion of the people were excluded from the franchise, ought not to be taken as the opinion of the people. And why? Because those constituents were recognized simply as trustees for the whole population. But when the franchise is extended to the mass of the population, then the condition of things is entirely changed, and the population have a right to know what line Parliament will take upon certain important public questions. Let me read, for the information of the House, a passage from Mr. May's work on the constitutional history of England. In referring to this very question, he says:

"The political education of the people, the publicity of all Parliamentary proceedings, and the free discussions of the press, have combined to force upon constituencies the estimation of measures as well as of men. Hence candidates have sought to recommend themselves by the advocacy of popular measures; and constituents have expected explicit declarations of the political faith of candidates. And how can it be contended that upon such measures as Catholic Emancipation, Parliamentary Reform and the Repeal of the Corn Laws, constituencies were not entitled to know the opinions of their members. Unless the electors are to be deprived of their voice in legislation, such occasions as these were surely fit for their peculiar vigilance. At a dissolution the Crown has often appealed directly to the sense of the people, on the policy of great public measures; and how could they respond to that appeal without satisfying themselves regarding the opinions and intentions of the candidates?"

If that principle holds good with regard to those measures then before the people of England, it holds equally good with regard to an important measure like this. In Great Britain there have been many appeals from the adverse vote of Parliament, because it was recognized that in the end public opinion must govern. In 1831, when the King was advised by Earl Grey's government to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the country, the King informed the House that he was about to prorogue them with a view to a dissolution for the purpose of ascertaining whether the policy of the Government, or the other Chamber, was that of the nation. He appealed to the nation for the purpose of ascertaining whether the Reform Bill which had been submitted by his advisers was one of which the nation approved. If it was not his intention to consult the people, then there was no object in dissolution. If the hon. gentleman is right, then no government ought to have the power of advising a dissolution. The right to dissolve ought to be taken away from the Crown, for an adverse vote in Parliament should be conclusive, even if the Administration think the country entertain a different opinion. It is perfectly obvious that this House, if the opinion of the people can be known upon a public question, has no right whatever to pursue a policy in contravention to the opinions of the majority of the nation. This was held, too, by all the Whigs and Reformers in the old Irish Parliament; and if the hon. gentleman will look at the discussion which took place on the Act of Union in the Parliament of Great Britain, he will find that Lord Howick, Fox, and all the eminent men on the Whig side of politics, opposed the Union without a vote of the Irish people. When Pitt objected to such a position, he did not base his objection upon the argument presented by the First Minister here to-night. His objection was that there presentation in the Irish Parliament was so imperfect that the opinion of the nation would not be expressed by the election; that there was a large number of seats in the hands of a few parties who filled the House with placemen; and that, although the majority of the nation might entertain one view, the majority of Parliament might entertain a wholly different view.