

April 30, 1872

As to the expression of regret of the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Hon. Sir A.T. Galt) that his resolutions of last year had not carried, that hon. gentleman must admit that they could not possibly have influenced the proceedings at Washington. The Canadian Government had no responsibility whatever in the matter of the Washington Treaty, and he believed the First Minister would have acted in the most dishonourable manner towards the Imperial Government if he had joined the Commission with the deliberate intention of not conforming to the instructions he received from the English Government.

There had been a total misconception on this point—there could not be two parties on the English side of the question, and the leader of the Government had been in no way a Canadian Commissioner. As far as the matter affected Canada, Parliament had now full power to deal with it. He then referred to the remarks of the member for Lanark North (Hon. Mr. McDougall), on the subject of the West Indies Commission. He was acquainted with the sentiment of the people of British Guiana, and it was only just that he should point out the absurdity of the propositions put forward by some of the people of Canada. The great part of the revenue of British Guiana was derived from duties on a few principal articles, such as flour and salt, fish and others produced in Canada, while a large proportion of the Canadian revenue was derived from duties on sugar, which was produced in British Guiana, and it was there impossible to carry out the suggestion that those articles respectively should be admitted into the countries free, without seriously affecting the revenue of both countries.

He would now refer to one or two remarks of the member for Durham West (Hon. Mr. Blake), who had alleged that he (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks) had admitted a discrepancy of views between himself and his colleagues. There was no such discrepancy, for as to the remarks of the hon. Secretary of State for the Provinces (Hon. Mr. Howe), which had so often been called in question, he believed there was no more loyal a man in the House than that hon. gentleman, and no one more attached to British connection. That gentleman might have expressed his views strongly, but they tended in an entirely different direction from independence or annexation.

**Hon. Mr. HOLTON:** He only improved the impossibility from his point of view of continuing the connection.

**Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS:** Nothing of the kind. There were a number of persons who held opinions in regard to a reorganization of the Empire, and who believed that better relations might be established by which the colonies would have a larger voice in the conduct of imperial affairs. He must admit that such sentiments were largely entertained, but he did not believe they could be carried out, and he believed that was the direction in which the remarks of the Secretary of State for the Provinces had pointed.

The member for Lotbinière (Mr. Joly) had seemed to imagine that Canada could frame a commercial policy entirely irrespective of the Imperial Government, and he (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks) had endeavored in his previous remarks to show how impossible such a course was.

As to the remarks of the member for Lennox (Mr. Cartwright) he did not believe there was any danger of the evils he apprehended. Of late there had not been any great extension, many public works had been promoted, but there had been no large introduction of foreign capital, and there were no indications of the danger against which the hon. gentleman was so constantly warning them.

**Hon. Mr. HOLTON** said the Minister of Finance (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks) having repeated a proposition that the Prime Minister went to deal with Canadian matters as an officer of the Imperial Government, and with no responsibility to that House, he must say that he held such a statement to be altogether absurd, and in his judgment it was disrespectful to the House that such a grave question should be introduced by a side wind in the Budget Speech. He did not doubt that there had been a direct intention to draw out the House, but it had not succeeded. He would not speak on the matter until the question had been placed before the House by the Prime Minister, but that hon. gentleman would not take the ground of the Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Mr. BLAKE** rose to correct a misapprehension on the part of the Finance Minister (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks). He (Hon. Mr. Blake) meant to say that the present statement of the Finance Minister, in reference to the Treaty, was at variance with what he had stated on a previous occasion. At present, the Finance Minister said he regretted that Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald was appointed a Commissioner. Last year, he congratulated the House and country on the appointment. (*Hear, hear.*)

**Mr. YOUNG** said he had no intention of addressing the House, but for the reference of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Morris) to him. That gentleman always addressed the House in a tone of melancholy patriotism.

The hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) had been quite right in saying at London there had been deficits in 1867-68. Sir John Rose claimed a surplus of \$350,000, but deducting certain items which should not have been in the revenue, there was really a deficit.

**Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS** admitted that, deducting the payment made by the Great Western Railway; there was a deficit the following year of \$39,000; and if the items of premium and exchange were deducted, there was a deficit of \$476,000.

The third Finance Minister, Sir Francis Hincks, showed that there was likely to be a deficit of \$340,000, and so put on additional taxes. The five per cent increase, and the famous national policy new duties, and the extraordinarily large importations which then began caused by the enormous expenditure on public works, saved the country from a deficit perhaps the third year. Great credit was taken for the surplus, but the real cause, as he had said, was because there had been an increase of from fifteen to twenty millions to the imports for several years; but whilst those circumstances were filling the treasury, the increased railway expenditure which produced it was rapidly piling up the aggregate indebtedness of the