customs duof the incin has to pay need to pay hiskey, it is ; no takes it kes tobacco, nd to smoke

take sugar,

ise duty on

istoms duty

the question t stated that

t stated that workingmen

tleman agree

was, that the man was not herefore the ask, was he the customs r in his?

temperance There is the lead the temis pleading perance peowhiskey and are one and ie a workingy. the same cors.) Well, is a necessary is a necesther the hen.

to; but I do a; and when to draw a n's ability to in p insults groon, whose very greatly aying that the le sugar, are, may be said ns duties in 190, or at the rate of \$23.22 instead of \$50 per family, as the hon. gentleman put it.

Mr. BLAKE-No.

Mr. WHITE—No? Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that \$20,000,000 of customs duties to 862,000 families is more?

Mr. BLAKE—Does the hon. gentleman want to know the basis of my calculation?

Mr. WHITE-Yes, I do ; most decideuly.

Mr. BLAKE—What I stated was reported in the newspapers. I did not exclude the excise. I took the customs and the excise duties, and I pointed out that the consumer paid something approaching 50 per cent. in excess of what went into the treasury. I took the customs and excise duties and I added something approaching 50 per cent., and that made \$50 a head. [Opposition cheers.]

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell)—I see that hon. gentlemen behind the leader of the opposition are satisfied with that statement. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLAKE-It was the statement I made.

Mr. WHITE—What then has become of all the arguments we have had during this debate, as to the relative taxation of the United States and Canada? Are we to be told that because we charge an average here of somewhere about 20 per cent. en our importations—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT-Nearer 40.

Mr. WHITE-That the man who buys, pays that fine on the article that is produced in the country, and that in the United States, where nearly double is charged, the man who buys does not pay it? [Cheers.] Let the hon. gentleman take one ground or the other; but let him not, in this house, as in everything else, take one measure for the people of Canada and a different measure for the people of the United States, in order that he may prove to people outside that the people of Canada are much more burdened with taxation, much less advantageously situated, than the people of the United States. The hon. gentleman should take one position or the other, and I care not which he chooses to take. If he chooses to take his last position, and will apply it all around, to the United States as well as to Canada, he will have to revise the figures he has given us, and I am sure the finance minister will be glad to revise the figures he gave, and will show, upon that basis, that the condition of things in Canada is infinitely more advantageous to the people of Canada than is the con- now brought down.

dition of things in the United States to the Americans. [Cheers.] Every loyal man, every man in Canada who loves his county, will decline to adopt one basis of calculation for Canada and a different basis of calculation for the United States. [Cheers.] I will give the hon. gentleman the benefit of the excise ; nay, more than that, I will give him the benefit of the entire revenue, and I find that if he takes the whole revenue, including the revenues from post office and railways, he will find that instead of \$50 per family it is only \$36 per family. [Cheers.] Why should the hon. gentleman, with his responsibility as a public man, looking in the future, I suppose he thinks the near future, to be the leader of the government, and therefore to control the public affairs of this Dominion, why should he go on to a publicplatform, and, addressing an audience of fellow Canadians, venture to make a statement of that kind, a statement which is false in fact, which is false in inference, which is false in every relation in which you can possibly look at it - a statement which has simply one result, that of creating the impression outside that the people of this country are less advantageously situated than are the people of the United States. [Loud oheers.]

IMMIGRATION AND PRISON LABOR.

These hon. gentlemen have been making their appeal to the workingmen and they Well, in the talk to us about immigration. earlier part of what I had to say, I referred to the condition of immigration during the time they were in office, and I do not feel disposed to repeat what I then said. But what is the position of the government, as regard to the workingmen? In the first place, we have had the announcement from the minister of agriculture, in answer to a question put to him by an hon. member of this house, that the government not going to (assist only not is to [assist but is actually going to discourage the introduction of ordinary laborers and of ordinary mechanics into Canada; as, in view of the fact that the Pacific railvay will shortly be completed and that there will not be much prospect of any great railway work being constructed then ciin the immediate future, it may not be necessary or advisable that these people should come to Canada. [Hear, hear.] We have that statement from the hon. the minister of agriculture. Then we have an important statement in the tariff resolutions which are now brought down. When I was in Ganan-