

ernment of Canada to do as hon. gentlemen opposite indicate they should do, as the hon. member for South Huron [Sir Richard Cartwright] indicated in his speech, by his reference to this question, was his desire they should do—send down to Washington, without invitation, without suggestion, verbally made or received, another commissioner, to meet with the same humiliation which was meted out to the late Hon. George Brown when he went there and when he constructed a draft treaty, which practically gave up everything and got comparatively little in return, and then found that it was not even discussed in the Senate of the United States—that this government should be asked to do that is that they should be asked to do what I venture to say the people of Canada, having regard for their own self-respect, would not ask them to do. [Cheers.]

APPEALS TO THE WORKINGMEN.

Now, sir, we have had in this debate from the hon. gentlemen, and we have seen in other quarters as well, extraordinary appeals, both direct and by way of suggestion, to the workingmen of Canada. We had in the know-nothing proclamation of the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) a suggestion that we were to have hereafter nothing but native Canadians in Canada; that, practically, it was an offence for any man who was not a native Canadian to come into the country or to remain in it. [Hear, hear.] We had the suggestion that the policy of the government in relation to the workingmen, and especially with regard to immigration, has not been a favorable policy; and we have had statements by hon. gentlemen on the platform outside of parliament, and by some of them in parliament, calculated to excite the feelings of workingmen against the government of the day. For instance, as to the question of the terrible burden which has been imposed on the workingmen of Canada, the leader of the opposition, in one of his speeches, in Toronto, I think, made the statement that the direct burden of taxation which workingmen have to bear under the present tariff is about \$50 per family. Now, Mr. Speaker, one does not know quite how these figures have been arrived at; but if you look at the census of 1881 you will find that at that time there were 812,136 families in Canada. Taking the accepted increase at 2 per cent. a year since that time, there will be an addition of about 50,000 families, so that to-day there ought to be 862,136 families in the

Dominion. What were the total customs duties?—and after all, as a matter of the incidence of taxation, that is all a man has to pay in Canada, because he does not need to pay any excise duty. If he drinks whiskey, it is his own lookout; it is a luxury; he takes it and he pays for it. If he smokes tobacco, that is a luxury; he is not bound to smoke tobacco.

Mr. BLAKE—Is he bound to take sugar, too?

Mr. WHITE—Is there an excise duty on sugar.

Mr. BLAKE—No; there is a customs duty on it.

Mr. WHITE—I am discussing the question of customs duties, and I have just stated that the customs duties are what the workingmen have to pay.

Mr. BLAKE—Very well.

Mr. WHITE—Does the hon. gentleman agree with me, then?

Mr. BLAKE—No; what I said was, that the hon. gentleman said the workingman was not bound to take whiskey, and therefore the excise should not be charged. I ask, was he bound to take sugar, and should the customs be charged? Does he take sugar in his?

Mr. WHITE—There is a model temperance man for you. (Loud cheers.) There is the hon. gentleman who is going to lead the temperance cohorts in Canada, who is pleading to-day for the support of the temperance people, and who insinuates that whiskey and sugar are equally unnecessary, are one and the same thing, and that because a workingman is not bound to use whiskey, the same argument applies to sugar. (Cheers.) Well, I think sugar may be regarded as a necessary of life. I do not think whiskey is a necessary of life. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman thinks so or not.

Mr. BLAKE—I do not.

Mr. WHITE—I do not think so; but I do think sugar is a necessary of life; and when the hon. gentleman endeavors to draw a parallel between the workingmen's ability to give up the use of sugar and their ability to give up the use of whiskey, he simply insults the intelligence of the workingmen, whose intelligence, let me tell him, he very greatly underestimates. (Cheers.) I was saying that the customs duties, and they include sugar, are, after all, what the workingmen may be said to have to pay; and the customs duties in that year amounted to \$20,025,890, or at the