

National Policy in Canada, reduced their price—that they sold lower by \$6 apiece to Canadian customers than they were willing to sell to their own customers. If that practice is pursued by them, one would suppose that their own customers in the United States would find it out and not be too well pleased. It is just an instance of making their own people pay more than what is fair for their manufactures, in order that they may be able to supply them to foreigners at a lower price. In this way the hon. gentleman explains why it is that the sewing machine manufacturers of Hamilton are doing a less profitable business under the National Policy than they did before under free trade.

HON. MR. TURNER—I explained how the increased importation was.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—There are more sewing machines imported into than exported from Canada.

HON. MR. TURNER—No.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—My hon. friend remarked that if he was in Scotland, he would be a free-trader, as he was before.

HON. MR. TURNER—I did not say that. I said I would be a free-trader under the same circumstances.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I was struck with that observation. It may not have come to the notice of my hon. friend that some of the largest concerns engaged in manufacturing sewing machines in the United States have invested immense sums in putting up establishments in England for the manufacture of sewing machines. Why?

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Because they make so much in their own country that they can afford to do it.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—It is simply because they find the materials and labor cheaper in that free-trade country, and they can manufacture the sewing machines more cheaply than they could in their own country, and thus are enabled to supply foreign markets.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—But labor is dearer in England, you told us.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—No; I said dearer in England than on the continent. So, my hon. friend if he was a free-trader in Scotland, will come to the conclusion that he should be a free-trader in Canada, too. But he says we have commenced to develop our North-West. We in the east have had a most glowing description of that country and that is one reason why there is so much unrest, because young people become dissatisfied with their own farms and homesteads and come to the conclusion that they must go west, but unfortunately they do not go to the North-West, but they go to the Western States.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Oh no.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—My hon. friend says, "Oh no," but I am aware that they do to a very large extent. I know of few families in the North-West who have moved there from New Brunswick. It would be much better for Canada if we could keep our own people for our own country. I have no doubt, we have a very good soil in the North-West, and that it is a very desirable country to settle in, but so far as launching out into the prairies and developing the North-West is concerned, and in two decades hence seeing a population there which will astonish the world, I only hope it will be true, but it will not come to pass under the railway policy, protective policy and land policy of the present Government.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—That is just what will do it.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I do not believe that it will be so under the policy pursued by the Minister of the Interior, and the Minister of Railways and the Government of this country. We had statements made on the resolutions for the union of British Columbia by gentlemen whose faces I do not see in this Chamber this evening. They said by the time the railway was constructed there would be 7,000,000 of people in Canada. I am very sorry to say that our country is not keeping even natural increase. There is