

Conservative regime. The net homestead entries under the Liberal government numbered 12,626, and the cost for each net homestead entry was only \$52, as compared with the cost of \$110 for each net homestead entry under the Conservatives. There you have double the work done for less than half the price. I challenge any gentleman on the opposite side to make any other deduction than that I have made from the official figures that I have given to you.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where did you get them; the report is not down yet?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I got them by my own hard work, and had you not left the committee in bad temper the other day you might have had the information which I am giving you now.

Mr. TAYLOR. You examined the witness before you called him.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). People who go to committees for political purposes and try to break them up in order to accomplish their own ends, and then because they cannot have their own way, get mad and take his own friends and himself out of the committee, certainly lose a good deal of information that they would otherwise have received. It appears to me that these hon. gentlemen do not want to get information, because the other day we brought a party to give information, and they refused to accept of it. Consequently, they are now in darkness, while others are in light, and they wonder where we get the information when they close their eyes to the source from which it comes.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have been waiting for three months to get the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). And you may have to wait longer. Now, the average yearly net entries under Conservative rule were 1,975, and under Liberal rule 4,050. The average yearly cancellations under Liberal rule were 430, and under Conservative rule 1,047. The total average homestead entries yearly under Conservative rule were 3,022, and under Liberal rule 4,480. If these figures are not conclusive, no figures in the universe would be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to draw my remarks to a close; and I may say that the efforts of the Liberal party to people our vast domain have been rewarded with great success, as I have shown. It cannot be said that this success was due to chance or accident, and was independent of wise legislation. It cannot be said that it was owing to the expenditure of vast sums of money, for a great deal less has been expended in comparison with the work done. There is great credit due to the government for this success, particularly to the able Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who formulated,

inaugurated and administered the policy under which such abundant fruits were realized and our country enriched. It is one more evidence, Mr. Speaker, to show that it is the Liberal party and not the Conservative party that possesses the 'genius of government.'

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Macdonald, East Huron), would hardly expect me to follow him in a discussion that has little or nothing to do with the question now before the House. The hon. gentleman made a very interesting discussion. He proved to his own satisfaction, and no doubt to the satisfaction of a number of his friends, that his deductions were well founded, particularly when we have the announcement that his figures are in no sense to be questioned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this debate has proceeded at very considerable length; but I am bound to say that I do not think that the debate, even at this late stage, is without considerable interest and profit to the country. I listened at the outset with a great deal of interest to the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance, as I was anxious to know what he would present as the strong reasons for the claim of the Liberal party to the support of the people of this country; and I was not at all disappointed at the ground he took. In the first place, he told us that we had in this country an immense increase of trade, an increase of the bank discounts and deposits, an increase of railway traffic, an increase in the sale of lands, an increase of immigration, a great growth in the iron industry, and a surplus at the end of last year of \$4,000,000 odd, with a promise next year of a surplus of something like \$7,500,000. All the hon. gentleman need have done was merely to state that there was expansion, and all these things would follow, quite independently of the action of hon. gentlemen opposite. Therefore, it was very difficult to discover why these hon. gentlemen should claim credit. The main point now under discussion is that hon. gentlemen opposite are now and have been for the last three years on trial for their fiscal policy. If there is any rule of more importance than all others, which overshadows all others, by which a party that comes into power should be judged, it is the fiscal policy which that party has put before the country. Now, what was the fiscal policy of hon. gentlemen opposite? I am not going into the question of broken promises, because my hon. friend who has just taken his seat says we are not to count on broken promises. He has laid down an excellent rule for the Liberal party. He has told us that we are not to confront them with having been inconsistent. He tells us blandly that all the Liberal party have to do is to hold one set of principles to-day and abandon them to-morrow. Why abandon them?