

ing Fund more than was paid in the year 1877-78. It is only necessary for me to remind the House that the sinking fund is a sum laid aside towards the redemption of the debt, and that it is practically a reduction of the debt to that amount, instead of an increased tax, though it appears on the expenditure side of the account. The next item is Immigration and Quarantine. In the year 1877-78, the expenditure under that head was reduced very materially from what it had been the previous three years. It was \$180,691.44, while in 1883-84 the expenditure was \$575,326.72, an increase of \$394,635.28. I may state to the hon. gentlemen opposite that the average expenditure during their Administration for immigration and quarantine was \$300,000 a year, and for the five years from 1879 to 1884 it was \$340,000 a year, with results which, I need hardly say, were three-fold greater than the results of the expenditure during the five years from 1874 to 1879. Sir, I think it is not necessary for me to say anything more than to make that statement with reference to that branch of the expenditure. The next item is Militia and Defence, the expenditure upon which in 1877-78 was \$618,126.58, while in 1884 it was \$989,498.22, or an increase of \$371,364.64. But if we go back and take the five years from 1874 to 1879, we find that the expenditure for militia was about the same as it has been from 1879 to 1884—that is for the five years from 1874 to 1879. The whole expenditure for militia and defence varied very little from the expenditure that took place for the five years 1879 to 1884, though there is a considerable difference in the expenditure of 1877-78 and that of 1883-84. But we know perfectly well that notwithstanding that over the five years there has been an average about the same, yet in 1884, we had four new organisations, consisting of three infantry schools and one cavalry school—one in the Maritime Provinces, one in the