

Opening of the Yukon.

We have expended a large sum on the Yukon; no such sum was expended by the late government. This expenditure of ours in the Yukon is added to the other expenditures to swell the total. But these hon. gentlemen who dwell upon that increased expenditure always forget to tell us that for every dollar we have spent on the Yukon practically we have got a dollar back. In fact to a recent date we have made money upon the Yukon. I do not recollect what is shown by the more recent statements, but, I believe that, except for some expenditures on capital account, the Yukon has returned every dollar that has been spent upon it. So, while hon. gentlemen try to make this expenditure a means of alarming the country, we have made it the means of opening up and developing a territory that was unknown to them when they were in power.

Encouragement of the Fisheries.

We have expended more on fisheries. As between 1896 and 1903, there has been an increase of about \$100,000. Are we to be condemned for that? Have we not heard hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, during this very session, express the opinion that larger expenditures should be made upon fisheries, that experiments and investigations should be carried on in order to enable us to develop and utilize the fisheries of British Columbia and the maritime provinces? Where is the member of this House who will vote to reduce the expenditure devoted to the development of the fishing industry of this country.

Profitable Expenditure.

We have increased the expenditure on customs by \$332,696 in 1903 as compared with 1896. But that increased expenditure represents the cost of collecting an increased revenue amounting to no less than \$17,168,447. Does anybody expect that we are to collect a revenue of \$37,000,000 in customs in 1903 for the same amount that was expended in collecting a revenue of \$19,000,000 in 1896? We have increased to a small extent the expenditure on excise. The expenditure in 1903 was \$8,114 more than that of 1896. But the receipts during that time have increased to the extent of \$4,087,773. Does anybody mean to say that you are going to collect \$12,000,000 in 1903, as against \$7,900,000 in 1896, and yet add nothing to the expenses of collection? We have increased the expenditure on post offices between 1896 and 1903 by \$440,167. But the receipts of that department, in the meantime, have increased to the extent of \$1,430,000. We have increased the expenditure on militia, as between 1896 and 1903, to the extent of \$826,295. These sums are all given in the grand total which my hon. friend rolls up with a view to alarming the country. Yet, only yesterday, as I have said, we had the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam Hughes) complaining, not that we expend too much on the militia, but that we expend only 37 cents per head when we ought to be spending at least eight or ten times that amount.

Successful Immigration Policy.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has referred to the expenditure on immigration. If there is anything that this government should be proud of it is the policy of the Minister of the Interior with regard to immigration and the results of that policy in bringing immigrants into this country. I am glad that my hon. friend made allusion to that. It is true that in 1896 they expended on immigration \$120,000, and that in 1903 we spent

\$64.
dolla
noth
trav
prid
ing
inior
some
this
from

Terri
carry
\$330,
\$802,
havin
and e
it is o
them
and t
count
ing th
and g
face o
the gr
a furtl

M
discu
represe
share o
that ti
fair sha

Mr

Mr
that
down in

Mr

Mr
While
to the p
receivin
others v
mitch.
too muc
the need
more, a