

which I desire to call the attention of the House by way of comparison is the Dominion Lands expenditure. That expenditure was in 1877-78, \$87,628; 1884, \$166,898, an increase of \$79,270. Now, Sir, when we consider the vast territory which has been transferred to the control and management of the Department of the Interior, when we consider the large sales that have been made in the last three or four years, when we consider the number of settlers who have gone upon the lands of that country—and from which lands we have received no money return—when we consider that the receipts for lands from Manitoba and the North-West from 1874 to 1878 were \$89,392.61, while the receipts from 1879 to 1884 were \$4,070,543.67, I think it will be understood by this House why the management of so large an estate as that, the sale of such a large portion of that country, and the settlement of tens of thousands of people upon its lands, justified the increased expenditure of something like \$60,000 or \$70,000 last year, as compared with the expenditure of 1878.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is that exclusive of the capital expenditure?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, I will come to that by-and-bye—the hon. gentleman will find that I have not forgotten it. The next item of expenditure is public works and buildings. The expenditure under that head in 1877-78 was \$998,594.70. In 1884 it was \$2,908,851.65, or an increase of expenditure amounting to \$1,910,256.95. The expenditures last year on public buildings and harbors, and all other works under the management of the Public Works Department, were nearly treble what they were in 1877-78. Now, Sir, so far as this expenditure is concerned, I admit that it is a charge on the country—I admit that there is no direct return given. But who will say that if the Government or the country has a surplus sufficient to