head, for lighthouse and coast service—there are other branches of it, but this will do to illustrate my point—amounted to $445,000. The expenditure in 1908 amounted to $2,835,000. That is to say, that of the $8,000,000 in question $2,400,000 were devoted to the improvement of the lighthouse service. The lighthouse and coast service mean practically the lighthouse service. I am not disposed to say that the administration of that department has been entirely free from censure. I think probably, as the report of Judge Cassels seems to indicate, that there has been very considerable extravagance in certain quarters, and that there has been certainly something which looks extremely like graft on the part of a good many officials. That extravagance the government will check. That graft, if the law permits them to do so, they will punish ; but I would call attention incidentally to this fact, that the offenders, if they be offenders, are for the most part men whom we did not appoint, but whom we found in office when we came in in 1896 and whose morals may have been contaminated by the company which they were obliged to keep.

Hon. Mr. BOLDUC—The new company or the old?

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—The old, most decidedly, and I think if my hon. friend remembers certain events which took place in parliament in the years 1893-4-5, he will know that officials of that department, did stand in considerable danger of being contaminated. However, that is not exactly the point. The point I want to make is this: It is true there has been a very large increase, at any rate in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and under the head of lighthouses and coast service, but at the same time there has been an enormous improvement in that service, and an enormous benefit conferred on the mercantile marine, aye and on the people of Canada by that improvement. To-day the St. Lawrence is lit and supplied with lighthouses and light accommodation as it never was before, and as very few rivers of its magnitude are to-day. I believe that the amount saved to the community in insurance alone would much more than compensate them for the increase in expenditure on the lighthouse department, and I may say this, every hon. gentleman who knows anything of the trade of Canada, knows that the value of the cargo of the ships that go down the St. Lawrence to-day amounts to several hundred of millions of dollars. An accident to one of those ships carrying such a cargo as they do would in a single year much more than offset the total amount of the increase, large as it is. And while, as I have said, I am in no way disposed to defend any unnecessary expenditure in this or any other department, I do say that when you accuse the government of extravagance merely because the expenditure increased in such a department as that by a couple of million dollars or, may be more, you will do well to remember that the community at large—and this affects the whole community, because practically almost the whole of our exports go via the St. Lawrence, at any rate during the summer season—you will remember that the community derive a very large benefit from that expenditure.

I do not think it necessary to go into minute details about these matters, except the remark that before I have done I think I shall be able to show the House that in the remaining item which would be necessary to make up the eight million dollars that I am now discussing—that is the item of immigration- the money that we have expended has been of enormous advantage to the people of Canada. There I think the increase has amounted to something like $1,000,000 or thereabouts. In 1896, our expenditure for immigration amounted to about $120,000. It had increased to very nearly one million one hundred thousand dollars per annum in the twelve years terminating in 1908. Now, the House will observe that while I do not pretend to say that there may not have been some ground for criticism with respect to any one of those departments, I do maintain, and I think the House on due consideration will agree with me, that in the cases that I have enumerated, either the whole parliament concurred in the expenditure, as in the case of the militia, or there has been good value given for the money expended. Perhaps my hon. friend opposite will permit me to ask him a ques-