

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE—Do you object to the increase?

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED.—That is not involved in the question. Commissioner Casels in his report to parliament pointed out that the only remedy for the abuses which the evidence disclosed was an awakening of the public conscience, and I pointed out that the Prime Minister of this Dominion did not seem to appreciate the enormity of his offense in attempting to bribe fifteen hundred civil servants in Ottawa to support him by promising to increase their salaries to the extent of \$50,000 to \$75,000 for past services and 12½ per cent as a future and permanent increase. Yet hon. gentlemen talk about the government of the day administering the affairs of the Dominion with regard to honour, conscience and moral considerations. I may say that this was not an isolated case. In a hundred constituencies throughout the Dominion practically the same bribes were offered to the public. Take, for instance, the question of rural mail delivery. Notwithstanding the position taken by the government last session in absolutely refusing to concede rural mail delivery to the farmers on the ground of expense, and on the ground that it could not be practically carried out, the Postmaster General announced on the eve of the election, when Ontario seats seemed to be in jeopardy, that, if the government were supported, rural mail delivery would be granted even before the election. And this announcement was made at a time when certain government organs were opposing everything touching rural mail delivery. I would illustrate this by mentioning what occurred in Edmonton. At the time when the Postmaster General made that promise the Edmonton 'Bulletin,' the organ of the Minister of the Interior, published on the same day an article opposing in the strongest language the introduction of this same rural mail delivery. Take again the expenditure in October last. It was \$1,536,000 more than the expenditure in the corresponding month of 1907. No doubt that increased expenditure was intended to have its effect upon the electorate.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.—When my hon. friend speaks of the expendi-

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED.

ture in October last being a million and a half more than in October of the preceding year, I presume he included capital as well as ordinary expenditure?

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED.—I fancy the expenditure on capital account would have the same influence on votes as ordinary expenditure.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.—Possibly, or possibly not, but I presume that he is putting the two together?

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED.—Oh, yes, I am putting the two together, but I would point out to my right hon. friend that it was scarcely a coincidence that in that particular month, when the elections were about to be held, it was considered not unwise tactics to make a very much larger expenditure than in the corresponding period of the preceding year. This is how we cultivate public conscience.

Reference is made to the increased care exercised in immigration. That is a matter on which we can, in a qualified way, congratulate the government. I regret that the government has not done away with the bonus of \$5 per head given to immigrants. I fail to understand why Canada does not follow the example of the United States of America. Our neighbours do not pay emigrants to come to their shores, but on the contrary impose a poll tax of \$4 per head upon them. There are sufficient inducements in the country for immigrants without offering bonuses. The character of our immigrants is undoubtedly a source of very heavy expenditure to the different provinces of the Dominion. I would illustrate this by mentioning some statistics taken from the blue book of the province of Ontario, showing what it is costing that province to support what I might term the criminal immigrants located in that province. During the past five years the number of foreign born admitted to the asylums has nearly doubled. In 1903 it was 180; in 1907 it was 364. This was nearly double their proper proportion in the population. The proportion of foreign born in the whole population of Ontario is 20 per cent; the proportion of foreign in the Central prison is 51 per cent; that is 31 per cent beyond the percentage of their population. The pro-