

have put the country to the expense he did in connection with this matter. If he had not thought it important, I am sure that his regard for the public treasury and economy and his strong conviction of duty, would have all stood in the way of the appointment of such a commission. Now, the hon. gentleman has had his commission and report, which, although it might have been light literature in the days of Methuselah, cannot be called so in the lives of men of three score and ten; and I question whether the hon. gentleman, with all his industry, can afford sufficient time to make himself conversant with the views of the commissioners, and the witnesses they examined. Notwithstanding the heat of the evening, the House will listen with interest to any opinion the hon. gentleman can give us in this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has put several questions to me, and made known a number of wants, but I have some conscientious scruples against going into that matter just at present, because such great constitutionalists as my hon. friend and myself ought to set a good example; and it is altogether out of order to discuss the policy of a question of this kind over a supplemental vote simply meant to finish up the expenditure heretofore authorized. On that account, to set a good example to the House—and I am sorry my hon. friend has lapsed so often, but he has made several this session—I must refuse to put myself out of order. There is another reason why I should not care to discuss the question brought up by my hon. friend. The report is a long one, and the evidence still longer, and I would not like to take my hon. friend at a disadvantage. Although I have some knowledge of what is in the evidence and the report, I would like to give my hon. friend longer time to make himself sufficiently conversant with the case to discuss it upon its merits.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not require this report to fortify my opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not asked to fortify my opinions or to give my particular views with reference to it, but to inform other members of the House who needed information.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The benighted members.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the hon. gentleman got the courage of his opinions?

Mr. FOSTER. I always had.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the first place, we ought to have some detailed statement as to how this amount was spent, and in particular I should like to know what were the amounts which were paid to the several commissioners individually for the time they expended. The hon. gentleman says that the sum total of ex-

penditure is \$63,000, and \$20,000 for printing, making \$83,000 altogether.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is this \$8,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose that is included.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, say \$90,000. I would like to know what amounts were paid to these parties. I may say that I look upon this whole expenditure as a gross waste of public money. I do not believe that one copper's worth of good has resulted to the country from this expenditure. There are some indications that the Government was anxious that every interest should be represented on this commission. Inasmuch as the president, a very worthy gentleman and a gentleman of importance, is believed to be either directly or indirectly interested in a great brewery in or near the city of Montreal, it is peculiarly proper that he should be made president. I have no doubt that he was by no manner of means the least useful member of the committee. I should like to know what these gentlemen were paid for their valuable services and for the valuable report they have presented.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman wants to know what this \$8,000 is to be devoted to?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; I wanted to know what sums were paid to the commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think I can give that, for that carries back to the expenditure of previous years, and I came prepared to explain this item. In the \$63,000 which was expended up to 7th June, \$13,636.27 were for the Queen's Printer; \$3,874.75 for translation; \$7,776.95 for reporting; \$2,393.52 for reporters' travelling expenses; \$2,591.47 for sundries—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friends seem very suspicious. Sundries in this case means paper pads and that kind of thing—\$4,629 for clerical and other assistance. That makes a total of about \$35,000, and all the rest of \$63,000, or about \$28,000 was paid to the commissioners.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How was that divided—how much to each commissioner?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot give the hon. gentleman that. The information has appeared in the Auditor General's Report.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will look up the Auditor General's Report, page C-26, he will find the information.