

las Stewart received, as clerk of Justice Department, \$1,800; as Minister's private secretary, \$600, and for services, Behring Sea, \$400, making \$2,800. Now the Minister of Finance says that some extra services were performed by these individuals in connection with the Colonial Conference. Were they not paid their full salaries for serving the country—\$1,750 in one case, and \$2,800 in the other case? I would like to know if their whole time is not at the country's disposal for any duty they may be called upon to fulfil? This system of extra payments is taken advantage of to pay every clerk in the different departments for every little incident on which they can base a claim for extra services. I say that the system is an abuse, and should be stopped. The committee has no right to grant to these men, who are receiving now more than their services are worth, any further sums of money. We have too many blood-suckers in this Dominion who are ready to take advantage of every little excuse to draw money out of the public treasury and put it in their own pockets. There is no excuse for the Minister of Finance, in the face of the impoverished condition of the people of this country, in the face of his deficit of \$4,500,000, and in the face of the necessity of providing for other things which are pressing upon the Government, coming forward and asking the committee to vote \$200 additional to each of these two men, who are already amply paid. It is a gross piece of injustice, and, for my part, I intend to resent all such payments in the interest of the people of this country.

Further amount required to meet expenditure in connection with the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic..... \$8,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a fair opportunity for the hon. gentleman to let us know what this commission has really cost us, and, I might add, what conceivable good it has done to any human being other than the three or four gentlemen who have extracted a good many thousand dollars for sitting on the commission and obtaining an amount of information, of which the most important item I have found is that, if the general cookery of Canada were improved, and the women would make themselves better cooks, there would be fewer drunkards in the Dominion. It may be true, and it is, no doubt, a valuable thing to pay \$100,000 for it, but I think we might have had it for considerably less expenditure of time and money.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has had his usual blast. I do not suppose that this is quite the time for us to go into the merits of the commission. That was the outcome of a resolution passed by Parliament. As to the cost, I find that up to the 7th June, 1895, there was expended \$63,184, and \$8,000 is asked for here, so that the cost, as appears from that calculation, will be about \$70,000.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the meaning of the transfer. Is that to reduce the amount by \$20,000?

Mr. FOSTER. That is to make available for printing, \$20,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That has to be added to the \$70,000?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. The evidence has already been printed and distributed—that is the parliamentary supply. The report is now being printed, and the printing of the report, and any further copies of evidence required will come out of the \$20,000, so that the whole cost of the commission, printing, and all, will be between \$80,000 and \$90,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will that be the whole expenditure?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a very considerable item, between \$80,000 and \$90,000 for the hon. gentleman to find out whether Parliament should legislate in the direction in which some eight or ten years ago he contended there is no doubt it ought to legislate. It seems to me a very serious responsibility devolves upon the Minister of Finance. He was perfectly sure, ten years ago, that Parliament ought to legislate. Now, he has put the country to the expense of \$80,000 or \$90,000 to find out whether the opinion he entertained was good or not, so that the hon. gentleman's faith in his former convictions was not, when it came to the test, after all, as strong as he led the country to suppose it was. The hon. gentleman, of course, will be able to tell us whether he has got in the report, which he has no doubt digested and thoroughly mastered, that information which has removed all the doubts which had arisen in his mind, and he will be able to tell us perhaps now what course he thinks, in the public interest, should be taken. The hon. gentleman, we know, was an ardent advocate of prohibition. He appointed this commission to remove doubts and to secure, perhaps, that fortification and support from it, which you may call courage if you like but not the courage of the kind with which the hon. gentleman proposed to fight. He will tell us now whether he proposes to submit any legislation upon this question. I suppose the report is premature, but it is here now, and the elections are not over. Will the hon. gentleman tell us whether the Government propose to act on this report before the elections, or whether they intend to submit it as a question for the consideration of the people as to submit to the sovereign people in the matter, or whether they intend to act upon the views of the commissioners, and to fight those men who are in favour of prohibition? It is a very important question, certainly very important, or the hon. gentleman would never