

eral stated any grievances against the Government other than two—in fact, only one, but one with two branches? First, that he asked for the promotion of two men to be first-class clerks, and he did not get them promoted; second, that his contingencies were cut down by \$500. Go through that petition from first to last, and point out any allegation in that petition of unfair treatment on the part of the Government, or grievances in regard to the Government, except on those two points. It cannot be done. Now, whence comes the evidence of that unfair treatment? My hon. friend knows, and those who sit behind him know, as the House knows, that this year has been a year when the Estimates have been very severely pruned—they have been very carefully looked into. My hon. friend leaps to the conclusion that the Auditor General's two men were not promoted because he was the Auditor General, and I was the Finance Minister, and that the other departments, forsooth, had been treated differently.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And so they have.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us see. I suppose I have a grudge against the Department of the Governor General. It had one first-class clerk last year; it has only one first-class clerk this year. I must have a grudge against the Department of Justice. The department had four first-class clerks last year; it has four this year. For the benefit of my hon. friend I will give him a little information which he does not possess. My hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, pressed before Council the appointment of two chief clerks in addition to those he already had, and pressed his claim with very great force, and with very great fairness. He did not get them. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) did not know that fact; but he does happen to know that the Auditor General pressed for some promotions, and did not get them. It is asserted that I am sympathetic in dealing with other departments, but not with the Department of the Auditor General, and that I am importing animus and party feeling in dealing with it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Other departments have fifty-five.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman cannot run round the bush. I will deal with those other matters later. He must take this dose of medicine at the present moment. Then I must have had spite against the Penitentiaries Branch. It had one first-class clerk last year; it has only one this year. I must have had spite against the Department of Militia and Defence. It had seven first-class clerks last year; it has seven this year. It is the same way with regard to the first-class clerks in the Secretary of State's Department; and also in the Department of Public Printing. I

Mr. FOSTER.

must have special spite against the Minister of the Interior, because the number of first-class clerks in that department has been diminished by one. The Auditor General did not get his two promotions. The Minister of the Interior lost one first-class clerk; yet we are all right so far as the party feeling is concerned, but the Auditor General's treatment is an index of where the animus lies. The office of the Controller of the North-west Mounted Police had one first-class clerk last year; it has one now. The Department of Indian Affairs had ten first-class clerks last year, it has nine first-class clerks this year. The Auditor General has the same in both years. The Department of Finance and Treasury Board has one first-class clerk proposed more this year than last year, and has one second-class clerk less proposed than last year. That we will debate on its merits when the time comes. In the Customs Department, there is an increase of one first-class clerk. In the Inland Revenue Department, the first-class clerks remain the same. In the Post Office Department the first-class clerks remain the same, and the second-class clerks are actually reduced by five, and the third-class clerks by four. In the Department of Agriculture the first-class clerks remain the same in both years, and in the Marine and Fisheries there is one more. In the Department of Public Works they are the same. In the Department of Railways and Canals they are the same. In the Geological staff, the first-class clerks, or technical officers as they are called, are the same; and in the High Commissioner's office they are the same. Now, what does that show? It shows that when we go through the departments, the increase in first-class clerks is almost nil, and that the decrease more than offsets the increase, and that other departments have equal claim, as far as the first-class clerks are concerned, increase or decrease, than has the Auditor General's Department. So much with reference to that. I will take up another point. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) gives it as his mature judgment, that if we want to make a comparison of the departments as to efficiency, ability, training, and high-class work, you must take the Justice Department, the Geological Department, the Finance Department, and the Auditor General's Department. Let us examine that position. Take the Geological Department. Every man of the technical officers in the Geological Department must be a specialist, and a specialist in what requires more than a mere glib facility of going over the multiplication table backwards, of counting up a row of figures which may come to be done automatically, and with very great accuracy; of seeing whether a certain appropriation amounted to a certain sum, and seeing whether the cheques drawn against the credit given for that appropriation amounted to exactly the