

taken from the contingency account, is, I think, a request which the House can hardly accede to. What the Auditor really asks the House to do is to censure the Government, and this from an appointee of Government and a member of the civil service is too absurd to consider seriously.

Mr. COCHRANE. How much salary are these two men getting now ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think they are getting \$1,400 each, one has lately come to the maximum and the other has been there for a year or two. The Government cannot see its way clear to grant a commission upon these grounds. It may, however, become necessary some time or other for the Government to have a special commission appointed who will take up this whole question of audit, and report upon the matter for the information of the Government and the House ; but the committee that is asked for by the petition, and, on the grounds that petition sets forth, cannot be granted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Like a lady's letter, I think the pith of the hon. gentleman's speech was in his postscript. He made it very apparent, indeed, that he regretted the good old days when the audit was compressed into a space that was not likely to give any trouble to the Department of Finance, or to the supporters of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. And your days, when there was none.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was the party who created the audit, and I created it with knowledge. I knew that when our expenditure was a matter of \$14,000,000 less than the present Government had to provide for, there was not likely to be much necessity for an audit ; and if the hon. gentleman had imitated my example, and if, in the space of five years and after, he had had to encounter an expenditure of \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 incurred by his predecessors, and yet was able to point to a total increased expenditure of barely \$200,000, there would be much less need for an audit than we have now. However, it is clear that the real offence the Auditor General has committed, as the Minister made abundantly clear before he concluded his remarks, was this, that the Auditor General—who, I beg to inform him, is in a very special sense an officer of Parliament, as contradistinguished from an officer of the Government—has given, for many years back a huge amount of information to the people of Canada which has been, no doubt, very inconvenient to the hon. gentleman and his friends. The Auditor General has brought to light a vast number of expenditures which reflect no credit on the Government of which the hon. gentleman is a member, and I have not the slightest doubt myself that the Min-

Mr. FOSTER.

ister of Finance did not feel at all disposed, as he intimates, to be in any way concerned in enlarging the volume of the Auditor General's Report. I am bound to say that in the report as it stands, there is quite enough to give food for reflection, not merely to the hon. gentleman and his supporters, but to all persons throughout this country who care to know how it comes to pass that to-day we are spending very close on \$40,000,000 for services which ought never to have cost this country \$25,000,000, and, with proper and wise administration, never would have cost this country \$25,000,000. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman was good enough to point out the marvellous increases, the startling and sudden jumps, which have taken place in the Department of the Auditor General. Did he ever hear of a very remarkable sudden jump which took place in the case of a Mr. McLeod, who, I think, was pitchforked into the Civil Service with very little experience at all, and who, if I am not mistaken, is now receiving about \$2,400 a year as Assistant Receiver General, somewhere down in St. John, a gentleman with whom the Minister of Finance is very familiarly acquainted.

Mr. FOSTER. I know him well, and he is a fine fellow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think he was promoted to about \$2,400 a year, with very little merit, except that he happens to be a rather close connection of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FOSTER. His merits are undoubted, but you are wrong in your figures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the amount he receives ?

An hon. MEMBER. Two thousand two hundred.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We will give him the benefit of \$200. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman went at considerable length into the question of the amount which the Auditor General's Department now receives. I have taken the trouble to look at the details of that department in the year 1892, and I find there were then twenty-five officers, whereas there are now twenty-six. Those twenty-five officers, in 1892, received \$25,095 ; the twenty-six are now receiving \$26,740. Well, deducting the \$500 which, I suppose, would be about the amount paid the extra clerk employed since that time, it does look as if there was no very great increase in these four years, but a vastly less increase than the ordinary statutory allowances would provide. Now, were these twenty-six officials receiving the average statutory allowance of \$50 a year, which is rarely refused in the other departments, the expenditure for this office would be \$30,000, in place of \$26,740. Applying that test, which, I admit, is a somewhat