

large. Including salaries, printing and contingencies, the amount asked for is about \$40,000. This is for auditing \$40,000,000, or at the rate of \$100 of cost for every \$100,000 of pecuniary transactions. I am perfectly sure that in the management of any private business that would not be considered a large rate. Then, it is said that the report is swollen far beyond what is necessary. I do not think that that is so. There are in the report 1,600 pages. That means four pages of letter press for every \$100,000 of public expenditure. We are told that there is more detail than is necessary; that in England the detail is not given so minutely as it is with us. In England they have upward of \$400,000,000 of expenditure every year, and it would require twelve volumes of 1,600 pages each to give the expenditure with the same detail as it is given in the Auditor General's Report. Now, in England, as here, the information is given, not to inform the Government of something they did not know before, but for the information of the members of the House of Commons, and to enable the House of Commons to exercise that control over the public finances which it deems to be in the public interest. And so long as the report is not so voluminous or so minute as to prevent the House from becoming acquainted with its contents, it is not more minute than the public interests require. There is an impression abroad in the House that one of the grounds of the attempts to cripple the department of the Auditor General is that it is held by some that he gives details of matters that ought not to have found their way into his report. That would be a good objection if the statement made by the Auditor General in his report were inaccurate. But there is no charge of inaccuracy; there is merely the charge that it is not a comfortable thing for some parties who have received money from the public treasury to have pointed out the various purposes for which that money was obtained. Well, this may be a fault in the expenditure, or it may be a fault in the public taste. As to the latter, I do not think that any persons have done more to pervert the public taste—if it is regarded as a defect—than the gentlemen on the other side of the House and the press which supports them. We all remember the attacks made years ago upon the local government in Ontario. We remember the attacks made upon the Lieutenant-Governor Macdonald, the stories put in circulation about the sumptuous manner in which his friends who accompanied him to Port Arthur on one occasion were provided for. That was used for all it was worth against the Lieutenant-Governor and the member of the Government most intimately associated with him on that occasion—the Commissioner of Crown Lands, if I remember rightly. And so this species of publication is not very agreeable. Now, in regard to the publication of such details, a great deal depends upon the person and

the manner in which he was engaged in the service of the Government. If the Government secures a person to perform a service gratuitously, they naturally do not expect to provide for him in exactly the same way as they would provide for the secretary of a Minister. What would be quite proper in one case, might not be proper in another. In either case, we do not suppose that the Government would insist upon the parties living on treacle and brimstone.

Mr. FOSTER. They thought Cockburn should have done it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a rule laid down by the hon. gentleman's friends long ago. I suppose he has heard of "Little Miss —," a picture which hung in the room of one of the Ministers in Toronto. I suppose he has heard of the glasses and decanters furnished for the Speaker's room there. I suppose he has heard a great many things just of the kind that appear in the Auditor General's Report, which, it is complained do not properly appear in that report. I do not know what the hon. gentleman would put there. How would he account for the expenditure? Would he group a hundred of these expenditures and call them "sundries"? If that is the course he wishes to see pursued, the hon. gentleman ought to ask Parliament to adopt that course, when the Auditor General would be required to conform his conduct to the rule of Parliament in that as in every other particular. I believe a great many frauds have been detected, a great many mistakes have been corrected, by the full details published by the Auditor General. If I remember rightly, not long ago frauds were detected in connection with the management of the Carillon and Grenville Canal, the discovery being due to the full reports of the Auditor General. It was discovered that persons who had been dead for years were still upon the pay rolls, that supplies were purchased for those who had been in the church-yard for many years, and that \$25,000 at least had been taken from the public treasury by manipulations of this sort. Now, it is said that this report has grown very large. That is because the Government have thrown the administrative audit upon the Auditor General. Let me call the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the Indian accounts were given to the Auditor General to audit for the first time in 1882; that the Franchise Act accounts were given to him to audit after the passing of that measure, in 1886; that these \$60,000 were struck off the charges on that measure by the Auditor General, and \$200,000 on the charges connected with preparation of the voters' lists on the subsequent occasion. So that in connection with that matter, the work of the Auditor General's department has been increased, and at least \$260,000 were saved to the public treasury in consequence of the audit. Then, there is the