

to any Government in power, if he fairly discharges his duties. I do not think that is a right statement of the case; I do not think it is necessary, neither ought it, in fact to be the rule. Sir, there is one important point that is left out, and, as my hon. friend alluded to it, I will take that up for a moment. He states the number of clerks and their salaries—that is done also in the Auditor General's statement—in the Finance Department, and draws an average; and then he says that as the clerks in the Auditor's office are paid on the average so much less, therefore there is unfairness. My hon. friend did not take into account that the Finance Department, with its quota of clerks, has been in operation since 1867, that it commenced in that year with a staff of officers from the old united provinces, and that from 1867 forwards, by that gradual accretion and accumulation that will take place, the officers, under the statutory increases and promotions, have gradually gone up to the higher grades and to the larger salaries in those grades. The Auditor General's office started in 1879 with a very small proportion of old officials, almost the entire number who are there now being officials who have entered the service since 1879. And yet you want this fourteen year old department, under our system of increases or accretions, to average equal with a department which is so much older; and he draws a conclusion that if it does not average equal, there is unfairness to the one that averages less. I want to say that the Auditor General has not been unfairly treated in another way. The Civil Service is a unity. In all the different departments, we look very carefully at what is going on in every other department. We are anxious to have fair-play as between department and department. You cannot make a hard and fast iron rule which will hold always. There will be some instances, some right and laudable instances, where exceptions are made on account of merit and service. But we try to administer the Civil Service on a basis of uniformity in the several departments as nearly as possible, and there is no exception among the departments at Ottawa which is so marked as the Auditor General's in that respect. The Civil Service law provides that its members shall come in at the minimum salary of \$400, with an addition in the case of optional subjects, and that the salary shall go on increasing at the rate of \$50 per year until it reaches the maximum of the class; and so on through all the grades. Now, the Auditor General has put more men, at their first appointment, on higher salaries than minimum than probably any other department in proportion to its numbers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is not that a necessity from the work of his department?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all, in my opinion. More than that. In the other departments

the rule is that a clerk, in the third class for instance, may have his salary increased until it reaches the maximum of that class by the annual accretion allowed by law, after which he has a claim for promotion into a higher class. That is the rule, and we abide by that rule.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. FOSTER. I tell my hon. friend that we do. My hon. friend would perhaps found an argument to the contrary on some exception, but every rule has exceptions, and I am speaking of the rule. Of course when a vacancy takes place by death or otherwise, that rule may be broken; and the man who stands the highest in his class and is the best fitted to fill the vacancy is the one who is selected by the Minister for promotion. Such an event will operate to bring a man into a higher class before he has reached the maximum of the class from which he was promoted. But in these matters—not of promotions but of increases within the class and promotions without going to the top of the class—you will find that the Auditor General's Department shows exceptional instances. Here, for instance, in 1879, Mr. Thomas Porter went in, at a salary of \$800, \$400 above the minimum. Mr. Lynch went in at \$400, had his salary increased from \$500 to \$700, was raised from \$750 to \$1,100, and then went as high as \$1,350 by annual increase of \$50. Take the case of F. Hayter, who went in at first at a salary of \$700, \$300 above the minimum, then went up by increases to \$850, and jumped from \$850 to \$1,100, then went to \$1,150, and from that jumped to \$1,400, after which he had his salary increased from \$1,700 to \$1,800, and is now getting \$2,000. I doubt if you can find in any other department so rapid a rise against the general settled rule. Take the case of J. Gorman, who went in at \$700, was raised to \$850 by increases and then jumped to \$1,100, after which he went to \$1,150 by one year's increase, and then was promoted to \$1,400, and to-day he has a salary of \$2,000. I have nothing to say against these officers. They are all good officers, and the Auditor General lays great store by them; but I am pointing out that these do not show at all that the tendency of the Government and the Minister of Finance has been to put the repressive cap on the Auditor General's Department to any burdensome extent. Mr. Bolton went in at \$700; Balderson went in at \$800, was raised to \$850, promoted to \$1,100 and then transferred. Mr. J. C. Macdonald went in at \$700; Mr. Bissonnette at \$700. These two, I think, however, were transfers from the Post Office Department, and that should be taken into account. Miss Baldwin went in at \$500; Reid at \$800, and Kearns, who was transferred from the Post-office Department, at \$700, went up to \$800, was then increased to \$1,100, and now gets \$1,350. Mr. Martin who went in at \$800,