

same sum. I say that no man who understands what training and education means, would, for a moment, put the clerks, as an average, in a counting department like that of the Auditor General, against the technical officers, geologists, astronomers, and the like of that in the Interior Department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear. You have got the salaries the same as in your own department.

Mr. FOSTER. I say more. I take the Department of the Minister of Justice and I say that his is a technical department. He has to have men who have been trained in law, men who have studied, and men who understand the intricacies of that great science which my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) pursues with such avidity and such success. I make the assertion here: That, as between the average ability, and the average training and capacity, necessary in the Auditor General's Department, as constituted; and, between the Justice Department, there is not a parallel to the disadvantage of the Justice Department, but quite the opposite. Take the Finance Department. I will say very little about that, except this, that I think the variety of work, and the kind of work that is done there, requires a set of officers, as a rule, of higher training and of greater ability, than is required in the Auditor General's Department. There is a grievance because the amount which was asked for contingencies in the Auditor General's Department, that is for temporary clerical work, was diminished. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) sees what is upon the face of the Estimates, but he does not see what was asked when the Estimates were being considered in Council. The Estimates had been gone through before, and sums that were asked for clerical help were cut down to the figures as they are. Just before we came to finish the Estimates, I went through them in Council, and, wishing to bring the contingencies for clerical work down to a certain sum, I docked off two or three departments, my own amongst the others, and the Auditor General's Department suffered to the extent of \$500. I did not have very much compunction in doing that, for this reason: That I knew that during the current year, two or three, or four permanent places in the Auditor General's Department had remained unfilled for a considerable length of time, and that the contingencies for clerical temporary help this year were large. These positions are in process of being filled, and, before the end of this year, will be filled, so that the Auditor General's Department starts out next year with its full complement of permanent men, and, consequently, comparing it with the current year, would require less temporary help than it did last year, and so I considered that the vote

might be fairly well diminished. It was diminished by that amount. The Auditor General still gets \$1,300 contingencies, and the Finance Department has only \$1,000 contingencies. If you take it as treatment on behalf of the Finance Minister, unfair, with regard to the Auditor General, as my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) says, what do you say to the Minister of Finance's treatment of his own department, where the contingencies are cut down to \$1,000, or \$300 less than the Auditor General has? Now, Sir, the Auditor General's office has fairly well increased. The Auditor General commenced, in 1879, with fourteen clerks. I suppose we may take 1880 as the first full year when he got into operation. He had fourteen clerks then, who were paid the sum of \$14,929.17, and his contingencies were \$2,547.42; the total being \$17,476.59. In 1890 it had increased to twenty-one clerks, \$23,076.78 for their pay, \$2,990.40 for contingencies, or a total of \$26,067.18. In 1894 it had increased to twenty-four clerks, with pay for the same amounting to \$25,962.52, with contingencies of \$3,499.95, or a total of \$29,462.47. That is, from 1880 up to 1894 the increase was from fourteen to twenty-four clerks, and the total cost, not taking in his own salary, was an increase of 68 per cent. Now, Sir, that is a very good increase, indeed. Sixty-eight per cent in a period of fourteen years. Let me take the Department of the Minister of Finance, and let me make a comparison as between the two. In 1879, the Department of the Minister of Finance had thirty-eight clerks, and in 1895 it has twenty-eight clerks. It spent, in 1879, \$48,500, but it spent, in 1895, only \$43,100; and I make the assertion here that the work of the Finance Department has increased just as largely in its importance, in the care that is given to it, and in the amount of actual work necessary in the department; it has increased just as much as has the Department of the Auditor General in the last ten years. In that respect I do not think there is very much to be found fault with. Just these few facts which I have given, disprove entirely that there was a certain course of action pursued towards the Auditor General's Department, which was not pursued towards the others, and that it was pursued through partisan motives. Now, Sir, the Auditor General is, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) says, an officer of this House. I do not think the Auditor General can really be called an officer of this House. There is a law upon the statute-books, and that law gives it into the power of the Governor General in Council to appoint the Auditor General, and he is the appointee of the Government for the time being, in this Dominion. His tenure of office is made conditional, and in that respect he differs from most of the other civil servants. But in every other re-