| South Australia— | Auditor-General Salaries and Contingencies | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | • • | 900 0 0 3,541 0 0 4,44 | . 0 | 0 |
|------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----|---|-----|----|
| Tasmania— | Auditor-General Salaries Contingencies | •• | •• | $\begin{array}{ccccc} 600 & 0 & 0 \\ 1,056 & 10 & 8 \\ 134 & 4 & 11 \\ \hline & & & & & & \\ 1,790 \end{array}$ | 15 | 7 |
| New Zealand— | Controller and Auditor-Ge Assistant Controller and A Salaries Contingencies | | ••• | 1,000 0 0 800 0 0 4,307 11 8 370 12 2 6,478 | : 3 | 10 |
| | (2.) THE | TREASURIES. | | 5 ,4,10 | | |
| New South Wales- | -Salaries Contingencies | •• | | 14,046 4 10 1,667 11 8 —————————————————————————————————— | 16 | 6 |
| Victoria— | Salaries Contingencies | •• | •• | 23,531 6 10 5,762 4 8 | 1,1 | 6 |
| Queensland— | Salaries Contingencies | •• | •• | 3,837 0 0 176 9 9 4,018 | 9 | 9 |
| South Australia— | Salaries and Contingencies | | | 3,326 | 0 | 0 |
| Tasmania— | Salaries Contingencies | •• | •• | 2,756 1 8 80 5 2 | . 6 | 10 |
| New Zealand— | Salaries Contingencies | •• | •• | 8,364 6 1 38 10 10 | 16 | 11 |

If we take the two departments together the cost will be as follows:—

| | | | € | s. | d. |
|-----------------|-----|-----|--------|----------|----|
| New South Wales | | | 23,784 | 4 | 4 |
| Victoria | • • | • • | 38,773 | 8 | 5 |
| Queensland | • • | | 9,407 | 8 | 8 |
| South Australia | • • | • • | 7,767 | 0 | 0 |
| Tasmania | • • | | 4,627 | 2 | 5 |
| New Zealand | | | 14.881 | 0 | 9 |

It is impossible to make an accurate comparison of the respective costs of these offices in proportion to the work done, because the work done in each is very different. For example, the inspecting officers are counted as Treasury officers in the Sydney accounts, and as Audit officers in the other colonies. Their cost, with travelling expenses, is £4,050 a year. Again they do not inspect the railway stations, which constitutes two-thirds of the work of the New Zealand inspectors. The expense of the New Zealand Audit has therefore been diminished in the above statement by two-thirds of the cost of inspection, in order to compare it with that of the other colonies. For the same reason the salary of the Audit Officer in London has been deducted, there being no corresponding charge on the Estimates of any other colony.

Owing to the published accounts in all the colonies being drawn up in a different form, it is difficult to get any fair basis of comparison; but assuming that the actual expenditure, so far as it can be gathered from the accounts, may be taken as the best basis for such a comparison, the percentage of the cost of the Audit and Treasury to the expenditure will be found to be nearly as follows;—