

the legislation adopted. What Government was it that asked this Parliament to increase the emoluments that the Auditor General was receiving from Parliament, but the Government of the day, under its former leader? Who was it but the Government of the party in power that came down to Parliament and asked, time and again, for increases and promotions to deserving officers of the audit office, or those represented to be qualified for promotion and increase of salary? Yet without any facts, without the slightest justification, the Auditor General undertakes to tell this Parliament that if he and his staff do their duty they will be unpopular with the Government. We have nothing to say against his staff; we assume that they do their duty. But we regretfully say that, if the Auditor General rushes into the political fray, takes sides with the hon. gentlemen opposite, places himself in confidential relation with the hon. member for Bothwell, who, of course, opposes this Government tooth and nail; that his usefulness in the country will largely be interfered with, and that his reputation for impartiality will be absolutely destroyed, and in that respect he will not be able satisfactorily to discharge his duties. He attacks, in that respect, not only the Government of to-day, but any Government that may be formed; and I venture again to submit that in that matter he cannot have the sympathy of either side of this House. There is no hon. gentleman opposite who has ventured so far as to say that the Auditor General and his staff, if they do their duty rigidly, will be unpopular with the Government, whether Liberal or Conservative. For instance, let me ask hon. gentlemen opposite, do they agree that that gentleman and his staff will come under their animadversion and cease to be *personae gratiae* to them, if, as he states, they simply do their duty? It would not be going too far to say that that sentence is an insult to this Parliament, to hon. gentlemen opposite as well as to us. The leader of the Opposition shakes his head; I take it, therefore, that he agrees, and I am sorry to believe it, that if the hon. gentleman peradventure should become the head of the Government, and if the Auditor General and his staff should do their duty, they would be unpopular with the Government of which the hon. gentleman would be the head. Is he willing to take that position?

Mr. LAURIER. No; if he does his duty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Exactly, and that is my contention. I say that if he does his duty honestly and fearlessly, he has a right to count upon the support of the members to your right and the members to your left. Therefore the statement of the leader of the Opposition is in support of the

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

position I maintain, that that sentence in his statement is absolutely unwarranted. Far better that we should have no Auditor General, if there was a grain of truth in that assertion. Then he goes on and refers to a passage in his report of 1893, which evidently he thinks has not been carefully considered by this Parliament. But this reflection, I beg to say, is as much upon the hon. gentlemen opposite as it is upon us, particularly if the contention be right that was urged to-day, that he is a parliamentary officer. That statement made in his report of 1893, was as follows:—

Is it not better to show clear-headed and industrious men that you appreciate their intelligence and zeal by giving with pleasure to three the salaries you would be forced to give to four, and get from them more work than from six of the other kind, and of an immeasurably better quality? Then, the man who is brightened by his work being appreciated, respects himself and takes an interest in everything connected with his department.

So he has to instruct us; he has to instruct gentlemen to your right and gentlemen to your left as to the manner in which the Civil Service shall be conducted. You have passed a Civil Service Act, you have laid down certain rules for promotion, certain ideas as to the basis of a Civil Service organization, that should obtain in this country. But the Auditor General says that is all wrong, it is wrong to proceed from grade to grade, it is wrong to proceed according to the spirit of the Civil Service Act, but Parliament should go further and give the Auditor General rights that no man in this House would contend it was ever contemplated that he should possess. That is another criticism that ill becomes him in his office. Personally, I have nothing against the Auditor General. My relations with him, I may say, have been pleasant from the time I became a member of the Government down to this day. But I am discussing matters of principle, just as the Auditor General wants to discuss them in his petition; and I refer to him merely as an officer, whether a parliamentary officer or an officer on the civil list, with certain privileges, certain peculiar privileges, given to him in regard to removals by this Parliament. But I say that is a criticism and an attack altogether outside of his sphere. That is a matter of opinion to be discussed on the floor of this House, that is a subject for the legislators of this country, and is no more a subject for him to bring before this House than for a second or third-class clerk in any branch of the Civil Service. That is the position that I believe I can support by good authority. Then, again, he has another sentence that I think it would have been well for him to have omitted from his petition, considering the position he occupies. He says:

The politicians have done enough for a man when they have secured his appointment.