

long contention that he does not properly discharge his duties. But what is after all the whole blame they put upon him? Simply that he burdens his reports with too many details. If there is any other criticism that has been made this evening I would like to know what it is. Simply that his report is too elaborate and long.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And misleading.

Mr. LAURIER. That is only an inference. The complaint simply is that he burdens his report with too many details.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And shows carelessness.

Mr. LAURIER. That is the opinion of the other side, but I do not believe that it is the opinion entertained by the Canadian people at large. The contrary was said by the hon. member for South Oxford this afternoon. There is no public book of greater value to-day than the Auditor General's Report as it is made. There is nothing that has thrown greater light into the actual work of Administration than this very blue-book, and I believe this is the secret of all the objection we have heard against the Auditor General. My hon. friend said a moment ago, if the Auditor General properly discharged his duty he should not incur the enmity of any political party. I agree with him. If the Auditor General discharges his duty properly, he should not incur the enmity of any political party. He should not, but he does. I believe from the very speech of the hon. gentleman that all they have to reproach him with is simply that he threw too much light on their administration, and had, therefore, incurred their enmity. As to the merits of the petition, I have not a word to say for or against. I do not pretend to be able at this moment to form any judgment upon the merits of the complaint. The Auditor General asks for more power and more help. This is denied by the Government. I am not prepared to condemn the Government. The Government may be right and the Auditor General may be wrong. That is a point upon which I have not formed any opinion at present. But what is the case here? We find a difference of opinion between two independent powers—because, I repeat again, the Auditor General is independent of the Government and responsible only to Parliament. Here are two powers equally responsible—the Government and the Auditor General. There is a difference between them. I am not prepared to say which of them is right, but I say that when one of them comes to Parliament and simply asks that the matter be investigated, the demand is so very reasonable that I am surprised it was not granted at once.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to detain the House only for a few moments to read the

report of a speech with regard to this office made by Sir Charles Tupper when Minister of Finance, on the occasion of the proposed increase of salary to the Auditor General. Perhaps it will be the best answer to the criticism of the Minister of Justice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What year?

Mr. McMULLEN. This speech was made on 17th April, 1888.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a long time ago.

Mr. McMULLEN. Sir Charles Tupper said:

I have no hesitation in saying, as head of the Finance Department, and so being brought in constant and frequent intercourse with the Auditor General, that I believe that it would be impossible for members on either side of this House to over-rate the careful and painstaking ability of that officer or his conscientious devotion to the duties of the most important office which he discharges. He is in every sense of the word an officer of Parliament. Although he has felt it occasionally to be his duty to differ with members of the Administration, and with the conduct of the affairs of the public departments in carrying out the details of his office, I have no hesitation in saying that he has discharged his duty in such a way as to win the confidence and hearty approval of every member of the Government, as I am sure he has earned it of every member of both sides of the House.

Then again, he says:

I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite, that the last thing the Government had in view in this Bill, was to do anything that should enable us to interfere in the slightest degree with the position Parliament has given to the Auditor General. I quite concur in the views expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the value of this officer, to a very great extent, depends on the position he holds as an officer of Parliament, and the sole object we had in view in giving the benefit of the Superannuation Act, was to give a deserving officer the privileges which the Act would confer. But I do see a point in what has been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, that this involves the contingency of the power of removal of the officer by the action of the Government, which certainly was not the intention. I will leave the clause over for such amendment as will enable us entirely to avoid any such thing.

I give the quotations I have just read as a reply to the lengthy tirade against the Auditor General by the Minister of Justice.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

North-west Mounted Police—Required to meet the service of the year..... \$15,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is not an addition to the amount which was voted for the current year. That amount was voted under five or six different heads, the division being made according to the best knowledge of the Controller at the time. The expenditure under some of the heads has been larger and