

tor General. Some further consideration should be given by the Government, and a special clause prepared.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. On the other hand, who is to decide when that officer is to be superannuated?

Mr. MITCHELL. Parliament.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Then the matter must be brought to Parliament by somebody. It should be brought by the Government. Supposing this officer is perfectly independent, as we are of opinion he should be, of the Government, and you say he must contribute to the superannuation fund the same as any other officer, and is to be superannuated after so many years, when he becomes disabled, he should obtain his superannuation on the same scale as that fixed for any other officer of the Government. Well, the Auditor General will, most likely, when he finds he is failing in health, claim superannuation. He must write to some one, and he will write to the Government, which is the executive of the country. If you say that officer cannot be superannuated without the Government first coming to Parliament to obtain consent, he would not be different from any other officer. Because, if I am not mistaken, the Superannuation Act says that the names of the officers who are superannuated during the year must be reported to Parliament within so many days after the beginning of the Session. Therefore, this officer would be in the same position, and would be reported as such; but, suppose that officer becomes unfit for his work and is unable to claim his superannuation, is the Government to wait for six or eight months till Parliament meets before it can have an officer to discharge those duties?

Mr. LAURIER. Suppose he is unfit for his work to-day?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Suppose he is unfit for his work at any time. The case never arose before, but it is well to discuss it now. Suppose that officer is unfit for his work. He does not ask for his superannuation, or perhaps he is unable to ask for his superannuation. What is to be done? Are we to remain five or six or eight months without an auditor? I think not. I think, if the auditor is unfit for his work, the Government should have the responsibility of replacing that officer during the year until Parliament meets, and should then report to Parliament and let Parliament deal with the matter. The Government would report the circumstances and would say: We had to put some one in there to fulfil those duties; we could not leave the accounts without audit during all those months. But if the officer applies for superannuation, the Government should have the power to grant it if he is unfit for his work. But, if he asks for superannuation and he is still fit for his work, the Government should not grant it, and the Government would have to report to Parliament that the officer had asked for superannuation, but that the Government did not think he was unfit for his work, and therefore did not think he should be superannuated. One of the hon. gentlemen who spoke said the Auditor General should be altogether independent of the Government, that we should not be in a position to increase his salary or to give him any preferment. That is hardly the thing. We are doing the very contrary now.

An hon. MEMBER. Parliament is.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The initiative comes from the executive, and I must say, continuing what the Minister of Finance said just now, that the Auditor General, who was, when he was in Parliament, opposed to us, and voted conscientiously against us, as we voted against his party and against himself, though he has an arduous duty to perform, a very difficult and a very unpopular duty, has performed his duties well. The Auditor General has never been a popular officer, and he never will be a popular officer, because his duties must make him unpopular. He is in the

Mr. LAURIER.

way of everyone. He is in the way of the ordinary officers, he is in the way of the Deputy Ministers, and, no doubt, very often he is in the way of the Ministers as well; and that is the reason why the office was created, and that is why we have supported him, because we think that, when Parliament in its wisdom created that officer, it did so for the purpose in accordance with which he is now acting. I think we agree on both sides as to what is to be done with this officer, and probably the best way would be to pass the resolution, report it, and go into Committee of the Whole on another day and amend it in the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. I submit this point for the consideration of the Minister. To-day, as the law stands, the office of Auditor General can be vacated by death, resignation or by removal on a resolution of the House. It is not intended that, as far as that provision of the law is concerned, there should be any amendment. The only thing contemplated is that, if the auditor was stricken by disease, he should not be left penniless, but should have the same provision as other public servants have. I would suggest that some such clause as this would meet the case:

"The auditor shall have the privilege of contributing to the Superannuation Fund, and, if he resigns or is removed, he will be entitled to the same superannuation pension as if he belonged to the Civil Service."

I think that clause would meet the case.

Mr. THOMPSON. My own view is that we had better adopt the clause as amended, and, as the Bill has to go before the Committee of the Whole, I will consider the matter subsequently. I think it might be better to adopt the terms now proposed, or to make the whole of the clauses of the Superannuation Act apply to the Audit Act. I think nearly every provision of that Act should apply to him except section 8, which makes the retirement compulsory. It has been suggested that this would put him too much in the hands of the Government, that the Government would have to reward him by adding to his years of service, and that the Treasury Board in that way would have the power to influence him. Look at the position now. The auditor is entitled to no superannuation allowance. Parliament can provide for him, but it can only provide for him by an Act, so that practically he is now in the hands of the Government in that way, and the only control which we would have would be that, if that officer applied for superannuation to-morrow, the Treasury Board would have to ascertain his term of service and report whether, being a zealous officer, we should add to his term of service. It seems to me that, in any case, it would be absolutely necessary that the Treasury Board should have the right to investigate whether the officer has arrived at the time of life or is suffering from such an infirmity as would entitle him to superannuation.

Mr. CASEY. It is clear that this officer, being an able officer, and there being no provision for his superannuation, must be put under some regulations, either under a special set of regulations involving perhaps nearly the whole of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, or under a set of regulations which are already applicable to another class of officials, and I urge that he should be placed under the set of regulations which apply to that class of officials most like him—I refer to the judges.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will observe that in that case, in the first place, he would not have to contribute to the superannuation fund, in the second place he would be entitled to two-thirds of his salary if he became infirm the day after he was appointed, and he would be entitled to retire on an allowance for fifteen years service.

Mr. CASEY. No doubt he would have certain privileges under those circumstances which he would not have under the proposed provision. He would not have to contribute