is going to have the desired effect of doing away with the evils of patronage—

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: Just transferring it, that is all.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER:—If this is going to do away with the evils of patronage, I will be perfectly satisfied, as I know every gentleman in this Chamber will; for, whatever we did when we were in the Commons, as some of us were, whatever patronage we exercised, that is now no longer in our power. We are deprived, by reason of sitting in this Canadian House of Lords, of exercising the privilege of patronage. The appointments now will be made, as I understand, by the deputy heads of the various departments.

I am going to give you a concrete case to show how beautifully this system will work out. The Auditor General of this country is one of those deputy heads. Am I correct in that?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Yes.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: The Auditor General has done his duty by his country, as every man should do who lives in a new country like Canada, that requires population. As a result he has been blessed with many olive branches; and, just as a man of substance who is a farmer and has a large farm and a large number of sons likes to have those sons follow the same occupation as himself and become farmers, and settle in the same community as himself, so the Auditor General, following this example, has very cleverly settled all those olive branches of his in the public service of this country. Some time back, in the year 1913—before the war, if you will remember —I asked a few questions in the House of Commons, as follows:

1. What is the salary of the Auditor General?
2. Are Harold John Fraser and Ethel Maud Fraser employed in any department of the public service? If so, in what department, when were they respectively first employed, and what are their salaries?
3. Are William A. Fraser and Robert J. Fraser employed in the Government service? If so, in what department or departments, and what are their salaries respectively?
4. Are the said Harold John Fraser, Ethel Maud Fraser, William A. Fraser and Robert J. Fraser related to the Auditor General? If so, what is the relationship?

The answer was that those persons were employed in the public service; and answer number 4 states: "Yes, sons and daughter respectively." That is, that those who were males were sons of the Auditor General, and the other, the female, was the daughter of the Auditor General. Since that time a number of the others have reached an age when they might be appointed to the public service.

Hon. Mr. POWER: I rise to a question of order. This speech which the honourable gentleman is delivering has no relevance whatever to the section which is before the Committee.

The Hon. the CHAIRMAN: I understood the leader of the House to say to the leader of the Opposition that if he would allow this Bill to go into Committee of the Whole the principle of the Bill could be discussed. Am I right in that?

Hon. Mr. POWER: This has nothing to do with the principle of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: Nothing to do with the principle of the Bill? It has everything to do with the principle of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. POWER: I forgot to mention that this matter has been discussed in the other Chamber, which is the proper place to discuss a question of this sort.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: Suppose it has been discussed in the other Chamber, what has that to do with this Chamber? We are not depending on the discussions in the other Chamber. But the Chairman has ruled, and that is sufficient. During the present session, in the other Chamber the question was asked, whether those persons and some others were sons, or in what relation they were. I do not know why a different answer should have been given, under these circumstances, from what was given when I was told that they were "sons and daughter respectively"; but the answer in the recent case was: "No information in the records of the office." That was the answer which the Auditor General gave when he was asked by a member of Parliament if those persons were his sons or daughter. It would apparently look as though between 1913 and 1918 some doubts had occurred to his mind; otherwise why should he not answer? It has been said that maternity is an absolute fact, while paternity is something that may admit of doubt. Perhaps the Auditor General had this in mind. However, we have seen that every son and daughter of the Auditor General who was old enough for the public service has been appointed to the public service. Not only that, but his son-in-law, after he became such, was appointed to the public service, and is to-day receiving $8 per day. Every individual connected with the family of the Auditor General, by marriage or by