

additional vote. On January 18, 1924, a new auditor general was appointed. Can the Prime Minister say under what terms he was appointed? Was he appointed for life? Was there any indication at that time that the treatment he would receive would be that of a supreme court judge? The present Prime Minister was Prime Minister at that time. Can he recollect the terms under which the auditor general who has just been retired was appointed?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot recollect the terms of the appointment.

Mr. McCANN: While the hon. gentleman who occupies the position of Deputy Speaker of the house is quite within his rights in leaving the chair to defend any of his friends or civil servants of the house, let me say that he has performed a unique act on this occasion.

Mr. ILSLEY: I have seen it done before. The gentleman who was deputy speaker between 1930 and 1935 did it.

Mr. VIEN: The hon. gentleman will admit that the Deputy Speaker is still the member for Outremont.

Mr. McCANN: I indicated that in my opening sentence when I said that while the hon. gentleman was quite within his rights, it was a unique act for one in his position.

Mr. VIEN: I am defending what I considered a case of simple justice.

Mr. McCANN: The hon. gentleman's argument does not hold water. The auditor general's position and that of judges of the supreme court, while they may be relative, are not comparable. There is only one auditor general, and that is the case we are dealing with on this occasion. I submit that if the auditor general of Canada has a contract with the dominion through this government and he feels that he is unjustly dealt with, he should have recourse to justice through the exchequer court of Canada. Let him sue the dominion for that which he feels is due him. He is already receiving superannuation. It has been argued he is not even a civil servant. If he is not even a civil servant, then why does he claim treatment under the civil service superannuation? He is a civil servant, although perhaps not appointed by the civil service commission. He is responsible to the parliament of Canada, and the parliament of Canada to the people, and this is the proper place to deal with this particular item.

When this matter was brought up and studied for two years by the committee on superannuation, of which I was a member,

I felt that an injustice was being done if superannuation were paid to any employee of this government at a rate higher than \$4,000 per annum. While this matter would not come under that particular regulation, with regard to employees of the government who take on superannuation from such a date as the recommendation of the superannuation committee might be put into effect, we attempted to establish, and so recommended to the government, that no employee be given superannuation in excess of \$4,000 a year.

What does this mean? A superannuation allowance of \$4,800 and an annuity of \$1,500, total \$6,300 a year. It means that this government sets aside a capital sum of \$200,000, the interest on which shall be paid to a public servant who has received a salary of \$15,000. I do not know Mr. Gonthier personally at all; I do not know what his needs are, but I protest as strongly as I can against the injustice of giving one man \$6,300 a year while another man who has given his life to the government service for thirty or forty years is put off with a meagre \$80 or \$90 or \$100 a month.

Mr. VIEN: What attitude did the hon. member take in this house when retiring allowance equal to full salary was allowed the judges of the supreme court?

Mr. McCANN: It is, of course, hard to deal with these individual cases when laws are established and pension is given by statute. The principle of the whole thing is wrong.

Mr. VIEN: The same principle applies here.

Mr. McCANN: The principle is wrong whether it has been established for years or not, and people protest against it. I hear it from time to time; one reads every day in the papers of people protesting against high government officials who have had good salaries throughout their life being given superannuation far above what they are actually entitled to. The cases may be relative, but they are not comparable. I hope the day may come when these large superannuation allowances will not be put into effect. I believe that a man who has been employed and has given good service and who, on a contributory basis, has built up for himself something to keep him in his later years, is entitled to it. But why should people who are employees of a government have the taxpayers pay them so much a year for the rest of their life? Are there not many other people who are rendering service to the country? What about the professional men, men in the medical profession for example;