

Mr. THOMPSON: And that makes \$120,000. What were his allowances?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understand they were \$13,000 a year.

Mr. THOMPSON: His allowance amounted to \$13,000 a year and his salary to \$12,000. If you go out into the country and tell the people that a man who has been drawing \$12,000 salary and \$13,000 allowances for the past ten years is to be given \$5,000 a year for the rest of his life you know what will be said about it. I would ask that the item be struck out altogether.

Mr. DUPUIS: What are his annual expenditures due to his functions?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I believe if I were to go into detail it would be found that his expenditures took up most of, if not in some years more than his salary and allowances.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Since I have tried to get some answer to the question as to how the sum was arrived at, perhaps I might be permitted more or less to endorse the view just expressed. I have nothing whatever to say personally against Mr. Roy or his service to the country; I want that clearly understood. Further than that I know there are many people in one way or another connected with the government service whose salaries seem very high in comparison with those of ordinary Canadians. I recognize that. At the same time I do not see any way of bringing the matter to the attention of the house other than by taking it up on a particular instance of this kind. That is the reason I speak at this time. If any one else were involved I would proceed in the same manner.

When I think of the niggardly allowances we give to people on old age pensions, when I think of \$20 a month in some provinces being cut down to \$15, and when I consider the large numbers of people who to-day are striving desperately to maintain themselves and to educate their children on very small means, I feel the country is not in a position to give large salaries, large allowances or large annuities to any one group, even though that group may be associated with the government. After all, those of us who as members of the House of Commons, or of the civil service, or who serve the country in some other capacity, are drawing public funds must remember that those sums are paid by the ordinary people. The people on the public payrolls are not in a higher position than the citizens at large. Since the great majority of our citizens are not receiving anything like

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

these salaries, I think it is high time that there should be a revision in the whole scale of payment to those who receive their living from government sources.

For example while the internal arrangements of the old post office near this building may have been far from modern, I never go out and see the efforts being made to tear down its walls without feeling that it is wrong that we should act in that way when all over the country there are hundreds of thousands of people with hardly a roof over their heads. We have hesitated to go into a housing scheme yet we do not need to go any further than to lower town in Ottawa to see the wretched housing conditions that exist. I am not oblivious to the need for beautifying the capital. I recognize it should be a beautiful place; these institutions belong to all the people, but we must not forget that in our ordinary affairs we try to place necessities before luxuries. This government ought to be made to understand that the vast majority of the people of Canada are to-day in necessitous circumstances. Hardly a day goes by that I have, not only correspondence but interviews with people who come to me to explain the difficult—yes, almost desperate—situation in which they find themselves. I am frankly taking advantage of this opportunity to bring this aspect of the case before the government. We must take advantage of opportunities like this to drive home a position that is held, not only by some of us as individuals but I am sure by the whole of the people whom we are sent here to represent.

Mr. MacNEIL: Would the Prime Minister explain Canada's position in relation to Mexico, in view of the withdrawal of the British ambassador from that country? In what manner are our interests being represented at the present time?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We have a trade commissioner in Mexico who looks after our interests so far as trade is concerned. I doubt if we have sufficient political interests to require special representation in that country at the present time.

Mr. BENNETT: Speaking for myself and for many others I say frankly that the appointment of Mr. Justice Turgeon to Paris would be looked upon as an affront to the Canadian people. Since November, 1935, Mr. Justice Turgeon has not sat on the bench, but he has drawn his salary as a justice together with other moneys as well. If he were to be appointed now to represent us in Paris it would have a most serious and detrimental