

position which, as the leader of the opposition has said, corresponded with that of high commissioner in London. Mr. Roy was continued through the period of the great war, and after so long as Sir Robert continued in office. When Mr. Meighen succeeded Sir Robert as Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs, he, too, retained Mr. Roy in that position.

My recollection is that after the Conservative government was formed in 1911, the late Sir George Foster went to France on an important mission. Sir George had been strongly prejudiced against Mr. Roy, possibly because he believed there must necessarily be partisanship inasmuch as Mr. Roy was an appointee of a Liberal government, but Sir George came back from Paris feeling very strongly the other way. He had found Mr. Roy's services invaluable, and also that Mr. Roy himself held the confidence of the French ministers to a remarkable degree. I believe at that time it was in large part Sir George's influence which was responsible for Mr. Roy's continuance in office. Sir George was there, and saw and appreciated the nature of the work accomplished. When the Liberal administration took office Mr. Roy was continued, and my right hon. friend retained his services when he took office. I believe Mr. Roy has endeavoured to serve all governments conscientiously and faithfully. There may be some evidences of partisanship which may be in the mind of my right hon. friend, with which I am not familiar.

Mr. BENNETT: There are.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I suggest the long record of a service of twenty-seven years under different governments and through most critical times distinguishes Mr. Roy as a faithful public servant, and one whose exceptional as well as long services to the state are deserving of every recognition.

In regard to the desirability of having a diplomatic service so constituted that men entering the service may look forward to a permanent career therein and to recognition by way of promotion for merit, I am in entire agreement with my right hon. friend. As he has pointed out, however, the service up to the present time is small, and the responsibilities of a minister are great. A minister in Europe to-day is in about as important a relation to his country as a man can possibly be. While it is certainly desirable to find among the younger members of the service those who merit promotion to higher positions, I submit that with world conditions what they are to-day a great responsibility

rests upon a government with respect to the character, capacity, experience and particularly the sound judgment of the men to be appointed to the post of minister abroad.

Mention has been made of the name of Mr. Justice Turgeon. I think it is only natural that he should have been thought of. Certainly were he appointed to a position of the kind it would not be as a reward for political service in any way, but because of qualities of exceptional judgment and ability, which are recognized I believe on all sides of the house. As hon. members know, however, it is not possible, until provision has been made for the office, and until the name of whoever is suggested has been approved by the government of the country to which he is to be sent, to say anything about the person likely to receive appointment. All I can say is that in any appointment to be made the government will endeavour to make a selection which will commend itself to the country, irrespective of the political affiliation indicated.

Mr. THOMPSON: What was Mr. Roy's annual salary while he was minister to France?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: \$12,000.

Mr. BENNETT: And living and automobile allowances.

Mr. THOMPSON: Then I must register a protest against payment of the amount indicated in the vote. I protest against the payment of these moneys to a man who has been drawing during that time \$12,000 a year.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just in the years he was minister.

Mr. THOMPSON: Drawing \$12,000 a year during the years he was minister he should have saved enough to look after himself for the rest of his life. I farmed during my lifetime; I worked hard and saved. Had I not saved something for my old age I would have to go to the poor house. That is all there would be ahead of me. I am decidedly opposed to pensions being paid by the government to people who have not contributed towards them. This pension is to be paid by the already over-burdened taxpayers of Canada. It appears that \$5,000 per year is to be given to a man who since 1909—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should have said 1911.

Mr. THOMPSON:—a man who since 1911 has been drawing \$12,000 a year and allowances.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He has not been drawing \$12,000 since 1911; he drew that amount in the last ten years.