

purchased one radio, several pianos and things of that kind. Some of us in our own homes are still using the china which we had when we were married and some of us have not even been able to afford a radio. Even some hon. members who presumably are living on a scale a good deal higher than that of many of the ordinary working people and farmers cannot afford many of these things. Yet this is the scale we are maintaining for the upkeep of two individuals who happen to be our guests here for the time. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether this is setting the best example to our young Canadian people. We have been told that work and thrift are the great things which we ought to have in Canada. We were told in the early days that we ought to develop Spartan-like qualities. Is it a good thing for us to set up on this scale? I have wondered!—and I have wondered where it is going to end. Everything should be more or less in proportion. I had a letter to-day from a civil servant, an employee of this government, from which I shall read a paragraph. I cannot help thinking of these things when I come to vote on expenditures of this character. It reads:

Seeing that we shall not get any general advance in salaries this year, I hope some means will be found, before the house progresses, to get the government to consider the payment of a minimum salary of \$100 per month to all adult fully employed civil servants. This is the most important part to us, as I do not know, speaking frankly, how these married men manage to hang out on their \$75 and \$85 per month pittances. I am a house owner myself, and have an exceptional lass for my wife, and am on the top grade as a letter carrier, so do not feel the pinch; but how the others manage, and how local merchants can expect to carry on successfully with these wages prevailing is beyond me entirely.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Whom did my hon. friend say the letter was from?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is from a letter carrier.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is his name and the date of the letter?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not think it is necessary to give the name of a private correspondent.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I submit that it is quite contrary to the rules of the house for anyone to read a letter unless he is prepared to give the name of the writer.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The Prime Minister will have to show me that rule before I can accept it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I can show it to my hon. friend.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have quoted from a private letter that has come to me only to-day, and which states what I believe to be the facts. I have done so simply because I feel that in this house we are too apt to be caught in the atmosphere of the capital city and to judge things by the standards of the wealthy people whom we may meet with here, and we need sometimes either to go back home or to receive letters from home in order to be brought face to face with the actual conditions which confront large numbers of our people in Canada to-day. Only the other day I happened to be talking to a young working woman right here in the city of Ottawa. She was rather downcast, and I learned the reason. She said to me, "My wedding will have to be postponed. I had hoped to be married on the first of May, but my young man cannot get work, and so we cannot get married this year." That kind of thing is quite common to-day, and as I think of these young lives in which the happiness of setting up a home is indefinitely postponed because there is very little chance of getting work, even in the springtime of the year; when I think of the many homes in which medical treatment or a surgical operation is postponed year after year, much as it may be needed, because of the great expense; when I think of the many homes where the coming of a baby into the home is a domestic tragedy, when I think of the long years of part payments which so many people have to make in order to get the ordinary necessities of their home life, I wonder if we in Canada are justified in authorizing such elaborate expenditures as we pass so lightly in this house.

I have said that these are matters of comparison. I turn over to another page in these very estimates, to page 60, where under the heading of "Miscellaneous" I find:

Grant for the Canadian National Institute for the blind, \$10,000.

Grant to the Canadian Council on child welfare, \$5,000.

Grant to the Canadian Dental Hygiene Council, \$5,000.

Grant to the Canadian Social Hygiene Council, \$10,000.

Grant to the Canadian Tuberculosis Association, \$25,000.

Grant to the Canadian National Committee for mental hygiene, \$10,000.

You could put all these items together, Mr. Chairman, and they amount to practically the same as this one item which we are now being asked to vote for improving and furnishing Rideau Hall. Or I turn to the page of these estimates opposite to that