

not wish to contribute to the superannuation fund it is proposed that they will not receive anything in the way of retiring allowance. Those members of the diplomatic service who are members of the civil service do contribute to the superannuation fund and will continue to do so as at present.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is desirable that there should be some regular arrangement, and I think that the Prime Minister is quite correct, that, if the ordinary civil servant is required to contribute, some such law should apply to people who have not been in the service; and further than that, I think that there should be some relationship between the amount granted and the sort of service rendered as well as the length of time in the service.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is what the government has had in mind with respect to the amount proposed in the estimates in recognition of the Hon. Mr. Roy's services in Paris. Mr. Roy was in Paris representing the government of Canada for some time before and at the time of the great war. Throughout the latter period and subsequently he rendered very great service, not only to our own citizens, but also to many who came from Great Britain and other countries allied with Great Britain in the war. In the long period of time that he has been in France he has been exceptionally generous in the hospitality and service that he has extended to Canadians visiting France. He has not spared himself in any activities which it was possible for him to interest himself in, and which were likely to be of service to Canada. The government has felt, now that he has reached the age of seventy and is retiring, that this recognition is one which the people of Canada generally will regard as well merited.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I was endeavouring to point out that there should be some basis on which matters of this kind should be decided. We give pensions to various types of civil servants and the amount given bears some proportion to the amount of salary previously paid. Under what classification does this item come, or is it to be dealt with altogether regardless of other items of this kind?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A deputy minister in the public service, who had been in the service twenty-five years, would receive upon retirement a pension of, say, \$5,000, or at least half of his salary.

Mr. BENNETT: For which he had paid.

\*Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, from a fund to which he had made contributions, certainly. But the position of a minister in a foreign country would correspond, I should think, more to the position of a member of the government in the importance and responsibilities of the duties he discharges; and certainly in addition there would be obligations upon a minister in the diplomatic service which there would not be in the case of deputy ministers in the public service. If my hon. friend makes such a comparison he will find that what is suggested here in the way of annuity is on a sound and fair basis.

Mr. BENNETT: The only difference between the government and myself with respect to this matter is in the amount that is appropriated. Three years ago I was led to believe that the minister had decided to retire, and I believed, after the most careful consideration with my colleagues, that \$4,000 was a fair payment to make. The reason was this. Mr. Roy was a senator. His indemnity would be \$4,000; had he continued as a senator he would have received \$4,000 during the rest of his life, that being the present rate, though it was not the rate when he left the senate. Now he has made no contribution to the civil service fund, nor for any pension to be paid, nothing whatever, and I think the people of the country in these days would regard \$4,000—certainly I so believed—as reasonable compensation in the way of annuity to one who had rendered twenty-five years of service. The maximum that a civil servant can receive is thirty-five fiftieths of his average salary for a three year period, that is, seven-tenths; and there are very few civil servants who live out the thirty-five years nowadays, because they are retired at the age of sixty or sixty-five, and usually they retire at sixty if they can. Those who get the larger salaries hardly come in before they are twenty-five years of age.

I have no desire to do other than say what I said a few years ago, namely, that I am not unmindful of the service rendered by Mr. Roy. He was rather an extreme partisan, which is something that cannot be readily avoided at times; it is a state of mind rather than anything else at times. But Mr. Roy's contacts with the world in Paris have been of great value to the country, and not entirely lacking in value to himself. I rather think, however, that \$5,000 would be regarded by the average taxpayer of the country as a larger pension than one should receive who has made no contribution at all and for whom