

they liked, but they would have to do it at their own expense. The following table will show what has been saved in the case of the leader of the opposition:

Year	Repairs, etc.	Gas and oil	Chauffeur's uniform	Chauffeur's salary	Depre- ciation	Total
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1922-23.....	2,774 48	485 08	152 15	1,501 93	1,037 50	5,951 14
1923-24.....	1,652 27	714 14	320 50	1,532 00	1,037 50	5,256 41
1924-25.....	882 13	573 50	109 65	1,440 00	1,037 50	4,042 78
1925-26.....	481 80	568 31	193 15	1,440 00	1,037 50	3,720 76
1926-27.....	602 61	541 81	84 50	1,515 00	1,400 00	4,143 92
1927-28.....	281 43	440 05	213 45	1,657 05	1,400 00	3,992 43
1928-29.....	596 23	438 47	209 52	1,770 00	1,400 00	4,414 22
1929-30.....	465 24	536 02	268 25	1,770 00	1,400 00	4,439 51
1930-31.....	503 81	451 71	124 92	1,770 00	1,400 00	4,250 44

Total expenditure for the nine-year period.....\$ 40,211 61

An hon. MEMBER: Whose car?

Mr. SPOTTON: William Lyon Mackenzie King's.

That is the return of the expenses of the ex-Prime Minister; but in it I have computed the depreciation which I believe is fair. I have asked for outside figuring on this, and hon. gentlemen will kindly check these figures. In 1923-24 a Cadillac was purchased for \$7,150, less \$300 allowed for the old car. We are charging up the \$7,150 because that is really the purchase price of the car. In 1927, that car was traded in valued at \$3,000 towards the cost of an \$8,400 Pierce Arrow. Subtracting the \$3,000 from the original cost of \$7,150, the depreciation on the Cadillac for those four years is \$4,150. Dividing \$4,150 by four we get the depreciation for each year—\$1,037.50. I do not know whether that Pierce Arrow bought in 1927 for \$8,400 has been sold or not, but it would be fair to say that a car five years old would not be worth more than \$1,400. I doubt if any one with \$1,400 cash in his pocket would give more for a Pierce Arrow five years old, even though a prime minister—the grandson of a grandsire—had ridden in it. That represents a depreciation of \$1,400 a year for five years on the Pierce Arrow, plus a depreciation of \$1,037.50 for four years on the Cadillac. In other words, this spendthrift government has stricken out an item of \$5,951.14 and substituted therefor \$2,000; next year it has struck out \$5,256.41 and substituted therefor \$2,000, and so on down the line, the figures being \$4,042.78, \$3,720.76, \$4,143.92, \$3,992.43, \$4,414.22, \$4,439.51, \$4,250.44. The total cost of keeping the car and chauffeur for the ex-Prime Minister for the nine years—the entire upkeep—was \$40,211.61. Under the new arrangement it would be \$18,000 for nine years. I regard that as pretty fair financing. To draw a pen through \$40,211.61 and to

[Mr. Spotton.]

substitute therefor \$18,000 is something commendable. That represents a saving of \$22,211.61 in nine years, or approximately \$2,500 annually.

Mr. SANDERSON: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SPOTTON: If it is short.

Mr. SANDERSON: His figures are very interesting. Has he also the figures relating to the cost of improvements of a private car on the railways for the present Prime Minister?

Mr. SPOTTON: I am very much surprised that my hon. friend should ask that question. He may go on talking about railways; I am talking about cabinet ministers raising salaries. We will now take up the Minister of Immigration. He was the man who had led the economy group—and I am not throwing stones at the United Farmers, because I know the organization well enough to know that the so-called Progressive group who put their hand to the plough and looked back are entirely different from the United Farm group that put their hand to the plough and did not look back. One was a real conversion, the other a mock conversion. The figures for the Department of Immigration are these: 1927-28, \$4,554.42; 1928-29, \$4,503.63; 1929-30, \$4,115.28; 1930-31, \$4,404.85. In other words, in four years there was a total of \$17,796.94, almost \$18,000; and now the government that substitutes therefore the sum of \$8,000 is said to be doing a wrong act. Take the Department of Finance. In eight years we find the total of \$40,910.71 as against \$18,000, a saving of \$22,000 in that period. In the Department of Agriculture in eight years the total was \$28,854.12 as against \$18,000. I will not go into depreciation here. A Cadillac bought in 1924 was turned in in 1927 for a Pierce Arrow.