

make as much butter as before. If that is the case, the construction of a national highway across this country might offset to some extent the bad effects of the New Zealand treaty because, according to the Prime Minister's argument, the more tourists that come to this country the more milk will be consumed, although personally I have never been given to understand that the tourists come to this country to drink milk.

The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Dunning) was very much afraid that the construction of a transcontinental highway might interfere with the success of the Canadian National railways. I have a statement here by Sir Henry Thornton, the president of the road, who, speaking at a meeting of the Good Roads Association in Toronto a short time ago, said that he wished that next year we would have two millions of automobiles in Canada instead of one million, because it would be conducive to increasing railway business in this country. He went on to explain that the automobile was the complement of the railway. So the argument of the Minister of Railways does not hold good.

It is not so very long ago that this government, which to-day is afraid to spend money for the construction of a transcontinental highway for the linking up of the peoples of the Dominion, that we might get to know the country in which we live a little better, was prepared, as they announced in the speech from the throne in 1925, to enter into the so-called Petersen contract. I wonder if the members of the government remember that Petersen contract. They were prepared to launch on that expenditure for the purpose of breaking what they said was a shipping combine in the north Atlantic which was breaking the backs of the producers in this country by causing high ocean freight rates, and in that way increasing the cost of living. But the Conservative party in this house exposed the fallacy of that whole argument, and the result was that the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the government of that day has since had the honour of being left at home in his constituency to cogitate on the fickleness of Dame Fortune.

This government is not prepared to do anything for technical education in this country. It is prepared to spend millions and millions of dollars where the expenditure is not called for, but when it comes to expending anything on technical education for the benefit of those who are the least favoured in this country, the government is not prepared to spend the taxpayer's money.

I wonder if this government, which is always talking economy, ever stops to consider

[Mr. Cotnam.]

the cost of the personnel of the cabinet itself. I think the greatest extravagance in this country at the present time is its own government. The seventeen members of the government are the biggest extravagance which we have in this country at this time. There was a time not so very long ago when this government did not have so many supporters in this house as it has now, and they brought down a speech from the throne in which they said that in order to cut down expenditures they were going to reduce the number of departments, but now, instead of reducing the number of departments, they are going to give us more and more departments, with extra cabinet ministers, and extra cabinet pay. It takes seventeen cabinet ministers to govern this country now, and in a short time we shall have eighteen, for a people of 9,500,000, while the United States, with 120,000,000 people, can be governed through seven cabinet ministers.

Then we have our embassy at Washington. Last year we bought a palatial residence for the Hon. Vincent Massey in Washington at a cost to the taxpayers of this country of \$500,000. Whether we need an embassy down there or not is another question, but I would like to make a few observations on what it is costing us to keep the Hon. Vincent Massey down in Washington. According to the Auditor General's report this year, under the heading of Salaries and Wages, the Hon. Vincent Massey gets this title:

Envoy extraordinary—

I do not know whether there is anything extraordinary about the Hon. Vincent Massey. I never saw it anyway:

—and minister plenipotentiary, Hon. Vincent Massey, \$12,000, house representation allowance, 2 months at \$18,000, 10 months at \$10,000, allowance for automobile, \$2,000.

Then there is a list of first secretaries, commercial secretaries, chauffeurs, and so forth, with salaries ranging all the way from five to six thousand dollars apiece, and then at the bottom of the account we see this item:

Newspapers and publications, \$893.22; postage, \$319; rent of offices, \$900; rent of rooms at The Mayflower for Hon. V. Massey—

I suppose the Hon. Vincent Massey thought he had come over in the Mayflower and was one of the original four hundred:

—April 1 to June 1, \$2,541.69.

That money comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers in this Dominion. That is what we are paying for keeping the Hon. Vincent Massey in Washington, and what we would like to know is what we are getting anyway through having Mr. Massey down there.