

Q. Then, Mr. Bennett, you do not know whether it is \$49,000 in addition to the changes and renovation, the cost of the old car in the first place, or whether the \$49,000 was only for renovation and changes?—A. Well, all I know is this, that my information was as handed to me after this came up. I made some inquiries about it and I find that there is a letter from the President of the Canadian National Railways directed to Dr. Manion which says:

As you are aware, the business car at present assigned to the Prime Minister is unsatisfactory in certain respects, and inasmuch as it will cost more to alter it than to build a new one, I propose to pursue the latter course. An additional business car is badly needed and, by taking over the Prime Minister's car and providing him with another one, I can fill the deficiency. This is something which certainly ought to be done, and I believe it sound business to do so.

That was Sir Henry Thornton's letter. My memoranda is that car 102 was taken back which was represented as being worth \$57,500. There was an actual saving, as I say, of between \$8,000 and \$10,000 to the country.

Q. I would like to know how much it cost the Canadian National Railways to renovate and renew this car 100.—A. They did not do that. They were building a new car, so I was informed, instead of which they took over the former car and substituted a partially new car, which is the car now used by the Prime Minister, and in the figures that were handed to the minister it represents a saving of some \$8,000, the cost I believe upon the new car being \$49,000, which was the cost that they would make in any event, and not for the new car for the Prime Minister but for the car they were building for themselves.

Q. I have heard it said that you paid for these changes yourself?—A. No. There may be some slight expense on the car that I did pay.

Q. They tell some good things about you as well as bad.—A. Mr. Duff, my objection in all this matter is that I should have been charged with stealing the public money, and that my sister's name was dragged into this matter, as it was.

Q. I am opposed to that, sir.—A. And the reiteration and the incorrectness of the story. Those are the only things. I would not bother any committee with it only for that. The personal attacks of Mr. Gordon has made upon me I do not bother about. That is part of the price you pay for being in public life. In other words, Mr. Duff, other people besides Mr. Gordon have made statements about other public men. These charge made against me personally by Mr. Gordon are charges which I am not discussing here; but when you charge the Prime Minister of a country, whoever he happens to be, it is not the man, it is the office. I was not prepared to stand it. That is my position.

Q. Mr. Bennett, you said in your statement regarding Major Herridge's trip to London to the Imperial Conference that he did not receive any remuneration. Now, did you say part of his expenses were paid by the government?—A. I saw that they were paid. He did not know that they were paid until after they were and he said he did not wish his expenses to be paid. I said they had to be paid by the country—as they were.

Q. I do not see anything wrong about it at all.—A. I may say to you I spent much more money than the country paid so far as I was concerned on that occasion.

Q. I have done that myself.—A. I hope so.

Q. I notice there is a criticism here, Mr. Bennett, of your appointment of Mr. Herridge as Canadian Envoy at Washington. I suppose you take full responsibility for making that appointment?—A. Yes, Mr. Duff. That is a matter of fair political criticism against which no public man would have any right to make any objection. It is your right to criticize.