

It is untrue that I obtained a new private car for my own use at a cost to Canada of \$125,000.

It is untrue that the cost of Mrs. Herridge's honeymoon trip to Europe had been paid out of the Canadian treasury.

It is untrue that Mr. Herridge was ever engaged by me as a full-time legal advisor, or any other time legal advisor. When I went to the Imperial Conference in 1930 I asked Mr. Herridge to accompany me as a personal legal assistant and he agreed to do so. He was paid nothing for his services. He declined to accept any compensation.

Q. Either for services or expenses?—A. Just one moment. He declined to accept his expenses and I insisted they should be paid by the country as part of the expense of the delegation, and in part they were so paid, and partially by himself personally. He was never employed by the government to conduct any case in the Privy Council, either in the Radio or any other case. His stay in London was coincident with my own. He went with us to the Imperial Conference, and returned with me. I think that covers the statements that are made.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Bennett, just for the purpose of the record, what was the date of the Imperial Conference?—A. I think I arrived in London on the afternoon of the 1st day of October, 1930—that is my memory—and I returned to Canada in December, 1930. That is when I reached Canada. With respect to the car—

Q. May I just follow that for a moment? When was Major Herridge married?—A. In April, 1931. With respect to the railway car, I should like the committee to know that the car, now No. 100, is a car that was exchanged with the Canadian National Railways. After I became Prime Minister, car, I think 100, was turned over to me and it was suggested that I might want some changes in the car. It was a very fine car only the accommodation was not the sort of accommodation, perhaps, that I would prefer.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Was that the car used by the previous Prime Minister?—A. Yes, the Prime Minister's car, and the President of the Canadian National Railways intimated that he had to have a new business car and that if I wished he would take that car and give me one of their business cars and, as a matter of fact, that was done—so there is no car added to the government cars in any way, shape or form, but a substitution of one car for another car. As a matter of fact, car 100 that is now used by me is not a new car, for part of old 102 was used for that purpose. I had nothing whatever to do with it. I only know what changes were made in the accommodation and conveniences of the car; but there was no expenditure of any such sum as was mentioned, and there has been no additions to the cars.

Q. You would know how much the total expenditure on that car was for renovating and changing it?—A. I was told that they took over the old car and took the trucks off the car and spent, I believe, something like \$49,000. That is the sum that was spent on the car to make the new car.

Q. For all the renovation and changes?—A. That is my understanding; but I had nothing to do with that. The railway company took the car over, and they say it actually represented a saving of something like \$8,000 or \$10,000. Keep in mind they were building a new car, not renovating the former car; but they took over the former car and the car I now have was substituted for it. I understand the car I now have cost something like \$49,000, but they took the old car which they valued for their purposes at \$57,000.