

when they have made the statements, and that reliability is attached to such statements. That is the point I am desiring to make with you. If you were conducting a newspaper I think you will agree that you would be warranted in treating as seriously as the *Globe* editorial did a statement made by one who had occupied the position of a Minister of the Crown, and who is a member of the Privy Council, a member of the Bar and a King's Councillor. There is a great distinction between that and statements made by some wholly irresponsible person. That is all the point I desire to make with you, Mr. Duff.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that all, Mr. Duff.

*By Mr. Howard:*

Q. Mr. Bennett, in connection with the car, in your own judgment do you think the statement that you made is correct—that really there was a credit of \$8,000 to Canada?—A. I tell you this is the position. I am not a car manufacturer, and I was not very particular, Mr. Howard, about the car one way or the other. My memory is,—and I am only speaking now from long memory—I thought the old car was much more ornate than I cared to have, and the kitchen, if I remember right, is an old fashioned one and was situated between the dining room and the end of the car. That is my memory now. At any rate, the President of the Canadian National Railways spoke to me about it. He said what his letter said to Dr. Manion, that they were making a new car, and he said you can have it if you like. I said I would not become a party to any large expenditure of money for a car, and they said if they made this exchange it would cost the country nothing, and whether the credit of \$8,000 is so or not I can only say that that is the figure given me by the department. I may say to you that I became a little worried about the matter after I went away to England, and I sent word over that I did not want any expense put on a new car. As a matter of fact, you see what has happened, there is no new car. The old trucks of another car are used, and the car they were building for themselves is now the Prime Minister's car. I admit that I did have a name put on the car in addition.

Q. I am not criticizing for one minute the right of the Prime Minister to a private car; but I was just trying to get this: there was a car in existence that the late Prime Minister used at the time they were starting to build a new car. Therefore, if the expenditure of building a new car had been stopped it would have saved the country some \$60,000, \$75,000 or \$100,000.—A. Less than that, according to the figures they gave. The only thing about it is they said they need a car. I am not a judge of that, and I had no power to stop them; but if it had been stopped there would have been no new Prime Minister's car.

Q. Right, but on the other hand the fact that a new car was built did cost this country whatever the cost of the new car was.—A. It cost the Canadian National Railways you mean?

Q. Yes. After all, that is the same thing as the government of Canada to-day. The point I am getting at is this, that in view of that fact it is current around through the country, I believe, that in the costs to the Canadian National Railways this year there was a new car, and, therefore, I think possibly the statement that the Prime Minister had had a new car which cost the country so many thousands of dollars was fully justifiable.—A. Mr. Howard criticizes the fact that the old car was substituted for another car. I am not making any complaint about it, but that isn't so at all, and the cost of \$125,000 is incorrect. I quite agree that any public action of the Prime Minister, or any other member of the government, is quite a proper matter for criticism.

Mr. HOWARD: Certainly. That is just what I was getting at, and the fact that the new car was provided during this year might allow someone to make the statement. As to whether it cost \$70,000 or \$125,000, I do not think that is important.