

Q. Just as you have stated to Mr. Bowman, that you knew he spoke of Mr. Herridge, and you believe—A. Yes, I believed he spoke of the Prime Minister.

Q. You are not clear as to that?—A. I was rather surprised at the time at the outcome of Mr. Gordon's speech; and my impression was he has merely taken the opportunity at that meeting to make a public apology.

Q. To make an apology generally? And you do not remember particularly what was mentioned?—A. I was satisfied that he mentioned Mr. Herridge's name, and the Canadian Minister at Washington, and I am not quite positive in my own mind that he mentioned the Prime Minister.

Q. You are not quite as clear on that?—A. Not quite as clear, no.

*By Mr. Bowman:*

Q. When you went to that meeting, had you seen previously the article in the *Globe*, referring to the statements which Mr. Gordon had made previously?—A. Yes.

Q. You had seen that?—A. I had.

Q. I presume they appeared to be somewhat serious charges?

The CHAIRMAN: Again, that is hardly fair.

The WITNESS: Being in politics, my reply to that was that I did not take it very seriously.

Q. To you, they were not very serious charges?—A. Well, no. Not being in politics I might have taken them seriously.

Q. Being in politics, you, as a member of parliament, do not consider them very serious charges?—A. From a political speaker, no.

Q. You would not agree with what was in the editorial appearing in the *Globe* in which they were referred to as sensational statements which upset governments, implying a major scandal?—A. I do not think I read that. There must have been two editorials in the *Globe*. I do not think I read that one.

Q. You never read that?—A. I never heard that until I came into the room this morning.

Q. You did read one?—A. I did read one.

Q. You say it was different from this?—A. Yes, the other one was a different one from that.

Q. Do you know of any other one except that?—A. I never read that one before.

Q. You never read that editorial?—A. I read an editorial.

Q. As a matter of fact, there seems to be some confusion as to whether there was one editorial or two editorials.—A. There must have been two; because I never heard of any—about upsetting governments. I never heard that before.

Q. That does appear in the editorial that has been read into the record, and it is the only editorial that we know of?—A. I do not remember reading that.

Q. As a matter of fact, when Mr. Gordon spoke at Cobourg, the matter did not impress you as being of much importance—A. I was surprised that he had taken the opportunity at that meeting to make the statement he did.

Q. You were surprised that he had bothered about making a statement in Cobourg?—A. I am not going as far as to say I was surprised that he had bothered about it, but I was surprised that at that particular meeting—when Mr. Gordon got to his feet, that was the import of his speech.

Q. As a matter of fact, you did not take it seriously at all, and you were really surprised that Mr. Gordon should bring it up again at Cobourg?—A. I would not put it that way.

Q. How would you put it?—A. This was a political meeting, a political convention. When Mr. Gordon got up to speak I say he used the opportunity to make an apology, and I did not expect him to do that. I thought he was going to make a political speech.