

that had been wrongly given—I attended at Cobourg and at this meeting where there were a large number of persons present, including a number of Conservatives and reporters, as I ascertained, one of whom was reporting for the *Toronto Globe*, I immediately made a statement on that occasion that I had done an injustice to the Prime Minister and also to Major Herridge in stating that Major Herridge had argued a case for the dominion government while he was on his honeymoon trip, but that it was a case for a client of his firm; and having done him an injustice as well as Mr. Bennett I took that opportunity of retracting and explaining the fact that I had been confused as to the two cases, and I said that I apologized for the injustice that I had done him. I went further and said that I did not wish to do an injustice to any man, and that I had fallen into this error because I had taken this information I had received from certain sources which I believed at that time to be responsible, but the confusion had taken place by reason of the appointment Major Herridge received as a legal adviser which I assumed meant he was legal adviser of the government of Canada. I wish to say before my examination takes place this: That in regard to what was stated in *The Fredericton Gleaner* there was no confirmation at any time by telephone or otherwise of anything that I had stated at Hamilton and *The Fredericton Gleaner's* implications and innuendos are not founded, at least, upon anything I said. I wish to state now that there was never at any time any suggestion that there was any profit taking or any gain by Premier Bennett or Major Herridge in respect of their official positions, and I submit it is not suggested. But I suppose that is for the committee to decide; but that is my contention at the present time.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. Is that everything you want to say?—A. That is what I am saying at the present time. There may be some questions asked which may extend my reference to what I have said.

Q. But it is all you want to say at the moment?—A. That is all at the moment. I expect there will be inquiries made by members of the committee.

*By Mr. Duff:*

Q. Mr. Gordon, you were here yesterday when the Prime Minister made his statement?—A. Yes.

Q. You heard him say in his remarks that he had been accused of—not stealing money—I forget the exact words—but he took it from your remarks at Hamilton that you had accused him of being a thief?—A. I am sorry he said that. There was no such thought in my mind. I had known Premier Bennett as a member of the Canadian Bar Association and a member of the bar of very eminent standing, and I was one of the Ontario group that was very active in seeking his election as the president of the Canadian Bar Association because of the feeling I had of his eminence at the bar. And my relations with him had always been very cordial up—to be frank about it—up to the time of his Regina speech of the “great betrayal”, and since then I was a little stronger in the language I had used than I had used before that date.

Q. I understand you to mean that there was no reflection on Mr. Bennett's probity or honesty in regard to public funds?—A. I never intended any, and I never thought there could be any such suggestion or innuendo taken from what I said.

Q. And do I understand from your statement of your speech at Hamilton that you were under the impression that Major Herridge had been retained as solicitor or counsel or whatever the proper legal term is by the government or by Mr. Bennett to go to London to argue a case for the government before the Imperial Privy Council?—A. I had seen it in one of the press reports of *The*