

and allegations made by the Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C., a member of the King's Privy Council for Canada, upon a public occasion in the city of Hamilton, on the 6th day of January, 1932, as reported in the *Globe* newspaper published at the city of Toronto on the 7th day of January, 1932, and also in respect of a further statement made by the said George N. Gordon at Lindsay on the 8th of January, 1932, and published in the said *Globe* newspaper on the 9th day of January, 1932, and also published in other newspapers throughout Canada, reflecting upon the Right Honourable R. B. Bennett, Prime Minister of Canada and a member of this house, in regard to matters of public concern; and which said charges and allegations published in the said *Globe* newspaper are in the following terms and were published on the following respective dates—

January 7, 1932.—“The bald charge that Premier Bennett had financed the honeymoon trip of his sister to Europe out of the Canadian treasury, and that he had obtained a new private railway car for his own use at a cost to Canada of \$125,000, was made to local Liberals to-night by Hon. G. N. Gordon, K.C., who was deputy speaker in the federal house under the King government.”

“He criticized Premier Bennett for having appointed his brother-in-law as Canada's envoy at Washington, and then charged that the cost of Mrs. Herridge's honeymoon trip to Europe had been paid for by Premier Bennett out of the Canadian treasury.”

January 9, 1932.—“I have been too long in the public eye to make statements that are not based on facts,” Mr. Gordon said, adding that only a small section of his reference to Mr. Herridge appeared correctly in *The Globe*. A large audience in Hamilton heard every word he said, and he followed his notes very closely, Mr. Gordon continued.

“Major Herridge was Mr. Bennett's brother-in-law, and this was his honeymoon trip,” said Mr. Gordon. “He also went to London to argue an appeal before the Privy Council, so if he was a full-time Canadian legal adviser he should not have taken the full time preparing and arguing the appeal before the Privy Council and thus neglecting his duty as the Premier's legal adviser, which Mr. Bennett permitted him to do.”

“Mr. Herridge, according to Mr. Gordon, remained a long time in London as a Canadian official, and was in the pay of the Dominion government during the time of his honeymoon trip.”

With power to call for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses upon oath and to report from time to time to this house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before the motion is carried I should like to repeat my former remarks concerning what is due His Excellency in the matter of the speech which he has presented to parliament and for which we were expecting to express our thanks this afternoon. I believe, were one to search the records of British parliamentary institutions the world over, one would not find a case, where, at the instance of the Prime Minister, through one of his colleagues, a matter of this particular character would be interjected as a subject of debate before His Majesty or

His Majesty's representative had been thanked for the speech from the throne delivered to parliament with a view to opening its deliberations. I am not surprised that the Prime Minister has absented himself from the house at this time. Quite evidently he knew this matter was to come up, and for reasons best known to himself is not present. However, there is a custom followed in matters of debate and other business in parliament, and we might as well understand at once whether that custom is going to be observed or not. That custom is that each side of the house should receive some due notice and warning of matters which are to come up for public discussion. If this question is of the great importance the Minister of Justice (Mr. Guthrie) has just said it is, it was certainly due to myself as leader of the opposition that I should have had some notice that it was to be brought before the house to-day, and it was due to every hon. member on this side that that notice should have been given in the regular manner in which notice is generally given with regard to other motions. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice who has just made the motion has been in parliament for many, many years. I do not hesitate to say to him that never in his parliamentary experience has he known anything of this kind, and that if our positions were reversed and he were standing where I am on this side of the house to-day he would be most eloquent and emphatic in the exception which he would be taking to this method of procedure.

As to the motion itself, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that personally I felt more or less shocked when I saw the notice which had been placed on the order paper and realized that it had come from the Prime Minister himself. The Minister of Justice says he is not so much concerned with Mr. Herridge—and I presume that includes Mrs. Herridge—but that with regard to something which has been said about the Prime Minister it is all important that we should have this investigation. May I say that if the Prime Minister had been as considerate of his sister and of his brother-in-law as he has been of himself, he would have been very careful to avoid bringing their names into public discussion in the manner in which he has. This is a means on the part of the Prime Minister to satisfy his self-will and wounded pride of his own. No man in Canada has less reason to take umbrage at what political opponents say about him than has the right hon. Prime Minister. If I had wished to seek revenge