

*By the Chairman:*

Q. May I just ask a question in regard to that? You thought the important matter was Major Herridge, and not, you say, that the Prime Minister had financed the honeymoon trip out of the public treasury. You did not think that was important?—A. I thought Major—I will put it this way: I thought Major Herridge was the one who was—that the statements regarding Major Herridge were the ones that ought to be corrected, and that the ones regarding the Prime Minister I had corrected, and that the correction of the ones concerning Major Herridge carried with them a correction of the statements respecting the Prime Minister.

Q. Although, later on, on January 16, you thought it was necessary to add the Prime Minister's name, is that so?—A. I did not think it was necessary to—well, I did it as a matter of course, and a matter that I thought was from a sense of duty.

Q. You agree with me, Mr. Gordon, as you see it now, that it was in regard to the Prime Minister, a statement calculated to injure him, and perhaps destroy him in his public office?—A. It is not half as ragged as the things that have been said about Mackenzie King.

Q. I am asking you about this.—A. I do not see it that way. I want to state my position clearly—

Q. If you want to take it that way, all right.—A. I want to be fair. You are the chairman of the committee, and I appreciate you are not counsel prosecuting the case.

Q. I mean— —A. But you have a right to a complete inquiry.

Q. I think we should have.—A. I have been chairman of committees for a great many years, and I have some ideas of the chairman's rights, and the witnesses' rights.

Q. Do you think it is material?—A. No, I am just—I do not want to quarrel with the chairman's rights, and with an inquiry and investigation. I want to make as complete an explanation as possible, and give you all the facts that I can. That is what I am attempting to do.

Q. That is it?—A. I do not want to be inveigled into making admissions that I do not think are fair.

Q. I don't want you to do that.—A. That are not fair to me, or I don't think are fair to the two gentlemen whose names are involved in this matter.

Q. That is the only thing that appears to me. It seems to me quite proper to get your understanding of the case. You have given it pretty well. Then, you do not think that they were calculated to injure in the way that I have described. Perhaps I am putting it in legal language, but put it in your own language. They are serious charges, and calculated to injure the Prime Minister— —A. No.

Q. —in his office?—A. Mr. Bennett had a perfect right, if he so desired, to appoint Mr. Herridge to go to England to argue a case for the government when he was on his honeymoon trip, and to argue it there, and retain him, if he desired, out of the public funds. But the suggestion that a share of the expenses of Mrs. Herridge was paid out of the public funds would be wrong, and highly improper, and that was never made.

Q. Would you be able to tell us why you made the statement?—A. I will be frank with you. I read the speech of the great betrayal of the Prime Minister—he was not Prime Minister then—in Regina, and his statement that Judas did not take nine years to betray. It was so startling to me that the cordial relations that always existed before were somewhat changed in my mind, and I felt that strong language being used merited strong language in return; although I am prepared to admit since Mr. Bennett has become Prime Minister, his attitude has been that of dignity, and caution and care in his expressions. The matter came up largely as to the extravagance of the government, and