

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. Don't you think, Mr. Gordon, without having received any letters that when your attention was drawn to those serious charges and allegations that the move, if any, as to an apology or expression of regret should come from you and not from Mr. Bennett or Major Herridge?—A. Yes, I do think so.

Q. And, as a matter of fact, Mr. Gordon, *The Globe*, in the editorial which you say you saw, contains these words:—

Emphatic denial has been given at Ottawa, it being pointed out that the case involved was not a government matter, but one pertaining to private corporations, which Major Herridge had been handling previously.

So that prior to the time you made your correction at the Lindsay meeting, or rather prior to the time that you made your remarks at the Lindsay meeting, emphatic denial had been given in *The Globe*, in the words which I have just quoted?—A. It doesn't say by whom.

Q. No.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Mr. Gordon, I presume you saw that despatch which Mr. Bowman has just read. Am I right again in saying, or asking you if that is not one reason why after reading that despatch you endeavoured to obtain further information and then made the apology or retraction?—A. I did that. I wrote and made inquiries.

Q. Mr. Gordon, in your remarks at Lindsay—as quoted here in the motion of the Minister of Justice for this investigation—these words appear:—

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. . . .

I want to call your attention to those words, "so if he was a full-time Canadian legal adviser."—A. Well, that came to my mind—

Q. Is that a qualification of the statement, that if he was a full-time legal adviser he should not have done certain things?—A. I would like to put it my own way. After I had seen this *Globe* editorial a doubt was raised in my mind, because it said it was a private brief, and I had the impression he was the legal adviser at that time, and if he was the legal adviser he would have difficulty in disassociating himself from his official duties for preparing this brief on the radio case before the Privy Council.

Q. Mr. Bowman mentioned the fact that you had criticized Mr. Herridge's appointment as Canadian Minister to Washington.

Mr. BOWMAN: No, no, I didn't mention that.

Mr. DUFF: Oh, yes, you did. You read it there.

Q. Why did you criticize Major Herridge's appointment? Had you seen anything in the newspapers or heard any comment with regard to his appointment?—A. I considered the matter fair comment. That was the main part of what I had to say about Major Herridge. The other part I said occupied probably two or three minutes; but I did criticize it as a matter of fair comment in the political field, that he had not been a political supporter of Mr. Bennett's for the larger part of his life, and that there were eminent Canadians like Sir Robert Borden, Sir George Foster and Mr. Meighen who were available for that office.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we are getting a little far afield. Are there any further questions?