

## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

The CHAIRMAN: I think each member of the committee has had a copy of the printed proceedings. It will not be necessary, I take it, to read them. Now, I understood that Mr. Gordon wanted to give evidence.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me.

GEORGE NEWCOMBE GORDON, called and sworn.

WITNESS: There was a meeting held in Hamilton, and at the meeting in Hamilton a very small portion of what I said was reported in the *Toronto Globe*, and the report that was contained in the *Toronto Globe*, as I said in Lindsay and attempted to correct, was incorrect. The *Toronto Globe* reported, according to the memorandum that is contained in the resolution in the House of Commons—the report was that Mrs. Herridge's honeymoon trip was paid by Mr. Bennett out of the Canadian treasury. There was no such statement made; but what I did say was this: that Major Herridge had been appointed the legal adviser to the Prime Minister and had an opportunity of arguing a case before the Privy Council in connection with radio matters, and that his honeymoon synchronized with the trip he had taken to London. I had in mind at the time the privilege that ministers have of having their expenses paid by the crown, and the fact that ministers do, when their families travel with them, keep a separate account of moneys expended for the use of their families on such trips; but as the reporter stated yesterday, there was no mention of Mrs. Herridge's name. That was a very small portion of what was said, but that was, in effect, what was said. *The Globe* immediately wrote an editorial upon that, reading into it what I felt should not have been read in; and as I was to speak in Lindsay a few days afterwards I immediately telegraphed *The Globe* that I intended to answer that editorial by a statement I would make at Lindsay. At Lindsay, the reporter was not present, so he asked me to give him a resumé of what I had stated in regard to the matter relating to Major Herridge, which was a small portion of what I had said. At the Lindsay meeting I made an effort to correct what was reported as of the Hamilton speech by saying that Major Herridge had gone to London and was on his honeymoon trip when he argued this appeal before the Privy Council, so that if he was a legal officer to the government of Canada he should not have taken that time and that opportunity of arguing that case before the Privy Council. My sources of information have been cuttings from my office from *The Montreal Gazette*, the *Toronto Globe*, *The Mail and Empire*, *The Toronto Star* and the *Toronto Telegram*. Occasionally cuttings were sent to me; but they were mainly the sources of information—relying chiefly upon the Canadian Press report. I then ascertained that there were two radio cases, one of which Major Herridge had argued in London and had come from the office of Henderson and Herridge, and was not the radio case I had in mind which, I think, was a case that the Dominion government was interested in in respect of provincial or dominion control of radio broadcasting. And that was the one I assumed that Major Herridge had argued as the legal adviser of the government of Canada or of the Prime Minister, whichever it was. When I found I was in error, and that it was a case in respect of a patent which was argued before the Privy Council, I immediately, at Cobourg—which was the largest public meeting I had an opportunity of speaking at to correct the impression