

'I would not knowingly like to do anyone an injustice, much less a fellow-member of the Canadian bar,' said Mr. Gordon to-day. 'I explained at Cobourg that I had got the two things confused. I thought that Major Herridge had appeared before the Privy Council while on his honeymoon in connection with the legal battle over radio between the Dominion and the provincial governments, whereas he actually appeared on behalf of a private company in a radio patent case.'

It is expected the committee will be informed that in his Cobourg speech Mr. Gordon declared he had confused the two radio cases, because Major Herridge previously had been the legal adviser of the Prime Minister at the Imperial Conference.

It is expected the witnesses who will be called for Mr. Gordon will corroborate his explanation made at Cobourg.

In regard to the private railway car there may be a partial explanation but not a complete withdrawal. It may be stated that a new railway car was built by the Canadian National Railways but that the chassis of the car formely used by the Governor General was used.

Yes. That is substantially what is contained in the—is this *The Citizen*?

Mr. BOWMAN: *The Journal*.

WITNESS: *The Journal*. That is substantially what I said.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. There again you made some reference to Major Herridge, but none whatever to the Prime Minister.—A. For this reason: Major Herridge was the man who was chiefly suffering from what was said, as I saw it. Premier Bennett's name was incidentally mentioned only as a member of the government who had retained Major Herridge. But I felt Major Herridge was the one that I owed the greatest duty to correct what I had said about it.

Q. Were you asked?—A. —and I still think so.

Q. Were you asked if you had anything to say about the Prime Minister by the reporters?—A. No; I do not think the Prime Minister was ever mentioned.

Q. That is the reason you did not mention him again when you were speaking to the reporters?—A. No; because I had in mind Major Herridge was the one chiefly concerned in the matter.

Q. It was not in the papers, but I think you said yourself, did you not, that Major Herridge had been sent over to argue a case for the government. Was that the statement you made in your evidence just now?—A. I thought that Major Herridge had been retained by the government to act as legal adviser.

Q. Not to argue a case for the government? You said that.—A. Yes.

Q. You said that?—A. Yes.

Q. In Hamilton?—A. I said that in Hamilton, yes.

Q. Did you ascertain whether that was true, or not?—A. I had been told that it was true by reputable persons. I saw by the paper that he had argued a case dealing with a radio matter, and had been successful in it, when he was on his honeymoon trip. I saw it in one of the papers.

Mr. BOWMAN: A government case? Acting for the government. Did you say that?

WITNESS: No. I was coupling the two facts, that he was an assistant legal adviser to the government, or to Premier Bennett, and he was arguing this radio case; and I knew that the Dominion government had a radio case in which the provinces were interested as to jurisdiction. I coupled the two together.

Mr. DUFF: You were mixing your metaphors.