

Mr. DUFF: Other exaggerated statements have been made on the platform.

The WITNESS: Yes, I dare say. You should be an authority on that.

*By Mr. Duff:*

Q. Mr. Bennett, you said a moment ago when I was asking you if you had seen the correction and explanation in *The Globe* with regard to Mr. Gordon's remarks at Cobourg I took you to say that you were not satisfied with that; but what would you consider—I may perhaps be going a little too far now—a proper retraction?—A. Oh, Mr. Duff, if a proper statement had been made such as I would have to advise a client who came to me when I was practising my profession, do you suppose I would have bothered further about the matter? Why, of course not.

Q. Can I go this far? Do I understand you to say that you would be quite satisfied instead of having this committee investigate this matter—because it is a delicate matter—A. Mr. Duff, as a matter of fact, someone said to me, if a proper apology were offered—not to me personally but to the office of the Prime Minister—would it be acceptable to me and I said certainly, as long as it is a matter of record; and the rules of law governing that are shortly put: perhaps you are interested in this—a case in which during the war my advice was sought. It arose in connection with a slander in which a person was charged with being a German, and the minute it was brought to the attention of the parties interested they said, of course, we will offer an apology, and in the standard books upon the subject there is a form and expressly you have to express regret and you have to admit that your statements are made without warrant, and I remember this gentleman's client, he used to be a member of this House, hesitating about that, and I had to inform him that this had to be done.

Q. Along that line, Mr. Bennett, I have seen apologies myself couched in legal phraseology which men have signed and did not feel very badly about it.—A. I admit, Mr. Duff, that the mere expression of regret by a man does not always mean that he does.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. You do not mean to say, Mr. Bennett, in law as a matter of fact the giving of an apology has anything to do with the result of a case; it may be in contradiction of the fact.—A. Not at all, what I desired to say was, that you will observe from looking at the report of the Cobourg meeting—

Q. I did not think you wanted to go as far as that.—A. Read it. The report has been sent from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: So far as the committee is concerned, must we not take into consideration the statements made from time to time and form an opinion of our own as to its adequacy and completeness.

The WITNESS: Undoubtedly. That is the reason I was answering Mr. Duff as I was, Mr. Speakman.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Yes, quite.

The WITNESS: Because he has asked me the question.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I mean at the moment, as a member of the committee, the point that is impressed upon my mind is this: it is not at the moment a question for the committee as to whether any statement is satisfactory to the Prime Minister.

The WITNESS: Not a bit.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: But as to whether, in our opinion, as a committee, that statement is adequate and covers the case.