

Mr. BOWMAN: We have not put in any of those documents, Mr. Chairman. We have those newspaper items and also those three telegrams, and I would suggest that they be read into the record.

The CHAIRMAN: They are all in the record, Mr. Bowman. I would suggest to the committee that we file those as exhibits.

Mr. BOWMAN: That is what I had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN: These will be exhibits 7, 8 and 9.

Q. What is the date of the Cobourg issue?—A. The Cobourg issue is dated January 16.

Q. In the report of your Cobourg meeting, do you give the number of people who were present?—A. I do not know that it is mentioned.

*By Mr. Howard:*

Q. Is it customary? It has been said that there were eighty at the first meeting?—A. Yes, more than 500 delegates were present.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. In view of the questions of Mr. Bowman, I think you had better read the editorial, to make Mr. Bowman's question intelligible.—A. The editorial in the issue of January 8 is headed "Mr. Gordon's charge," and is as follows:

If Hon. G. N. Gordon, K.C., was sure of his ground when he told a Hamilton political meeting that the honeymoon trip of the Prime Minister's sister was financed out of the Federal treasury, he was justified in making his charge and should have offered his proof. If he lacked proof, he committed a grave indiscretion, to put it mildly, and one which may have an unfavourable reaction on the Liberal party.

It was a sensational statement, of the kind which upsets governments, implying a major scandal, the charge being, in effect, that a Privy Council case was diverted to Major Herridge that he might make his honeymoon journey to the Old Country at the expense of the government. 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.

A member of the Bar should have little difficulty in distinguishing between government and private litigation, or learning in which category the case at issue fell. Mr. Gordon should not have made the statements he did without knowing the facts, and if he had the facts he cannot let the matter drop. Is he prepared to substantiate them, dethrone the government, and have the Canadian Minister at Washington recalled? If not—if he has spoken without giving due consideration to what he said—he has placed the Liberal party in the undesirable position of having a reckless platform representative and of being willing to listen to unwarranted political issues.

In view of the specific denials of Mr. Gordon's charge, it is not clear how he can stand by his guns. Being an eminent lawyer, he may know. But if he cannot do so, he should be requested to keep off the political platform in the future for the good of politics.

*By Mr. Duff:*

Q. That editorial was written before Mr. Gordon made his correction and withdrawal at Cobourg.—A. Well, it was. That editorial appears in the issue of January 8th.

Q. I mean, it was written before your paper was published, or before you would know whether he made the statement of withdrawal at Cobourg. The editorial was published before you reported Mr. Gordon's correction and with-