

Q. So that it was in your mind when you spoke at Lindsay?—A. Yes, it was in my mind when I spoke at Lindsay that it was a brief of a private client.

Q. And the dictated statement that is part of this exhibit is correct?—A. Well, I don't know. The young man took it down, I imagine. My car was waiting for me and it was late, and I gave him some information. I never saw it after he took it down. I cannot say how correct it is.

Q. Well, do you agree that this part of it is correct:—

Major Herridge was Mr. Bennett's brother-in-law and this was his honeymoon trip. He also attended 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 of preparing and arguing the appeal before the Privy Council and thus neglecting his duty as the Premier's legal adviser, which Mr. Bennett permitted him to do.

Mr. Herridge, according to Mr. Gordon, remained a long time in London and the Canadian official, and Mr. Gordon insisted that Mr. Herridge was an officer of the Dominion Government and in the pay of the Dominion Government during the time of his honeymoon trip.

A. Yes, that is substantially correct.

Q. And that is your explanation of your Hamilton speech?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, may I ask you this, Mr. Gordon: it was still a case of not knowing the facts, was it, when you were speaking in Lindsay?—A. I thought I had the facts.

Q. You thought you had the facts?—A. Yes.

Q. And you were speaking in Lindsay assuming that the facts were as you stated?—A. Exactly.

Q. And can you suggest anything material in the suggestion that was made that it was hypothetical "if he was", etc; is there anything material in that at all?—A. Well, I had seen or heard of the statement that had been given from some source at Ottawa that Major Herridge was taking a private brief, and I had seen the comment that he had been appointed the legal adviser; but either Mr. Bennett or the government, knowing that there was a radio case of very great importance in which the Province and the Dominion were contesting the rights as to jurisdiction, I had assumed that that was the same, and other lawyers too had the same view.

Q. That is exactly the point that I was getting at.—A. And those were lawyers of some eminence and that is what led me to think that that was the same case.

Q. Well, when you made this speech you were simply assuming that your facts were correct?—A. Yes.

Q. And you had taken no opportunity between the 7th and the time of speaking on the 8th to correct your facts?—A. Yes, I had. I had my clerks go through my files for the reports of this radio case and Mr. Herridge's appointment, to check up the Canadian Press and some other reports; but I was not able to locate what I was seeking, for some reason.

Q. And being unable to locate what you were seeking you went on and made the speech in Lindsay?—A. I stated it in that hypothetical way.

Q. Still on the assumption that the facts were correct?—A. That these facts were correct, sir.

Mr. DUFF: With the qualification that it was.

The CHAIRMAN: Quite so. You are quite right.

Mr. BOWMAN: If that is a qualification.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, we must not argue it. After all, Mr. Gordon's understanding is of importance; but we will have to decide for ourselves.