

ister of Canada, a Member of the House of Commons, in his office as Prime Minister, and were made recklessly and without any adequate attempt to ascertain, before making them, whether they were true or untrue.

In the opinion of your Committee, the conduct of Mr. Gordon in making the statements, he did was reprehensible and deserving of the censure of the House of Commons, the more so as Mr. Gordon is a Member of the King's Privy Council for the Dominion of Canada.

A copy of the proceedings and evidence taken, together with the exhibits filed, is attached.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Mr. Duff, seconded by Mr. Howard, moved in amendment that the said motion be not concurred in, but that the draft report marked "B" be adopted as the Report of the Committee:—

We, members of the Special Committee appointed to enquire into certain charges and allegations purporting to have been made by the Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C., beg leave to present the following as part "B" of the third report:—

A number of witnesses appeared before the committee and gave evidence regarding the despatches which appeared in the *Globe* as set out in the Order of Reference:—

(1) From the evidence of the only newspaper correspondent present at the meeting at Hamilton, and also from the evidence of Mr. Gordon, it was proved that Mr. Gordon did not use the following words: "The bald charge that Premier Bennett had financed the honeymoon trip of his sister to Europe out of the Canadian Treasury."

(2) Regarding the second charge, "That he had obtained a new private railway car for his own use at a cost to Canada of \$125,000," the evidence shows that a new car was built by the Canadian National Railways at a cost of at least \$69,000, at a time of great depression and when the railway was losing millions of dollars annually.

(3) The statement that he criticized Premier Bennett for having appointed his brother-in-law as Canada's representative at Washington was not disputed, and is correct.

(4) In Mr. Gordon's evidence he stated, under oath, that he had mistaken an appeal before the Privy Council in London by the Canadian Government, on a radio case, with a private radio case, where Major Herridge acted as counsel before the said Privy Council. The fact remains, however, that Major Herridge made one trip to London at the expense of the people of Canada, at the time of the Imperial Conference, and also the fact that the Prime Minister appointed Major Herridge Canada's Representative to Washington, before his second trip to England, and when on private business, gave the said Herridge a certain prestige which he would not otherwise have possessed, and this offers explanation for Mr. Gordon's statement.

The evidence shows that Mr. Gordon corrected, retracted and apologized, at Cobourg and again when on the witness stand at Ottawa, and regretted any words he might have used which could or might have been construed as reflecting unfairly on the Prime Minister or on Major Herridge.