

at Lindsay a couple of nights afterwards and I intended there to make an explanation and that I did not care to confirm or to make any statement over the telephone because so many misunderstandings have taken place by telephone messages. I declined to be the victim.

Q. I think it is all extracted in the evidence. I wish to make that quite clear, Mr. Gordon. I would like to remind you that what was said is this, on page 13. It was what was called a syndicate article. It reads:—

Hon. Mr. Gordon confirmed the charge to-day when *The Gleaner* telephoned him at his Peterboro home. "It was a deliberate case of charging the government for their honeymoon trip" he said. Other lawyers were handling the case which was to come up at the Privy Council. It was taken out of their hands by the Prime Minister and given to Herridge so that Mildred might have a honeymoon trip at the Canadian Government's expense.

Do you swear now, Mr. Gordon, that that despatch of the Star Newspaper Service is false?—A. I say it is not true and I did not say it.

Q. You did not say it. Did they telephone you at all?—A. They telephoned me and asked me to confirm it or deny it.

Q. The Star Newspaper Service did telephone you?—A. Yes.

Q. But what you told to the Star Service is not what—A. Is not what is shown there.

Q. Is it substantially what is contained there?—A. It is not substantially what is contained there.

Q. What was it?—A. I said I would not confirm or I would not deny. I intended to deal with the matter over at Lindsay.

Q. That was quite different, wasn't it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. All right, Mr. Gordon. You know the Star Newspaper Service in Toronto?—A. No, I don't. I know some—

Q. What I mean is, they did telephone you?—A. Well, someone telephoned me and said it was *The Star*. I don't know who it was. And there was another telephone message came from some other Toronto paper. I think it was *The Telegram*.

Q. Then, Mr. Gordon, *The Globe* article, as it has been read, and as it appears, does constitute a serious charge, does it not?—A. *The Globe* Hamilton article?

Q. Yes. You would agree that that constitutes a serious charge?—A. Yes.

Q. And it has been sworn to be correct?—A. No, it has not been sworn to be correct.

Q. In what way?—A. The reporter said that Mrs. Herridge's name was never mentioned in the transaction.

Q. That is true, but does that make any difference really?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Suppose it had been Mr. Herridge's honeymoon trip, does that introduce—A. Not at all. You know the practice of minister's and others. They charge their family's expenses separately and they pay their own,—the Crown pays their own.

Q. But you did speak of the honeymoon trip?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are not denying that?—A. No, sir.

Q. And then at Lindsay, as I understand it,—I just want to clear my own mind on the matter—you spoke in reply to that *Globe* editorial?—A. In explanation of it I would say.

Q. Well, use your own words.—A. With the information I had available at that time.

Q. You had seen *The Globe* report of the 7th at that time?—A. Well, I don't know whether I had seen it or whether I was told about it. I was laid up with influenza at that time. It was brought to my attention anyway, the purport of it.