

J
103
H7
1932
G6
A1

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

J
103
H7
1932
G6
A1

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
CANADA

07 OCT 2010

BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

SESSION 1932

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

CERTAIN CHARGES AND ALLEGATIONS

MADE BY

THE HONOURABLE GEORGE N. GORDON, K.C.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 1

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1932

THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 1932

WITNESSES:

Mr. Andrew Patterson, Newspaper Reporter, Hamilton, Ont.
Mr. R. Crossin, Newspaper Reporter, Hamilton, Ont.
Mr. Andrew Clarke, News Editor, Toronto Ont.,
Mr. Ford Moynes, Newspaper Reporter, Lindsay, Ont.
The Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, Prime Minister of Canada.
The Hon. W. D. Herridge, Canadian Ambassador at Washington, D.C.,
U.S.A.
Mr. William A. Fraser, M.P.

OTTAWA

F. A. ACLAND

PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY

1932

SESSION 188
HOUSE OF COMMONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

CERTAIN CHARGES AND ALLEGATIONS

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. G. R. Geary, *Chairman*,
Mr. J. L. Bowman,
Mr. T. Cantley,
Mr. W. Duff,

Mr. O. Gagnon,
Mr. C. B. Howard,
Mr. A. Speakman.

JOHN T. DUN,
Clerk of the Committee.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1882
THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 1882

WITNESSES

Mr. Andrew Patterson, Newspaper Reporter, Hamilton, Ont.
Mr. E. C. ...
Mr. Andrew ...
Mr. Ford ...
The Right Hon. R. B. ...
The Hon. W. D. ...
U.S.A.
Mr. William A. ...

PRINTED BY ...
1882

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, February 25, 1932.

The Special Committee appointed to enquire into certain charges and allegations made by the Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C., met at 11 a.m.

Members present: Messrs. Bowman, Cantley, Duff, Gagnon, Geary, Howard, Speakman.

On motion of Mr. Cantley,—

Resolved,—That Mr. Geary be Chairman of the Committee.

Mr. Geary took the Chair.

On motion of Mr. Speakman,—

Ordered,—That the News Editor of *The Globe*, Toronto, Ont., together with the Hamilton, Ont., and the Lindsay, Ont., correspondents of *The Globe*, who supplied the reports to that newspaper respecting charges and allegations made by the Honourable George N. Gordon, as contained in *The Globe* on the 7th and 9th days of January, 1932, be summoned to attend for examination at the next meeting of the Committee.

On motion of Mr. Howard,—

Resolved,—That the next meeting of the Committee shall be held on Thursday, 3rd March.

The Clerk of the Committee was instructed to notify the Right Honourable R. B. Bennett, the Honourable W. D. Herridge and the Honourable George N. Gordon that the Committee will sit on Thursday, 3rd March, to examine the above-mentioned witnesses. It was the opinion of the Committee that the Honourable George N. Gordon should be afforded every opportunity to be heard and to cross-examine witnesses.

On motion of Mr. Speakman,—

Resolved,—That the Committee recommend to the House that 500 copies in English and 250 copies in French of proceedings and evidence which may be taken be printed, as required, and that Standing Order 64 be suspended in relation thereto.

The Committee adjourned until Thursday, 3rd March, at 11 a.m.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, March 3, 1932.

The Special Committee appointed to enquire into certain charges and allegations made by the Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C., met at 11 a.m. Mr. Geary, the Chairman, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Bowman, Cantley, Duff, Gagnon, Geary, Howard, Speakman.

The Minutes of Proceedings of the last meeting were read and adopted.

The following witnesses were severally called, sworn and examined:—

Mr. Andrew Patterson, Newspaper Reporter, Hamilton, Ont.

Mr. R. Crossin, Newspaper Reporter, Hamilton, Ont.

Mr. Andrew Clarke, News Editor, Toronto, Ont.

Mr. Ford Moynes, Newspaper Reporter, Lindsay, Ont.

The Rt. Hon. R. B. Bennett, Prime Minister of Canada.

The Hon. W. D. Herridge, Canadian Ambassador at Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Mr. William A. Fraser, M.P.

While being examined for evidence, Mr. Andrew Clarke filed the following exhibits:—

1. Certified copy of telegram to *The Globe*, Toronto, from G. N. Gordon, dated Lindsay, Jan. 8, 4.40 p.m.

2. Certified copy of telegram to Moynes, Lindsay, Ont., from *Globe*, dated Toronto, Jan. 8.

3. Certified copy of telegram to *Globe*, Toronto, from Moynes, dated Lindsay, Ont., Jan. 8, 8.44 p.m.

4. Copy of *The Globe*, Toronto, 7th January, 1932.

5. Copy of *The Globe*, Toronto, 8th January, 1932.

6. Copy of *The Globe*, Toronto, 9th January, 1932.

7. Copy of *The Globe*, Toronto, 16th January, 1932.

Mr. Andrew Patterson, Mr. R. Crossin, Mr. Andrew Clarke and Mr. Ford Moynes were discharged from further attendance as witnesses.

The Committee adjourned until to-morrow at 11 a.m.

JOHN T. DUN,
Clerk of the Committee.

ORDER OF REFERENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

OTTAWA, February 8, 1932.

Resolved,—That a special committee consisting of seven members of this House to be named hereafter be appointed to enquire into certain charges and allegations made by the Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C., a member of the King's Privy Council for Canada, upon a public occasion in the City of Hamilton, on the 6th day of January, 1932, as reported in *The Globe* newspaper published at the City of Toronto on the 7th day of January, 1932, and also in respect of a further statement made by the said George N. Gordon at Lindsay on the 8th of January, 1932, and published in the said *Globe* newspaper on the 9th day of January, 1932, and also published in other newspapers throughout Canada, reflecting upon the Right Honourable R. B. Bennett, Prime Minister of Canada and a Member of this House, in regard to matters of public concern; and which said charges and allegations published in the said *Globe* newspaper are in the following terms and were published on the following respective dates—

January 7, 1932.—“The bald charge that Premier Bennett had financed the honeymoon trip of his sister to Europe out of the Canadian Treasury, and that he had obtained a new private railway car for his own use at a cost to Canada of \$125,000, was made to local Liberals to-night by Hon. G. N. Gordon, K.C., who was Deputy Speaker in the Federal House under the King Government.”

“He criticized Premier Bennett for having appointed his brother-in-law as Canada's envoy at Washington, and then charged that the cost of Mrs. Herridge's honeymoon trip to Europe had been paid for by Premier Bennett out of the Canadian Treasury.”

January 9, 1932.—“I have been too long in the public eye to make statements that are not based on facts,” Mr. Gordon said, adding that only a small section of his reference to Mr. Herridge appeared correctly in *The Globe*. A large audience in Hamilton heard every word he said, and he followed his notes very closely, Mr. Gordon continued.

“Major Herridge was Mr. Bennett's brother-in-law, and this was his honeymoon trip,” said Mr. Gordon. “He also went to 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 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 as a Canadian official, and was in the pay of the Dominion Government during the time of his honeymoon trip.”

With power to call for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses upon oath and to report from time to time to this House.

Attest.

ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE,
Clerk of the House.

WEDNESDAY, February 17, 1932.

Ordered,—That Messrs. Geary, Gagnon, Bowman, Cantley, Duff, Howard and Speakman be named as the Committee in respect of the Motion adopted on the 6th day of February, 1932, to investigate certain statements made by the Honourable George N. Gordon as more fully set out in the said Motion.

Attest.

ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE,
Clerk of the House.

THURSDAY, February 25, 1932.

Ordered,—That 500 copies in English and 250 copies in French of proceedings and evidence which may be taken by the said Committee be printed, as required, and that Standing Order 64 be suspended in relation thereto.

Attest.

ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE,
Clerk of the House.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE

FIRST REPORT

THURSDAY, February 25, 1932.

Your Committee recommend that 500 copies in English and 250 copies in French of proceedings and evidence which may be taken be printed, as required, and that Standing Order 64 be suspended in relation thereto.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

G. R. GEARY,
Chairman.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

The CHAIRMAN: The News Editor of the Globe is here, but before we call him I should like to know if you have copies of the Globe.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: Mr. Chairman, in respect to the—

The CHAIRMAN: Just one moment, Mr. Gordon.

Gentlemen, I think it was the view of the committee that we should proceed to hear evidence as to the making of those statements in Hamilton and Lindsay. It was felt that the charges should be proved formally. Should we take that proof before Mr. Gordon makes any explanation, as I see he wishes to make some statement?

Mr. BOWMAN: I think we should have the formal proof first.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, if record is taken solely from one newspaper with no regard for the address that was given at Cobourg in regard to this matter—

The CHAIRMAN: Are you giving evidence, Mr. Gordon?

Hon. Mr. GORDON: No, I am not giving evidence. I appear for myself in this case, and I am endeavouring to make certain representations to the committee. I understand that the committee formulates its own procedure. There is no procedure fixed.

The CHAIRMAN: I am only referring, Mr. Gordon, to whether or not you wish to make an opening statement.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: I just wish to make a statement as to certain facts relating to this inquiry. I say that the record before the committee of inquiry is not complete, inasmuch as it does not deal with the corporate statements that I made dealing with this particular matter, and indicating, as I set out there—

Mr. BOWMAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we are in order in taking a statement from Mr. Gordon at this time.

The CHAIRMAN: Not if it is a statement of fact.

Mr. BOWMAN: He has stated that it is a statement of fact. I think that we should have those statements proved first, and then deal with this matter later on. I have no intention of restricting Mr. Gordon in any way, but it seems to me we should formally prove the charges first.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: The only thing I wish to say is that this particular record that is before the committee is restricted in its limitation, and a full statement should be before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you want to submit anything else?

Hon. Mr. GORDON: The grounds for making those statements may be considered reasonable grounds, and after those statements were made it was ascertained that certain statements were incorrect, and there was a retraction made, and a statement made to the public indicating there was a confusion as to certain radio cases, and dates.

The CHAIRMAN: You will have every opportunity to make that statement, Mr. Gordon.

The first witness we shall call will be Mr. Patterson of Hamilton.

ANDREW PATTERSON called and sworn.

By the Chairman:

Q. You live where, Mr. Patterson?—A. In Hamilton.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Reporter for the Hamilton Spectator.

Q. Were you, Mr. Patterson, at a meeting in Hamilton on January 7?—A. January 6.

Q. 1932. Who spoke at that meeting?—A. Hon. Mr. Gordon was the chief speaker.

Q. Were there people there?—A. It was the inaugural meeting of the Hamilton Liberal party, Hamilton Liberal club, a new organization.

Q. I suppose it was largely attended?—A. Approximately eighty people there.

Q. Then, the matter which we are inquiring into, Mr. Patterson, is set out in a resolution of the House of Commons, appearing in Votes and Proceedings of the 4th February, 1932. This was taken from the Globe newspaper, carried into the Votes and Proceedings of February 4, 1932. It reads as follows:

January 7, 1932.—The bald charge that Premier Bennett had financed the honeymoon trip of his sister to Europe out of the Canadian Treasury, and that he had obtained a new private railway car for his own use at a cost to Canada of \$125,000, was made to local Liberals to-night by Hon. G. N. Gordon, K.C., who was Deputy Speaker in the Federal house under the King Government.

You did not write that, I understand?—A. No, sir.

Q. He criticized Premier Bennett for having appointed his brother-in-law as Canada's envoy at Washington, and then charged that the cost of Mrs. Herridge's honeymoon trip to Europe had been paid for by Premier Bennett out of the Canadian Treasury.

Was that said by Mr. Gordon at the meeting?—A. That was said.

By Mr. Howard:

Q. Did you say you were present at the meeting?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And there were eighty people present?—A. Yes.

Q. You did not write that article?—A. Not in the Globe.

By the Chairman:

Q. You reported it?—A. My story appeared in the Spectator.

Mr. DUFF: Is this the Spectator you have quoted from?

The CHAIRMAN: No, I have quoted from the Globe. I am just asking him if those statements were made at the meeting.

Mr. DUFF: His evidence is not of much use to us, then.

The CHAIRMAN: His evidence is just in connection with what was said at the meeting.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. I think you wrote it as it appeared in the Globe?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It says, "The bald charge that Premier Bennett had financed the honeymoon trip of his sister to Europe out of the Canadian Treasury—" You did not hear that statement made by Mr. Gordon, did you?—A. I did.

Q. And that he had bought a new private railway car for his own use?—A. I did.

Q. Now, Mr. Patterson, as reporter for the Hamilton Spectator you have reported other meetings, public meetings in the city of Hamilton at different times?—A. Over a period of twenty years, exclusive of four years of war service, when I was away.

Q. In those public meetings, which you have reported, of course, you cannot remember any specific ones, but in your experience as a newspaper reporter, have you heard other speakers make statements on the public platform, much in the same line as those made by Mr. Gordon?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. You have?—A. Particularly at political meetings.

Q. I think you will agree with me that during election times or between elections, when political matters are discussed, that public speakers make strong statements at times?—A. They do.

Q. That is, both political parties do, in fact, say things about other people that they should not say?—A. I am not a judge of that.

Q. But I am asking you your opinion?—A. I may have an opinion that a statement is not according to Hoyle, and on the other hand, it may be based on facts.

Q. Did he seem to overstep the mark, in your opinion, as to what one public speaker will say about some other person who is in politics, or engaged in the public service of the country?—A. That happens.

The CHAIRMAN: I expect it is for the committee to say whether in this particular case there was any overstepping of the mark.

Mr. DUFF: That is when we make up our judgment, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: If the committee has no more questions I would like to ask a few.

By Hon. Mr. Gordon:

Q. Was it not a fact that the statement made by me at this meeting was that when a certain case was being tried in England Major Herridge was unable to attend on that when he was on his wedding tour?—A. You did mention, yes, that he was in England.

Q. Yes, and at one time that he was the legal or personal adviser to Mr. Bennett, the Prime Minister, at that time?—A. I do not recall that you said that.

Q. And that this particular trip when he argued his case in England, at that time he was on his honeymoon in London. I want to get this because there were a large number of persons there and I want to know what opportunity you had of hearing what was said. Did you take shorthand notes?—A. No, I did not, Mr. Gordon.

Q. How is your recollection on that point?—A. My recollection is that you merely glossed over that statement and made the statement that his honeymoon expenses were paid out of public funds, and you then went on to an entirely different subject.

Q. Yes, but was this said, that Major Herridge was unable to take this trip to England to argue this particular case and his honeymoon expenses were paid as the result, from Canada to London on that trip?—A. You did not get into any details of an explanatory nature.

Q. Was Mrs. Herridge's name ever mentioned?—A. No, you did not, just Mr. Herridge.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

Hon. Mr. GORDON: No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: That is all, thank you. Mr. Crossin of *The Globe* is here.

Witness retired.

R. CROSSIN, called and sworn.

By the Chairman:

Q. You live in Hamilton, Mr. Crossin?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And I understand you were *The Globe* reporter?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were not at this meeting I understand?—A. No, sir, I was not.

Q. Well, then you sent the story into *The Globe*. How did you get the story?—A. I had a very busy night that night and I went into *The Spectator*

about half past nine. As a matter of fact I did not know this Liberal meeting was on. It was the first meeting of this new club and I heard that Mr. Gordon had made some very startling charges against the Prime Minister, and I asked who covered the meeting. Some of the boys on the *Spec* told me that Andie Patterson had covered it. But Andie had gone home by that time and I said, "Well, can I have a look at his copy?" His copy was there and I read it over. As a matter of fact, I read it over twice.

Q. Those were his notes, his copy?—A. No, sir. That was the finished story going to the printers, as it virtually appeared in the paper. That was his finished story, and I made some notes from that story and based my *Globe* report on those notes.

Q. And you sent in the report?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Which was published in the paper?—A. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is all.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Then you know nothing personally at all about what statements Mr. Gordon made at this meeting at Hamilton. There were eighty people present?—A. No, sir, I don't.

Q. You just took the notes from another gentleman's copy?—A. From his finished copy, yes.

Q. You had nothing to do with the heading in the *Toronto Globe* report of what Mr. Gordon is supposed to have said?—A. No, sir.

Q. How long have you been a correspondent of the *Toronto Globe*?—A. Eleven years I believe, ten or eleven.

Q. Were you in the newspaper business before then?—A. Yes, I have been a reporter for twenty-two years.

Q. And you have attended, I suppose, political meetings in Hamilton?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Held by both sides?—A. Many of them, yes.

Q. And also public meetings on political matters between elections?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you in your experience as newspaper reporter heard just as startling statements made by other speakers as those supposed to have been made by Mr. Gordon in this case?—A. I cannot say that I have, I don't ever believe I have, not where a woman's name was dragged into the issue.

Q. I am sorry for that myself.—A. I don't ever recall that; that was the only thing.

Q. But still you heard Mr. Patterson say that Mr. Gordon did not mention a woman's name, did you not?—A. I think in his report that—

Q. The previous witness—Mr. Patterson—stated that he did not hear Mr. Gordon mention any lady's name?—A. Perhaps not, but in his report you will find Mrs. Herridge's name.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. You say that you heard some very startling statements had been made?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That was common talk that evening?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Howard:

Q. Then there was no report directly from *The Globe*?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do reporters take notes in shorthand?—A. No, sir, I don't use shorthand. I don't know of any reporter that does myself.

Q. And the story in *The Globe* was written then from another person's copy?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. And, Mr. Crossin, in view of the fact that the report was not taken down in shorthand it might be possible that the story as it appeared in *The Globe* is not exactly what Mr. Gordon said?—A. I would not say that, sir.

Q. That is possible, is it not?—A. Oh, it is possible; but I don't think that because you don't do shorthand that that is any evidence that you don't get a man accurately.

Q. Well, you might get the general line of his statement but you would not get every word he said?—A. Not verbatim, no, sir.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. You would get the general truth of the statement?—A. Yes, sir, I think so.

By Mr. Howard:

Q. Is it not a fact in reporting—with your twenty-two years of service—that the reporter taking a meeting—I won't say his reports are coloured but he follows his own political inclinations a little?—A. Oh, I don't think so. I have no political inclinations myself. I am rather a cynic politically. I have no convictions at all.

Q. Therefore your reports will be cynical?—A. I would say they are not.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. They are as near the truth as you can get them?—A. I don't colour them. I do not believe in either party.

By Hon. Mr. Gordon:

Q. In the copy that you saw you say that Mrs. Herridge's name was mentioned in it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You heard the previous witness say that her name was not mentioned at all in what I said at Hamilton?—A. I think if you will read his report you will see that Mrs. Herridge is named in it.

Q. But you heard him say that her name was not mentioned at all in the address that I gave?—A. No, I didn't take it that he replied that way. I thought he meant that reference that you were speaking of.

Witness retired.

ANDREW CLARKE called and sworn.

By the Chairman:

Q. You are the news editor of *The Globe*?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And as such you make up the news part of the paper for publication?—A. Yes.

Q. And there is here an issue of *The Globe* of January 7th, in which is the report that you have heard read?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And is that the report that came in from Hamilton?—A. That is the report received from our Hamilton correspondent.

Q. And which you published?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And of which you made a head-note?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And your head-note reads:—

Grave Accusation Hurlled by Gordon at Prime Minister—Treasury Paid for Sister's Honeymoon Trip, He Tells Hamilton Audience.

That would be made up how?—A. The heading is written according to measurement. The type has to fit those columns; but it is made up, based on the report.

Q. In other words, is it your heading?—A. It is written by the telegraph editor and passed by me.

Q. And when you say "passed by you," I take it that it is justified by the report?—A. Yes, I have read the report and seen the heading, and O.K'd. it for printing.

By Mr. Speakman:

Q. That is, Mr. Clarke, you satisfy yourself that the headlines give a fairly accurate representation of the body of the report itself?—A. Yes, it is the substance of the report.

By Mr. Howard:

Q. But is this customary, Mr. Clarke, the man who writes the article does not put on the headline. Another man puts the headline on?—A. Oh, no. The article was written in Hamilton and the heading written in *The Globe* office.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to follow with this witness on to the other speech that is quoted, if that is convenient to the committee, and then questions can be asked.

By the Chairman:

Q. *The Globe* commented editorially then I understand the next day?—A. The next day.

Q. And then did you hear from Mr. Gordon?—A. The next day, on the 8th, we received a wire from Mr. Gordon addressed to *The Globe* saying that he would reply to *The Globe* in Lindsay that night.

Q. Reply to what part?—A. The editorial. It was the editorial reference, I presume.

Q. Did he telegraph about the accuracy of the report in any way?—A. No, nothing said about the contents of the report. No suggestion that the report was not accurate.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. Could we have the wire?—A. I have a copy of the wire sent by the Canadian Pacific Telegraph Company. It is dated Lindsay, January the 8th, to *The Globe*, Toronto:

Am answering *Globe* at Liberal Annual Meeting here to-night. G. N. Gordon.

Q. And did Mr. Gordon speak at Lindsay?—A. Well, as soon as we received that wire we wired our Lindsay correspondent, Mr. Moynes. This is a copy of the wire:

Moynes, Lindsay, Ontario. Please cover us on Honourable George Gordon speaking at Lindsay Liberals to-night and send us good story particularly if he replies to *Globe* editorial. Please acknowledge.

And Mr. Moynes replied to that:

Globe, Toronto. Will cover you on Gordon to-night. (Sgd.) MOYNES.

Q. Well, then, did you get a despatch from Moynes?—A. Yes, we got a despatch from Lindsay that night which appears in *The Globe* of the 9th.

Q. That is a copy of *The Globe* of the 9th?—A. It is on page 2, column 1.

The CHAIRMAN: *The Globe* of January the 9th. I will read this, Mr. Clarke. Will you follow this in *The Globe* and see if it is accurate:

I have been too long in the public eye to make statements that are not based on facts, Mr. Gordon said, adding that only a small section of his reference to Mr. Herridge appeared correctly in *The Globe*. A large

audience in Hamilton heard every word he said, and he followed his notes very closely, Mr. Gordon continued.

Major Herridge was Mr. Bennett's brother-in-law and this was his honeymoon trip, said Mr. Gordon.

A. It does not read right on. "Mr. Gordon said, 'Premier Bennett had appointed his brother-in-law.'"

Q. It continues:

Major Herridge was Mr. Bennett's brother-in-law, and this was his honeymoon trip, said Mr. Gordon. "He also went to 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 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 as a Canadian official, and was in the pay of the Dominion Government during the time of his honeymoon trip."

A. Yes.

Q. That appears in *The Globe*?—A. That appears in *The Globe* of January 9th, page 2, column 1.

Q. And what is your heading?—A. "Replying to *Globe*, Hon. George Gordon Repeats His Charge. Questions Mr. Herridge's qualifications for Washington Post. Speaks at Lindsay."

Q. And does the remark you made in regard to the other heading apply to that?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Mr. Clarke in the report of Mr. Gordon's statements at Lindsay, I would like to be sure that these words are in *The Globe*—and I am not doubting your reading of it at all, Mr. Chairman—where it says:

He also went to 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 preparing and arguing the appeal before the Privy Council and thus neglecting his duty as the Premier's legal advisor, which Mr. Bennett permitted him to do.

Are those words: "so if he was," are they there?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, you will agree with me then, Mr. Clarke, in that statement that Mr. Gordon made there is a qualification there:

If he went to London to argue the appeal for the Canadian Government then he was a Canadian legal advisor.

He does not say definitely. Mr. Gordon, in the report, as reported by you, does not say definitely that Mr. Herridge did go over to argue this appeal for the Canadian Government?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Duff, is not that a matter for us. We are only getting an opinion. We have to make up our own minds.

Mr. DUFF: I don't think it hurts, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not evidence as to facts; it may be some opinion.

Mr. BOWMAN: Where the words have been spoken it is up to us to interpret them.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Those words are there, Mr. Clarke?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you got a copy of *The Globe* containing a report of a speech made by Mr. Gordon at Cobourg a few nights later?—A. We have.

The CHAIRMAN: What date?

Mr. DUFF: In *The Globe* of January 16th, 1932.

The WITNESS: Yes, I have it here.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Does that report of that meeting contain a retraction by Mr. Gordon with regard to certain statements he made about Major Herridge?—A. It contains a reference to those statements somewhere.

By Mr. Howard:

Q. Mr. Clarke, what is the headline for that article?—A. The headline is:

Liberals Organize With Unity and Vim in Central Ontario. J. J. Duffus Named President as Representatives of Dozen Ridings Gather in Cobourg—Chairman Deprecates Reference to Reported Leadership Differences. Sinclair, Moore Address Meeting.

Hon. G. N. Gordon Takes Occasion to Correct Statement Regarding Canadian Minister at Washington—B. O'Connor, Marmora, Wins. in Speaking Contest.

Q. Will you be good enough to read what you have with regard to the retraction that Mr. Gordon made?—A. I will try and locate that. It is somewhere down in the report. This is quoting Mr. Gordon:—

Hon. G. N. Gordon, Peterborough, took the opportunity of referring to his statements made recently regarding the Canadian Minister at Washington. He said he had done an injustice to Major Herridge as to his going to England on his honeymoon when on official business for the government. The brief Mr. Gordon said he had received had interposed the wrong year of Mr. Herridge's trip to England, which Mr. Gordon said had misled him. Mr. Gordon said he had always found the source of his information reliable and trustworthy, and regretted that it failed him and caused him to criticize Mr. Herridge unfairly.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Clarke, would you consider that a retraction of the remarks that Mr. Gordon made with regard to Mr. Herridge at Hamilton and Lindsay?

Mr. BOWMAN: Surely, Mr. Chairman, that is not for the witness to say.

The CHAIRMAN: We are the judges.

Mr. DUFF: I know; but Mr. Clarke certainly has an opinion as a newspaper man, and I am asking him as a newspaper man what is his opinion.

The CHAIRMAN: It is only a case of saving time. I have no objection to your asking the question.

Mr. DUFF: I think, Mr. Chairman, we might as well go into this thing thoroughly. The reason I am asking this question is because I want the committee to see what the public think about this whole matter, whether it is only a tempest in a tea pot or something serious.

Mr. GAGNON: I think we ought to follow the same line as we do before a court of justice.

The CHAIRMAN: I think you see the point, Mr. Duff. I am just pointing out that we have got to settle that.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Well, the report you have just read a moment ago, Mr. Clarke, appeared in *The Globe*, and would you say that was a fairly accurate account of what Mr. Gordon said at Cobourg?—A. At Cobourg?

Q. Yes.—A. I would say it is.

Q. Is your correspondent reliable?—A. Our correspondent is reliable at Cobourg. We have selected our correspondents with great care, and particularly after they have served us sometime we learn to rely on them absolutely.

Q. You have been in the newspaper business, I suppose, a great many years?—A. Yes, 26.

Q. And you have had charge of arranging stories that have come in from your correspondents and preparing them for the paper?—A. Yes.

Q. When you arranged to publish the reports of Mr. Gordon's speeches at Hamilton and Lindsay, did you think they were any way unusual from other stories of a similar character that *The Globe* had published over a great many years?—A. Well, we considered them very outstanding and remarkable in the public interest. That is evidenced by the fact that they were prominently displayed.

Q. I mean, they were not really different from other articles which you had published at other times. Of course, it was not the same speech that you had published at other times, but in your experience you have published other articles of a similar nature?—A. We have published political speeches that were hot, and charges, of course.

Q. What is that, Mr. Clarke?—A. Political speeches that were hot have been published from time immemorial, and charges have been made from platforms, and have been reported.

Q. Charges similar to those?—A. I don't know that. I believe—

Q. Well now—A. I can't say.

By Mr. Howard:

Q. It was your own correspondents who attended at those meetings and took the story?—A. In Cobourg?

Q. In Cobourg.—A. Yes.

Q. And sent the story to you direct?—A. By telegraph.

Q. By wire?—A. Yes.

Q. You took it in Toronto. Did you revise the story, or did you publish it as sent?—A. Published as sent, with the necessary editing. In any transmission there are words, letters transposed, and punctuation left out; such things as that have to be revised before it goes to print.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. Mr. Duff refers to similar statements previously made. In the editorial referred to, January 8, the charges are spoken of as being sensational, implying a major scandal?

The CHAIRMAN: I thought Mr. Clarke said that was the 9th?

The WITNESS: That would be in the editorial of the 8th.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. That is the way your paper treated this statement. It was treated by them as a sensational statement?—A. That is the editorial opinion of the *Globe*.

Q. Implying a major scandal. So that it was not a common statement made every day?—A. No.

By Mr. Speakman:

Q. Do you write the editorial columns?—A. Not at all.

Q. So the editorial was written by another man who formed his own opinion as to the importance of the story?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Since the editorial has been questioned, perhaps it would be better if we put it on record.

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-

drawal at the Cobourg meeting?—A. Yes, that editorial was published on January 8th, and the Cobourg speech to which you refer, appeared on January 16th.

Q. Your editorial lecture, apparently, did some good.

Mr. BOWMAN: Surely, that is a matter for the committee to decide?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gordon, do you want to ask Mr. Clarke any questions?

Hon. Mr. GORDON: No, Mr. Chairman.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. Mr. Clarke, the statement at Cobourg appeared in your issue of the 16th January, and the reply to which Mr. Gordon refers, and which was made at Lindsay, is in the issue of January—A. Ninth.

Q. Ninth?—A. Yes.

Q. The day following—A. The day following the editorial Mr. Gordon was purported to answer the charges in that editorial at Lindsay. The editorial appeared on Friday, January 8th.

Q. Following that, you received those wires?—A. And Mr. Gordon spoke in Lindsay that same night.

Q. Yes. He had previously wired you he was going to answer the charge?—A. Yes.

Q. And the answer purports to be the answer to what appeared in the editorial to which you refer as being supplied by your reporter, Mr. Moynes?—A. Not the editorial, but the notes received from Lindsay from Mr. Moynes.

Q. Appearing in *The Globe* under date of January 9th?—A. Yes.

Q. Would you just look at the caption under which it appears? Am I correct? A part of that has already been placed on record. The caption reads: "Lindsay, Jan. 8th."—A. Yes.

Hon. G. N. Gordon of Peterboro at the annual banquet of the Liberal Association of Victoria and Haliburton, took occasion to reply to editorial criticism in *The Globe* regarding his Hamilton speech.—A. Yes.

FORD MOYNES, called and sworn.

By the Chairman:

Q. You live in Lindsay, Mr. Moynes?—A. Yes.

Q. You have heard Mr. Clarke recite some statements in connection with a meeting in Lindsay?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are the man who received those statements and sent them, as the case may be?—A. Yes.

Q. You gathered the statements?—A. I might make a statement, Mr. Chairman, in that respect.

Q. I was just going to suggest that. Perhaps you had better do it in your own way.—A. Mr. Chairman, I was advised by telephone at about seven o'clock at night at another town, and by the time I got to the meeting I found that Mr. Gordon had already spoken. We had not been invited to cover the meeting personally, and that being the case—the editor of *The Daily Post* of Lindsay, *The Lindsay Post*, was also there, and he had not heard the speech, and we both decided to interview Mr. Gordon, personally. Mr. Gordon came out of the lobby, and he was very generous and very courteous, and he said he would give us a statement. So—

By the Chairman:

Q. A statement of what he said?—A. At this meeting. So we went to the newspaper office, and Mr. Gordon dictated that statement to the typewriter, in my presence. I have that statement here.

Q. It was transcribed?—A. Yes.

Q. It was sent?—A. By wire, that night.

Q. Is it the same as appears in *The Globe*? Have you examined it?—A. Practically the same.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you want to check it over?

Mr. HOWARD: File it as an exhibit.

The CHAIRMAN: It is substantially the same.

Mr. BOWMAN: Let us have it.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, my glasses have been broken, and I am wearing substitutes, and I can hardly read it. If somebody else will read for me, it will be all right. It is typewritten, and the introduction is my own words.

The CHAIRMAN (Reading):

Lindsay, January 8—Hon. G. N. Gordon, of Peterboro, at the annual banquet of the Liberal Association of Victoria and Haliburton, here tonight, took the occasion to reply to the attack made on him by *The Globe*, regarding his Hamilton speech. "I have been too long in public eye to make statements that are not based on facts." Mr. Gordon said that only a small section of his reference to Mr. Herridge had been correctly used by *The Globe*, "and a large audience in Hamilton heard every word I said" and Mr. Gordon said he followed his notes very closely in making the Hamilton speech.

We want what was said outside those particular notes.

Mr. DUFF: I should like to have the rest of it, Mr. Chairman, in regard to Mr. Herridge's going to London to argue an appeal case before the Privy Council.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall give everything.

According to Mr. Gordon, Premier Bennett appointed his brother-in-law, Major Herridge, to the position of legal adviser to the Premier and took him to England with him, to the Economic Conference.

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 English 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. Gordon further said that the Canadian Legation at Washington was kept without a minister for 18 months, and then Mr. Bennett appointed Major Herridge to the job which had been run at a critical time in Canada's trade conditions, for a year and a half by secretaries.

Mr. Herridge, according to Mr. Gordon, remained a long time in London as 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.

Then there is something about the private car. I understand you, Mr. Moynes, that this is from Mr. Gordon's own dictation, of what he had said at the meeting?—A. Yes.

Q. And he gave it to you for publication?—A. Yes.

Q. In that regard?—A. Yes.

Mr. GAGNON: I understand that this document will be filed?

The CHAIRMAN: I read it into the record.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: No questions.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, then, those are all the witnesses that we have asked to attend, except I see Mr. Herridge is here and the Prime Minister.

Witness retired.

RICHARD BEDFORD BENNETT, called and sworn.

By the Chairman:

Q. You are the Prime Minister, Mr. Bennett, referred to in this article?—

A. Yes.

Q. Will you make any statement you care to make to the committee?—A. I was in Calgary when my attention was directed to the charge made against me. I at once denied it. When I came east I found that wide publicity had been given to this story, and on investigation I found that the article had been published in the newspapers of my native province under date of January the 7th, in the *Fredericton Gleaner*, in these words:

That Premier R. B. Bennett had deliberately taken a Canadian Government legal case out of the hands of other lawyers and had given the case to William D. Herridge, his then prospective brother-in-law, so that the honeymoon of Mildred Bennett might be spent in London and the Continent and that the expenses might be charged to the Canadian Government, was charged by Hon. G. N. Gordon, K.C., former Deputy Speaker in the Federal House, speaking to-night to Hamilton Liberals.

Hon. Mr. Gordon confirmed the charge to-day when *The Gleaner* telephoned him at his Peterborough 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."

Mr. Gordon further charged that Premier Bennett had scoffed at using former Premier King's private car, which was in excellent condition. Mr. Gordon said, "While unemployment and destitution ran rampant throughout the country the Prime Minister, just after he was elected, thought nothing of spending \$125,000 for the building of a new Canadian National private car for his own use. There were several other cars available, and none of them was good enough for Mr. Bennett."

By Mr. Cantley:

Q. What paper is that, Mr. Bennett?—A. That is from the *Fredericton Gleaner* of January 7th, 1932. I had further investigations carried on and I ascertained wide publicity had been given to those statements.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. In that article which you read from the *Fredericton Gleaner* do they say where they got that information?—A. Yes, just what I read. It is headed "Charges Against Premier Bennett—Special to the *Daily Gleaner* by Leased Wire—Toronto, Jan. 7." It is a syndicate article sent out from Toronto.

Q. But they do not say where they got it from?—A. No.

Q. It is not what Mr. Gordon said?—A. It is in quotation what Mr. Gordon telephoned from Peterboro. When I returned east I saw the matter had been taken in a very serious way by the *Toronto Globe*. An editorial had been written, and I felt that it was necessary in the public interest, as I viewed it, that no man should remain Prime Minister who was stealing public funds for the purpose of assisting anyone else in any particular position. I would just take the charges as they appear and answer them if you will just give them to me.

It is untrue that I financed, or that the government of which I am the head financed the honeymoon trip of my sister to Europe out of the Canadian treasury.

It is untrue that I obtained a new private car for my own use at a cost to Canada of \$125,000.

It is untrue that the cost of Mrs. Herridge's honeymoon trip to Europe had been paid out of the Canadian treasury.

It is untrue that Mr. Herridge was ever engaged by me as a full-time legal advisor, or any other time legal advisor. When I went to the Imperial Conference in 1930 I asked Mr. Herridge to accompany me as a personal legal assistant and he agreed to do so. He was paid nothing for his services. He declined to accept any compensation.

Q. Either for services or expenses?—A. Just one moment. He declined to accept his expenses and I insisted they should be paid by the country as part of the expense of the delegation, and in part they were so paid, and partially by himself personally. He was never employed by the government to conduct any case in the Privy Council, either in the Radio or any other case. His stay in London was coincident with my own. He went with us to the Imperial Conference, and returned with me. I think that covers the statements that are made.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Bennett, just for the purpose of the record, what was the date of the Imperial Conference?—A. I think I arrived in London on the afternoon of the 1st day of October, 1930—that is my memory—and I returned to Canada in December, 1930. That is when I reached Canada. With respect to the car—

Q. May I just follow that for a moment? When was Major Herridge married?—A. In April, 1931. With respect to the railway car, I should like the committee to know that the car, now No. 100, is a car that was exchanged with the Canadian National Railways. After I became Prime Minister, car, I think 100, was turned over to me and it was suggested that I might want some changes in the car. It was a very fine car only the accommodation was not the sort of accommodation, perhaps, that I would prefer.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Was that the car used by the previous Prime Minister?—A. Yes, the Prime Minister's car, and the President of the Canadian National Railways intimated that he had to have a new business car and that if I wished he would take that car and give me one of their business cars and, as a matter of fact, that was done—so there is no car added to the government cars in any way, shape or form, but a substitution of one car for another car. As a matter of fact, car 100 that is now used by me is not a new car, for part of old 102 was used for that purpose. I had nothing whatever to do with it. I only know what changes were made in the accommodation and conveniences of the car; but there was no expenditure of any such sum as was mentioned, and there has been no additions to the cars.

Q. You would know how much the total expenditure on that car was for renovating and changing it?—A. I was told that they took over the old car and took the trucks off the car and spent, I believe, something like \$49,000. That is the sum that was spent on the car to make the new car.

Q. For all the renovation and changes?—A. That is my understanding; but I had nothing to do with that. The railway company took the car over, and they say it actually represented a saving of something like \$8,000 or \$10,000. Keep in mind they were building a new car, not renovating the former car; but they took over the former car and the car I now have was substituted for it. I understand the car I now have cost something like \$49,000, but they took the old car which they valued for their purposes at \$57,000.

Q. Then, Mr. Bennett, you do not know whether it is \$49,000 in addition to the changes and renovation, the cost of the old car in the first place, or whether the \$49,000 was only for renovation and changes?—A. Well, all I know is this, that my information was as handed to me after this came up. I made some inquiries about it and I find that there is a letter from the President of the Canadian National Railways directed to Dr. Manion which says:

As you are aware, the business car at present assigned to the Prime Minister is unsatisfactory in certain respects, and inasmuch as it will cost more to alter it than to build a new one, I propose to pursue the latter course. An additional business car is badly needed and, by taking over the Prime Minister's car and providing him with another one, I can fill the deficiency. This is something which certainly ought to be done, and I believe it sound business to do so.

That was Sir Henry Thornton's letter. My memoranda is that car 102 was taken back which was represented as being worth \$57,500. There was an actual saving, as I say, of between \$8,000 and \$10,000 to the country.

Q. I would like to know how much it cost the Canadian National Railways to renovate and renew this car 100.—A. They did not do that. They were building a new car, so I was informed, instead of which they took over the former car and substituted a partially new car, which is the car now used by the Prime Minister, and in the figures that were handed to the minister it represents a saving of some \$8,000, the cost I believe upon the new car being \$49,000, which was the cost that they would make in any event, and not for the new car for the Prime Minister but for the car they were building for themselves.

Q. I have heard it said that you paid for these changes yourself?—A. No. There may be some slight expense on the car that I did pay.

Q. They tell some good things about you as well as bad.—A. Mr. Duff, my objection in all this matter is that I should have been charged with stealing the public money, and that my sister's name was dragged into this matter, as it was.

Q. I am opposed to that, sir.—A. And the reiteration and the incorrectness of the story. Those are the only things. I would not bother any committee with it only for that. The personal attacks of Mr. Gordon has made upon me I do not bother about. That is part of the price you pay for being in public life. In other words, Mr. Duff, other people besides Mr. Gordon have made statements about other public men. These charge made against me personally by Mr. Gordon are charges which I am not discussing here; but when you charge the Prime Minister of a country, whoever he happens to be, it is not the man, it is the office. I was not prepared to stand it. That is my position.

Q. Mr. Bennett, you said in your statement regarding Major Herridge's trip to London to the Imperial Conference that he did not receive any remuneration. Now, did you say part of his expenses were paid by the government?—A. I saw that they were paid. He did not know that they were paid until after they were and he said he did not wish his expenses to be paid. I said they had to be paid by the country—as they were.

Q. I do not see anything wrong about it at all.—A. I may say to you I spent much more money than the country paid so far as I was concerned on that occasion.

Q. I have done that myself.—A. I hope so.

Q. I notice there is a criticism here, Mr. Bennett, of your appointment of Mr. Herridge as Canadian Envoy at Washington. I suppose you take full responsibility for making that appointment?—A. Yes, Mr. Duff. That is a matter of fair political criticism against which no public man would have any right to make any objection. It is your right to criticize.

Q. There is a matter which really might have been left out of this.—A. It happens to be in it, unfortunately. It should have been left out, but unfortunately it was not.

Q. But it was fair criticism for Mr. Gordon to refer to that appointment?—A. It was fair criticism for anyone to say that Mr. Herridge was unfitted for his position, if he desires. I think you might say that.

Q. No, I would not say that. I would call that unfair.—A. No, there are many men, Mr. Duff, who say I am unfitted for my position. That is a matter of fair criticism.

Q. Yes, I would almost say that.—A. But when you speak of my brother-in-law that becomes a matter of importance—

Q. No, sir, I am leaving that out entirely, Mr. Bennett. I think that is about all, sir. With regard to what you said about public men criticizing others fairly or unfairly, whilst it is quite possible that these statements of Mr. Gordon's were rather serious, has a retraction been made?—A. You saw what *The Globe* said about that editorially. It might involve the life of the government.

Q. Yes, but after that, Mr. Bennett, did you see the report in *The Globe* about the Cobourg correction?—A. Mr. Duff, my attention was directed to it. As you will observe, it is nothing else but a retraction. You would hardly call that a retraction. And might I say to you, not being a member of the bar but having some experience doubtless—

Q. I am a sea lawyer, don't forget that.—A. I always treat you as an Admiral, as you know, and not as a sea lawyer; but I just desire to say this, that there are well-known provisions of our law; when retractions are made and apologies are given the law provides for them very clearly, and if one makes charges either maliciously or otherwise an apology is always in order, and is usually accepted; but it must be just what it says, it must express regret for having maliciously made improper statements.

Q. Did you ever think of taking action against the *Globe* for publishing these statements?—A. Well, Mr. Duff, when I returned from the west and gathered together the information that I have just referred to I at once realized that the papers that had circulated these stories were liable; but the law says that you must bring your proceedings within a certain time after it is brought to your attention, with all that is involved in connection with just such a matter as that, and I thought the easiest and simplest way to deal with it,—because you must remember that as a member of the King's Privy Council for Canada, a King's Counsel and a former Minister of the Crown, he had made the statements and most newspapers published them on that basis; and in far distant parts of this country, in remote sections, these statements would be used for the purpose of alleging that the Prime Minister of this country had done these things. Under those circumstances how can you take action? The papers believed the story, presumably, made by one in that position in life, as having a foundation in fact, and my business was not with my own reputation so far as the country is concerned but to this parliament of which, for the moment, I happen to be the leader, and my duty was to try at least to show to my peers in this House that these charges were unwarranted. That is the reason I am here.

Q. Of course you would not say, Mr. Bennett, that because Mr. Gordon was a Privy Councillor that people would think he would have the right to make, or would believe any statements he would make. For instance, to clear my point, I have got some clippings of speeches that other Privy Councillors made which, in my opinion, are almost, if not quite, as bad as Mr. Gordon's.—A. Doubtless, Mr. Duff, that may be true; but a newspaper is warranted in publishing statements that are made by those who occupy positions of importance upon the assumption that they have considered the consequence of their actions

when they have made the statements, and that reliability is attached to such statements. That is the point I am desiring to make with you. If you were conducting a newspaper I think you will agree that you would be warranted in treating as seriously as the *Globe* editorial did a statement made by one who had occupied the position of a Minister of the Crown, and who is a member of the Privy Council, a member of the Bar and a King's Councillor. There is a great distinction between that and statements made by some wholly irresponsible person. That is all the point I desire to make with you, Mr. Duff.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that all, Mr. Duff.

By Mr. Howard:

Q. Mr. Bennett, in connection with the car, in your own judgment do you think the statement that you made is correct—that really there was a credit of \$8,000 to Canada?—A. I tell you this is the position. I am not a car manufacturer, and I was not very particular, Mr. Howard, about the car one way or the other. My memory is,—and I am only speaking now from long memory—I thought the old car was much more ornate than I cared to have, and the kitchen, if I remember right, is an old fashioned one and was situated between the dining room and the end of the car. That is my memory now. At any rate, the President of the Canadian National Railways spoke to me about it. He said what his letter said to Dr. Manion, that they were making a new car, and he said you can have it if you like. I said I would not become a party to any large expenditure of money for a car, and they said if they made this exchange it would cost the country nothing, and whether the credit of \$8,000 is so or not I can only say that that is the figure given me by the department. I may say to you that I became a little worried about the matter after I went away to England, and I sent word over that I did not want any expense put on a new car. As a matter of fact, you see what has happened, there is no new car. The old trucks of another car are used, and the car they were building for themselves is now the Prime Minister's car. I admit that I did have a name put on the car in addition.

Q. I am not criticizing for one minute the right of the Prime Minister to a private car; but I was just trying to get this: there was a car in existence that the late Prime Minister used at the time they were starting to build a new car. Therefore, if the expenditure of building a new car had been stopped it would have saved the country some \$60,000, \$75,000 or \$100,000.—A. Less than that, according to the figures they gave. The only thing about it is they said they need a car. I am not a judge of that, and I had no power to stop them; but if it had been stopped there would have been no new Prime Minister's car.

Q. Right, but on the other hand the fact that a new car was built did cost this country whatever the cost of the new car was.—A. It cost the Canadian National Railways you mean?

Q. Yes. After all, that is the same thing as the government of Canada to-day. The point I am getting at is this, that in view of that fact it is current around through the country, I believe, that in the costs to the Canadian National Railways this year there was a new car, and, therefore, I think possibly the statement that the Prime Minister had had a new car which cost the country so many thousands of dollars was fully justifiable.—A. Mr. Howard criticizes the fact that the old car was substituted for another car. I am not making any complaint about it, but that isn't so at all, and the cost of \$125,000 is incorrect. I quite agree that any public action of the Prime Minister, or any other member of the government, is quite a proper matter for criticism.

Mr. HOWARD: Certainly. That is just what I was getting at, and the fact that the new car was provided during this year might allow someone to make the statement. As to whether it cost \$70,000 or \$125,000, I do not think that is important.

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.

The WITNESS: I am entirely with you on that.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Apart from any opinion which the Prime Minister may form I must come to my own conclusion as a member of the committee as to the adequacy of that statement.

By Mr. Howard:

Q. Mr. Bennett, in public life there are a lot of things that are not given in cash that have the equivalent of salary.—A. Well, as a matter of fact, that has been a question that has been greatly agitated—the superannuation fund, for instance in connection with lodgings, in connection with house and matters of that sort. Salary is well defined,—payment of fees to a professional man. There may be a residence as you know, allowances for expenses and matters of that kind.

Q. Well, that was not just the point I was getting at. The point I was getting at is this: There are men in Canada, as there are in other countries, who have been fortunate in this life, and yet they are looking for what we call privileges that they can only get by public service. Supposing a man took a position as Canadian Ambassador at Washington for nothing, wouldn't you think that the country was paying him something,—I mean the privileges that go with the office?—A. I should think you would not suggest that any man who gratuitously rendered a service to the country was compensated by the service that he was rendering, or any benefit he received. For instance, I find it a little difficult to find any benefits I am receiving for the service I have been endeavouring to render to this country since 1928.

Mr. CANTLEY: That will come after death.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? Mr. Gordon?

Hon. Mr. GORDON: No, Mr. Chairman.

Witness retired.

WILLIAM DUNCAN HERRIDGE, called and sworn.

By the Chairman:

Q. You are the Major Herridge mentioned in the newspaper articles?—A. I am, Mr. Chairman.

Q. Would you comment on them, please, and give your evidence in regard to the statements that are made?—A. Well, my evidence will be confirmatory of the Prime Minister's statements, Mr. Chairman. I deny these, Mr. Chairman, seriatim. My evidence naturally confirms the evidence of the Prime Minister. I went to the Imperial Conference as the personal assistant of the Prime Minister in September, 1930. I went, as the Prime Minister says, without salary. I gave my time to the work of the Conference. I had not at that time any case before the Privy Council. When I went to England in April—

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Just a minute there, Mr. Herridge, if you don't mind. You say that trip was in September, 1930?—A. Yes, September to December, 1930.

Q. How did you travel to England?—A. I travelled with the Prime Minister.

Q. I see, in the Prime Minister's private car?—A. Yes.

Q. Where did you sail from?—A. Sailed from Quebec.

Q. And during that trip you received no remuneration?—A. No.

Q. Except that your expenses were paid?—A. My expenses were paid, at least part of my expenses were paid. I found myself in the same position as the Prime Minister, inasmuch as I spent considerably more out of my own pocket than the total expenses amounted to.

Q. Your position with the Prime Minister I see by the record here was personal assistant.—A. Yes.

Q. You gave him assistance during the meetings of the Conference?—A. I attempted to, yes, Mr. Duff. With respect to my trip in April, Mr. Chairman, at the time of my marriage, I had a brief in a case which was on appeal from the Supreme Court of Canada to the Privy Council. It was a case in which I had the original trial brief, action in which was instituted in 1927. I took that brief at the trial in the Exchequer Court. I took it again in the Supreme Court of Canada and I took it on appeal to the Privy Council.

Q. With regard to that trip, Mr. Herridge, how did you travel, that second trip to the Old Country from Ottawa?—A. I travelled from Ottawa to New York. I travelled from New York to Southampton by the Steamship *Europa*.

Q. The *Europa* from New York to Southampton?—A. Yes.

Q. You did not go from a Canadian port on that trip?—A. No.

Q. You were the Canadian Ambassador to Washington at that time?—A. I had been appointed in the month of March previous.

Q. March 1931?—A. In March, 1931.

Q. And you were the Canadian representative at Washington when you made that second trip to the Old Country?—A. I was.

Q. You were also made a Privy Councillor before that second trip?—A. No, I was not made a Privy Councillor until,—I don't recall the date—it was some date in June after I returned from England.

Q. Mr. Herridge, after these statements, or these speeches which Mr. Gordon is supposed to have made at Hamilton and Lindsay, am I right in saying that a newspaper reporter interviewed you with regard to them and you told him—perhaps not in my exact words, or the words I am going to use—but you told this newspaper man that you did not think the matter was worth bothering with; in other words, you ignored the statements altogether? That was the impression you gave him.—A. No. The impression I gave, the impression the newspaper reporter should have received—and doubtless did—was that these things in my opinion were almost incredible. It was astonishing to me that a man in the position of Mr. Gordon should make statements about a person like myself who had gone into public service, very definitely to his own financial loss, and who on that account when he was trying to give a decent, honest service—which in the opinion of some people apparently is not understood—should have been saved from a situation like that.

Q. I see. That was not the way I read it.—A. Well, that is what I meant, and that is what I mean now.

Q. Mr. Herridge, when did you go to Washington as the representative of Canada?—A. About the middle of June.

Q. And you have been there ever since except on occasions—A. I have been there and I have been here and elsewhere on duty.

Q. You have been on duty ever since?—A. Yes.

Q. Might I ask you if you drew any salary as the Canadian representative to Washington whilst you were on that second trip to the Old Country?—A. No.

Q. When did your salary start?—A. My salary started on the 1st of June. My allowances started on the day I left Washington. That is roughly two weeks later.

Q. So that it would be about three months from the time you were appointed until you went to Washington?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gordon, do you want to ask some questions?

Hon. Mr. GORDON: No, Mr. Chairman.

By Mr. Howard:

Q. Mr. Herridge, you said a minute ago you were appointed as Canadian Ambassador to Washington in March, 1931?—A. Yes.

Q. And you went there the 1st of June, 1931?—A. Yes. In the interval I employed myself in putting my own private business in shape so that I could go there.

Q. So there were only three months between the appointment until the time you went there?—A. Yes, April, May and June.

Witness retired.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, I would like to call Mr. W. A. Fraser.

The CHAIRMAN: The committee has asked for no other witnesses.

WILLIAM A. FRASER, called and sworn.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Mr. Fraser, you are the member for Northumberland?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the Province of Ontario?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you attended a banquet given by the members of the Liberal Party at Cobourg on January the 15th, 1932?—A. I did.

Q. How many people were present at that gathering, approximately?—A. Between 400 and 500.

Q. Was Mr. Gordon there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He made a speech that evening?—A. He did.

Q. Were there any other prominent men there besides Mr. Gordon who made speeches, or honoured the occasion with their presence?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who were they?—A. Mr. W. H. Moore, M.P., Mr. Fred McArthur, M.P.P.

Q. What constituency does he represent?—A. Northumberland County.

Q. Liberal?—A. Conservative. The Rev. Dr. Boyle, and J. J. Duffus of Peterboro.

Q. Well, Mr. Fraser, could you tell the committee in a few words what Mr. Gordon said during the course of his remarks explaining the speeches which he had made previously at Hamilton and Lindsay?—A. If my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Gordon, on being called on to speak that night, opened his remarks by referring to newspaper reports,—I believe he mentioned the *Toronto Globe*—in connection with a speech he had made in Hamilton and Lindsay, and he said, in referring to those speeches, that he had apparently made statements based on information that he had received from sources, not mentioning the sources, in connection with Mr. Herridge, and I believe the Prime Minister, that were not correct. And he had ascertained afterwards that they were not correct. He stated that he was very sorry that he had made the statement, or very sorry he had done Mr. Herridge or the Prime Minister any injustice, and that he wished for me to understand that such were his feelings.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. You saw the statements made in the *Toronto Globe* regarding the Hamilton and Lindsay speeches of Mr. Gordon?—A. I did at the time, yes.

Q. When you heard Mr. Gordon make this explanation, were you satisfied in your own mind that that was a suitable retraction to make regarding the Prime Minister and Mr. Herridge?—A. Frankly, I was. And not knowing, of course, that Mr. Gordon was going to make any reference to it whatsoever, I felt at the time, personally, that Mr. Gordon had done the proper thing. That was my own impression.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. Mr. Fraser, you have read the article in *The Globe* of January 16th, dealing with this Cobourg meeting?—A. I cannot say I did.

Q. May I call your attention to a particular part of it:

Hon. G. N. Gordon, Peterboro, took the opportunity of referring to his statements made recently regarding the Canadian Minister at Washington. He said he had done an injustice to Major Herridge as to his going to England on his honeymoon, when on official business for the government. The brief Mr. Gordon said he had received, had interposed the wrong year of Mr. Herridge's trip to England, which Mr. Gordon said had misled him. Mr. Gordon said he had always found the source of his information reliable and trustworthy, and regretted that it failed him and caused him to criticize Mr. Herridge unfairly.

You followed that, as I have read it. There is absolutely no reference whatever to the Premier?—A. I said, "as far as my memory served me I believed Mr. Gordon mentioned the Prime Minister that night."

Q. Would you care to state positively now that Mr. Gordon did on that occasion refer to the Prime Minister, and include him in his remarks?—A. I believe I am correct in saying that. I do not know that I would state it positively.

Q. You are not sure?—A. I am speaking from memory.

Q. You are not sure?—A. I am not absolutely sure, but my emphatic impression is that he did.

Q. When you stated that in giving your statement as to this meeting, you said, "and I think the Premier." You are not very certain about it?—A. I am not. Personally, I believe that he mentioned the Prime Minister.

Q. You believe he did. Apparently the reporter did not so gather it—A. Apparently not.

Q. — in reporting the meeting.—A. This is the first time I read the report.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Fraser, you did not see *The Globe* carrying a report of that meeting, did you?—A. No, I did not. I never read the report before; I read the report of the meeting in the local paper.

Q. Mr. Gordon said nothing to you before or after in regard to this matter?—A. No.

Q. He did not say he was going to make any comment?—A. No.

Q. He did not speak of it before?—A. I had no intimation until he got up to speak.

Q. Who was the chief speaker?—A. Mr. Moore.

Q. Mr. Sinclair was there as well?—A. Yes.

Q. You heard what Mr. Bowman read?—A. Yes.

Q. It deals there with the Canadian Minister, doesn't it, this *Globe* report?—A. Yes.

Q. It is all based on the Canadian Minister?—A. Yes; but my impression, Mr. Chairman, at that time, and the impression that was left in my mind, as I said, I felt without having any knowledge of what Mr. Gordon was going to say, or having any discussion with him, afterwards, my own personal feeling was that Mr. Gordon had come to the conclusion he had made a mistake in his statement at the meeting in Hamilton and Lindsay, and I felt that he had taken the opportunity at the Cobourg meeting to make an apology. That was my opinion.

Q. That was your general impression, that he was making an apology, but as to the particulars of the apology, you cannot recall?—A. Just what I have stated.

Q. Just as you have stated to Mr. Bowman, that you knew he spoke of Mr. Herridge, and you believe—A. Yes, I believed he spoke of the Prime Minister.

Q. You are not clear as to that?—A. I was rather surprised at the time at the outcome of Mr. Gordon's speech; and my impression was he has merely taken the opportunity at that meeting to make a public apology.

Q. To make an apology generally? And you do not remember particularly what was mentioned?—A. I was satisfied that he mentioned Mr. Herridge's name, and the Canadian Minister at Washington, and I am not quite positive in my own mind that he mentioned the Prime Minister.

Q. You are not quite as clear on that?—A. Not quite as clear, no.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. When you went to that meeting, had you seen previously the article in the *Globe*, referring to the statements which Mr. Gordon had made previously?—A. Yes.

Q. You had seen that?—A. I had.

Q. I presume they appeared to be somewhat serious charges?

The CHAIRMAN: Again, that is hardly fair.

The WITNESS: Being in politics, my reply to that was that I did not take it very seriously.

Q. To you, they were not very serious charges?—A. Well, no. Not being in politics I might have taken them seriously.

Q. Being in politics, you, as a member of parliament, do not consider them very serious charges?—A. From a political speaker, no.

Q. You would not agree with what was in the editorial appearing in the *Globe* in which they were referred to as sensational statements which upset governments, implying a major scandal?—A. I do not think I read that. There must have been two editorials in the *Globe*. I do not think I read that one.

Q. You never read that?—A. I never heard that until I came into the room this morning.

Q. You did read one?—A. I did read one.

Q. You say it was different from this?—A. Yes, the other one was a different one from that.

Q. Do you know of any other one except that?—A. I never read that one before.

Q. You never read that editorial?—A. I read an editorial.

Q. As a matter of fact, there seems to be some confusion as to whether there was one editorial or two editorials.—A. There must have been two; because I never heard of any—about upsetting governments. I never heard that before.

Q. That does appear in the editorial that has been read into the record, and it is the only editorial that we know of?—A. I do not remember reading that.

Q. As a matter of fact, when Mr. Gordon spoke at Cobourg, the matter did not impress you as being of much importance—A. I was surprised that he had taken the opportunity at that meeting to make the statement he did.

Q. You were surprised that he had bothered about making a statement in Cobourg?—A. I am not going as far as to say I was surprised that he had bothered about it, but I was surprised that at that particular meeting—when Mr. Gordon got to his feet, that was the import of his speech.

Q. As a matter of fact, you did not take it seriously at all, and you were really surprised that Mr. Gordon should bring it up again at Cobourg?—A. I would not put it that way.

Q. How would you put it?—A. This was a political meeting, a political convention. When Mr. Gordon got up to speak I say he used the opportunity to make an apology, and I did not expect him to do that. I thought he was going to make a political speech.

Q. You did not expect an apology would be forthcoming. The fact of the matter is, your viewpoint was, it being a sort of political utterance, no apology would be necessary?—A. There was no attempt to judge that—

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Mr. Fraser, am I right in presuming that the reason you say you did not take this article in *The Globe* in regard to what Mr. Gordon had said at Hamilton and Lindsay very seriously, was because you had read other statements made by other politicians which were just as strong as the statement which Mr. Gordon was supposed to have made. Is that the reason you did not take them seriously?—A. Yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. At all events, what you took from Mr. Gordon was the impression that it was an apology, and you were not considering the particulars of the apology, particularly?—A. Mr. Duff asked me if—

Q. Aside from Mr. Duff's question, was the general impression you received, that a general apology was being made, and you were not considering the particular statements of the apology?—A. It was my impression that Mr. Gordon had made an apology, and I was surprised at him doing it at that time. I felt, well, all right, at that political meeting, he made an apology.

Q. That was your impression. You were not bothering about the particulars of the apology?—A. Naturally, speaking from memory.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you want to make a statement now, Mr. Gordon?

Hon. Mr. GORDON: It is rather late, now.

Mr. HOWARD: Will Mr. Herridge be here for our next committee meeting?

The CHAIRMAN: That is the question. There is nothing much for us to listen to—I mean to say, there is not a great deal more for us to go into, unless Mr. Gordon has witnesses that he wants to call.

Mr. BOWMAN: Is it possible to finish now?

Mr. DUFF: We cannot finish in four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: If Mr. Gordon objects, I think we shall have to adjourn.

Mr. HOWARD: When I asked the question about Mr. Herridge, I had some questions in mind I should like to ask.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we had better adjourn until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

Committee adjourned until 11 a.m., March 4th, 1932.

SESSION 1932

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

CERTAIN CHARGES AND ALLEGATIONS

MADE BY

THE HONOURABLE GEORGE N. GORDON, K.C.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 2

FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 1932

WITNESS:

The Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, March 4, 1932.

The Special Committee appointed to enquire into certain charges and allegations made by the Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C., met at 11 a.m. Mr. Geary, the Chairman, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Bowman, Cantley, Duff, Gagnon, Geary, Howard, Speakman.

The Minutes of Proceedings of the previous meeting were taken as read.

The Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C., was called and sworn. He made a statement and was then examined.

The Honourable George N. Gordon retired.

On motion of Mr. Duff,—

Resolved,—That the Committee hereby ratifies and confirms the action of the Chairman of the Committee in summoning Mr. Andrew Patterson of Hamilton, Ont., to give evidence.

The Committee adjourned to meet at the call of the Chair.

JOHN T. DUN,

Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

The CHAIRMAN: I think each member of the committee has had a copy of the printed proceedings. It will not be necessary, I take it, to read them. Now, I understood that Mr. Gordon wanted to give evidence.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me.

GEORGE NEWCOMBE GORDON, called and sworn.

WITNESS: There was a meeting held in Hamilton, and at the meeting in Hamilton a very small portion of what I said was reported in the *Toronto Globe*, and the report that was contained in the *Toronto Globe*, as I said in Lindsay and attempted to correct, was incorrect. The *Toronto Globe* reported, according to the memorandum that is contained in the resolution in the House of Commons—the report was that Mrs. Herridge's honeymoon trip was paid by Mr. Bennett out of the Canadian treasury. There was no such statement made; but what I did say was this: that Major Herridge had been appointed the legal adviser to the Prime Minister and had an opportunity of arguing a case before the Privy Council in connection with radio matters, and that his honeymoon synchronized with the trip he had taken to London. I had in mind at the time the privilege that ministers have of having their expenses paid by the crown, and the fact that ministers do, when their families travel with them, keep a separate account of moneys expended for the use of their families on such trips; but as the reporter stated yesterday, there was no mention of Mrs. Herridge's name. That was a very small portion of what was said, but that was, in effect, what was said. *The Globe* immediately wrote an editorial upon that, reading into it what I felt should not have been read in; and as I was to speak in Lindsay a few days afterwards I immediately telegraphed *The Globe* that I intended to answer that editorial by a statement I would make at Lindsay. At Lindsay, the reporter was not present, so he asked me to give him a resumé of what I had stated in regard to the matter relating to Major Herridge, which was a small portion of what I had said. At the Lindsay meeting I made an effort to correct what was reported as of the Hamilton speech by saying that Major Herridge had gone to London and was on his honeymoon trip when he argued this appeal before the Privy Council, so that if he was a legal officer to the government of Canada he should not have taken that time and that opportunity of arguing that case before the Privy Council. My sources of information have been cuttings from my office from *The Montreal Gazette*, the *Toronto Globe*, *The Mail and Empire*, *The Toronto Star* and the *Toronto Telegram*. Occasionally cuttings were sent to me; but they were mainly the sources of information—relying chiefly upon the Canadian Press report. I then ascertained that there were two radio cases, one of which Major Herridge had argued in London and had come from the office of Henderson and Herridge, and was not the radio case I had in mind which, I think, was a case that the Dominion government was interested in in respect of provincial or dominion control of radio broadcasting. And that was the one I assumed that Major Herridge had argued as the legal adviser of the government of Canada or of the Prime Minister, whichever it was. When I found I was in error, and that it was a case in respect of a patent which was argued before the Privy Council, I immediately, at Cobourg—which was the largest public meeting I had an opportunity of speaking at to correct the impression

that had been wrongly given—I attended at Cobourg and at this meeting where there were a large number of persons present, including a number of Conservatives and reporters, as I ascertained, one of whom was reporting for the *Toronto Globe*, I immediately made a statement on that occasion that I had done an injustice to the Prime Minister and also to Major Herridge in stating that Major Herridge had argued a case for the dominion government while he was on his honeymoon trip, but that it was a case for a client of his firm; and having done him an injustice as well as Mr. Bennett I took that opportunity of retracting and explaining the fact that I had been confused as to the two cases, and I said that I apologized for the injustice that I had done him. I went further and said that I did not wish to do an injustice to any man, and that I had fallen into this error because I had taken this information I had received from certain sources which I believed at that time to be responsible, but the confusion had taken place by reason of the appointment Major Herridge received as a legal adviser which I assumed meant he was legal adviser of the government of Canada. I wish to say before my examination takes place this: That in regard to what was stated in *The Fredericton Gleaner* there was no confirmation at any time by telephone or otherwise of anything that I had stated at Hamilton and *The Fredericton Gleaner's* implications and innuendos are not founded, at least, upon anything I said. I wish to state now that there was never at any time any suggestion that there was any profit taking or any gain by Premier Bennett or Major Herridge in respect of their official positions, and I submit it is not suggested. But I suppose that is for the committee to decide; but that is my contention at the present time.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is that everything you want to say?—A. That is what I am saying at the present time. There may be some questions asked which may extend my reference to what I have said.

Q. But it is all you want to say at the moment?—A. That is all at the moment. I expect there will be inquiries made by members of the committee.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Mr. Gordon, you were here yesterday when the Prime Minister made his statement?—A. Yes.

Q. You heard him say in his remarks that he had been accused of—not stealing money—I forget the exact words—but he took it from your remarks at Hamilton that you had accused him of being a thief?—A. I am sorry he said that. There was no such thought in my mind. I had known Premier Bennett as a member of the Canadian Bar Association and a member of the bar of very eminent standing, and I was one of the Ontario group that was very active in seeking his election as the president of the Canadian Bar Association because of the feeling I had of his eminence at the bar. And my relations with him had always been very cordial up—to be frank about it—up to the time of his Regina speech of the “great betrayal”, and since then I was a little stronger in the language I had used than I had used before that date.

Q. I understand you to mean that there was no reflection on Mr. Bennett's probity or honesty in regard to public funds?—A. I never intended any, and I never thought there could be any such suggestion or innuendo taken from what I said.

Q. And do I understand from your statement of your speech at Hamilton that you were under the impression that Major Herridge had been retained as solicitor or counsel or whatever the proper legal term is by the government or by Mr. Bennett to go to London to argue a case for the government before the Imperial Privy Council?—A. I had seen it in one of the press reports of *The*

Toronto Star, as I recall it, that Major Herridge had been retained to attend at London with Premier Bennett and I had the impression that the argument took place on that trip.

Q. And you are aware, of course, that because the Prime Minister—as even a member of a department of the government—retains counsel and chooses as counsel one of his own political or personal friends that that does not mean that the member of the government or the Prime Minister does anything that he should not do. That is one of their privileges—to appoint their own friends in cases of that kind as counsel?—A. There is no impropriety in the matter. All I was charging was favoritism.

Q. There was no improper conduct on the part of the Prime Minister?—

A. No improper conduct suggested by me.

Q. Now, then, in your statement you said that after you had found that you had been misinformed and that the statements made in your Hamilton and Lindsay speeches were not exactly according to the facts you took the first opportunity at Cobourg to correct that statement and to make an explanation, to make a retraction and an apology; is that correct?—A. I did. For I thought I owed it to the two prominent Canadian members of the bar.

Q. Did you make a retraction as far as everybody whom you mentioned was concerned?—A. As I said, those names had been drawn into the matter. I regretted that the matter had received the publicity that it had, because there was no foundation for it in what I said at Hamilton.

Q. May I go a little further. Are you satisfied in your own mind, first, that that was a retraction of the statements you made at both these previous meetings?—A. Well, in my twenty-five years of practice at law I have received less frank statements and accepted them in settlement.

Q. In view of what Mr. Bennett said yesterday, you can understand his position and the position of others who are interested in this matter, and in view of his statement are you willing to say here and now that although in your opinion your retraction at Cobourg was sufficient in your mind—are you willing to go as far as to say that you regret, in view of all the circumstances which have transpired since—that you regret that you ever made those statements at Hamilton and Lindsay?—A. I certainly regret the statements were made which formed the basis of this *Globe* report which was wrong, because it is not fair to Premier Bennett nor to Major Herridge that that innuendo should be attached, and I am as anxious as any member of the committee to correct that impression that has gone forward.

Q. And you are willing to express your regrets that you ever made those statements?—A. I have done that before and I do it now, because I feel it was a very serious thing—the way *The Globe* placed it before the public. I may add that another source of my information—I forgot to say—was *The Montreal Standard* and *The Toronto Saturday Night*. I see *The Toronto Saturday Night* reporter here, and I do not want to leave him out because he is one of my valuable sources of information.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. Mr. Gordon, you are one of His Majesty's counsel learned in the law entitled to K.C. after your name?—A. Yes sir.

Q. And you say you have been practising for twenty-five years?—A. Twenty-five years past.

Q. And this article which appeared in *The Globe* under date of January 6th was specifically brought to your attention?—A. It was brought to my attention through reading *The Globe*.

Q. And the editorial which appeared in *The Globe* on January 8th under the heading "Mr. Gordon's Charge"; that was brought to your attention?—

A. I do not think I saw that—it was brought to my attention—I was told about it, and that was the basis of a telegram I think I sent to *The Globe* that I wished to answer that and make an explanation at Lindsay.

Q. In your wires—I have your wire here—you say “I am answering *The Globe* at Liberal annual meeting here to-night.” This is a wire dated Lindsay, January 8th. You purported to answer the editorial appearing in *The Globe* at Lindsay on January 8th as making an explanation answer. I suppose if you had not previously realized the gravity of those charges or allegations which were contained in *The Globe*, I presume you did so when you read the editorial?—A. I read the editorial in *The Globe* as a newspaper editorial that had written into it a great many innuendos and inferences that had no right to appear into it.

Q. Would you call this an innuendo:—

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.

A. As I say, there is no foundation for that story to be written.

Q. No foundation for it whatever?—A. No.

Q. Such being the case, why did not you at once notify *The Globe*—the editor of *The Globe* or the news editor of *The Globe* that they were apparently misinformed as to what had taken place at Hamilton?—A. I did at the first public occasion I had.

Q. The first public occasion?—A. It is the only way you have of getting it before the public, you know.

Q. Are there not other ways of getting it before the public?—A. No, not fair ways. A letter to *The Globe* would be hidden in a corner or would not give the necessary correction. That would not be fair to those involved in the matter.

Q. In other words, what actually did happen, Mr. Gordon, was this, that those statements were allowed to be broadcast from one end of Canada to the other and not denied until ten days later after the articles appeared in *The Globe*?—A. An effort was made to correct that on the 9th—on the 8th I think it was at Lindsay.

Q. And do you call that a correction, Mr. Gordon?—A. I think so.

Q. You do?—A. Yes.

Q. And that correction was prepared by you after considerable consideration?—A. No.

Q. It was not?—A. No.

Q. But, as a matter of fact, Mr. Gordon, after that article did appear in *The Globe* under the date of January 6th, allow me to read again what *The Globe* does contain under that date:—

The bald charge that Premier Bennett had financed the honeymoon trip of his sister to Europe out of the Canadian treasury, and that he had obtained a new private railway car for his own use at a cost to Canada of \$125,000, was made to local Liberals to-night by Hon. G. N. Gordon, K.C.

You say now that you did not make such a statement?—A. I say I did not make the statement that is shown in that record, and the reporter here the other day said I did not make that statement.

Q. We will have to decide ourselves as to what the reporter stated?—A. It is on the record.

Q. Quite so. But you did not by a letter to the editor of *The Globe* or even by a letter to Mr. Bennett or to Major Herridge indicate that *The Globe* was wrong in publishing such a statement?—A. I took the method that is taken by

public speakers to make corrections so that the corrections can reach the persons who heard or read in the first instance what has been said in a public address. That is the method that has been adopted, and a very common one in this part of Canada.

Q. I am not asking you what you did do; I am asking you did you advise Mr. Bennett or Major Herridge that *The Globe* had incorrectly reported you?—
A. No.

Q. You did not?—A. Except by this method.

Q. On January 16?—A. No. On January 9th, was the first correction. January 16th was when the complete facts were before me—the public statement.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. The 15th?—A. The 15th of January.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. Did you write *The Globe* or any other prominent newspaper in Canada notifying them that you had been incorrectly reported?—A. No. There is no need to write a paper. The letters are written on a back page and they never reach the public.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. And in addition, they may not be published?—A. Yes. The only direct way is the manner I adopted.

Q. Or they may not be published at all?—A. My letters to *The Globe* might not be published at all.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. In the statement which you dictated at Lindsay to one of the reporters, do you remember using these words in reference to the article of January 6th in *The Globe*:—

I have been too long in the public eye to make statements that are not based on facts. . . . ?

A. I did not dictate that statement.

Q. Then, the reporter who made that statement that you did dictate it is in error?—A. I do not think he said that. I think he said that is what he added to it, and the dictated report is a brief memorandum which is placed before the chairman.

Q. My recollection is that this is part of the statement which he had dictated?—A. Yes. The dictated statement does not contain that memorandum. It is written in hand apparently as part of a conversation he had with me walking over to the Lindsay post office.

Q. What do you say about that Mr. Gordon; did you make that statement?—A. I may have.

Q. You may have?—A. Yes.

Q. That you had been too long in the public eye.—A. I think I said I had been too long in public affairs. I do not think I said "in the public eye." It does not sound like an expression of mine.

By the Chairman:

Q. You do not complain of that statement?—A. No. I am not complaining.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. And that was part of the correction which you were making of what had happened?—A. Yes. I might add that he asked me,—*The Globe* particularly wanted me to deal with the matter connecting Major Herridge with the Hamilton address. He was not concerned about the other part of my speech at Lindsay, although I gave him that information and didn't give him the rest of it.

Q. Now, you say that you purpose answering *The Globe's* charges at Lindsay, and might I quote from the correction which has been placed on record:—

Major Herridge was Mr. Bennett's brother-in-law and this was his honeymoon trip, said Mr. Gordon. "He also went to 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 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."

A. That is correct.

Q. And:—

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

A. That is right.

Q. And this was the way that you answered the editorial which had appeared in *The Globe*?—A. That is part of the answer, yes.

Q. In other words, Mr. Gordon, as a lawyer was that not a justification of the statement which was contained in *The Globe* of January the 6th?—A. Not at all.

Q. In there there is no reference to the Premier at all, in so far as any statements made in respect to him are concerned.—A. Premier Bennett, no reference to him? There is a reference to him. You have just read it.

Q. All right, where is it? Reference to the statements made, no retraction or correction of any statements made with regard to the Prime Minister in the articles that I have just read?—A. I don't get your question altogether.

Q. I say that the paragraph which I have just read, and which was your answer—A. Part of the answer.

Q. Part of the answer, all right, there is no reference there to Premier Bennett, no retraction or correction of any statement made on January 6th with respect to the Prime Minister?—A. No.

Q. So that you did not bother making any correction at the Lindsay meeting with respect to any previous statement made regarding the Prime Minister?—A. No. I considered,—I had the idea then from these sources of information that the argument had taken place at this time, that Major Herridge was the legal adviser to the government as he had a right to do—

Q. And might I refer to the report in *The Globe* under date of January 16th, "Correction by Mr. Gordon"?—A. Can I see that exhibit, please,—*The Globe* of the 16th?

Q. You have it there. It starts:—

Hon. G. N. Gordon, Peterboro, took the opportunity of referring to his statements made recently regarding the Canadian Minister at Washington. He said he had done an injustice to Major Herridge as to his going to England on his honeymoon when on official business for the government. The brief Mr. Gordon said he had received had interposed the wrong year of Mr. Herridge's trip to England which Mr. Gordon said

had misled him. Mr. Gordon said he had always found the source of his information reliable and trustworthy and regretted that it failed him and caused him to criticize Mr. Herridge unfairly.

A. The latter part of that is correct; the latter part is not complete.

Q. Another case of the reporter incorrectly quoting you.—A. Well, I was a newspaper reporter and I know just what happened. You are not telling me anything new. Premier Bennett himself in 1913 was incorrectly reported in Hansard as shown.

Q. Quite true. But what you do say is that you were incorrectly reported on this occasion?—A. I was not completely reported, no. That is what I am complaining about.

Q. And on that date—on January the 16th you made no retraction whatever of any charge directed against the Premier of Canada?—A. Yes, I did, and 500 people heard it.

Q. Well, there is none in this report of January 16th?—A. There is none in *The Globe* report, no. I don't know whether it is in the other newspaper reports or not. *The Globe* reports have been quoted for the particular purpose of the inquiry. As for the other newspapers, I don't know whether they contained it or not.

Q. Did you, upon seeing that news article appear in *The Globe* under date of January 16th, write a letter to *The Globe*?—A. No.

Q. Correcting that?—A. No.

Q. Did you write a letter to the Prime Minister of Canada?—A. No.

Q. Telling him you had been incorrectly reported?—A. No.

Q. You were quite satisfied to let the thing go?—A. No; but I found *The Globe* had reported incorrectly as it had on those occasions—and I wasn't going to spend any more time correcting *The Globe* report.

Q. In other words, you were satisfied to let the statements which had appeared in the paper go unchallenged?—A. No, I was not.

Q. That is what you did do, was it not?—A. No, it was not.

Q. What did you do?—A. I took the opportunity of telling different members of the House of Commons and the Senate and my friends and others just what had taken place, and then when I found that this inquiry was to take place shortly afterwards I knew that that would give me the opportunity of correcting what was not corrected, or what was incorrectly reported there.

Q. But other than that you did nothing to correct these reports which contained these serious statements under date of January the 6th?—A. Other than what I have stated to this committee.

Q. No, you did nothing else?—A. No.

Q. You refer there to a brief, Mr. Gordon. You are referring there, under date of January 16th, to a brief. That brief, as you have explained,—I presume that is newspaper clippings?—A. No, that is an error in this way: I said that the brief that Major Herridge had received was one from his firm, that he had argued the case, when he was on his honeymoon, for certain private interests. That is the way the word "brief" comes into that context.

By the Chairman:

Q. Are you speaking of Cobourg now?—A. This is Cobourg, yes.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. You said it interposed the wrong year:—

The brief Mr. Gordon said he had received had interposed the wrong year. . . .

A. Oh, no, no. That is all twisted.

Q. That is all wrong too?—A. Yes.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, if the other members of the committee are through I would like to ask Mr. Gordon a few more questions.

The CHAIRMAN: You can go as far as you like, Mr. Duff.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Mr. Gordon, Mr. Bowman asked you with regard to the reason you did not correct the statements made at Hamilton between the time you made the Hamilton and Lindsay speeches and the time you made the correction at Cobourg. Was the reason for the delay due to the fact that you had very little time in which to get the necessary facts to base your correction on?—A. I did, yes. I verified the information I had.

The CHAIRMAN: That is almost a leading question.

Mr. DUFF: I have heard lawyers ask a question like that.

Mr. BOWMAN: Mr. Duff is justifying his position as a sea lawyer.

The WITNESS: Yes, that was one of the reasons; but the main reason was that on account of the position of the two gentlemen whose names have been mentioned I felt there was only one way to present it and have it corrected so that it would reach the proper source, and that was at a public meeting fairly largely attended, one attended by the more important members of the Canadian Press.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Am I right in saying that because of *The Globe's* editorial you felt it then necessary to make further inquiries other than what you had previously made, and consequently you could not have made the retraction or apology until you had made those further inquiries?—A. I did not have the full information at Lindsay. I tried to get it from my cuttings file at my office, and I thought I had it correct for the Lindsay address; but afterwards I got in communication with friends in Ottawa, so that I got the whole story, so that I was able to fix the matter at Cobourg and present it there.

Q. Mr. Bowman asked you why you did not, after getting the proper information, communicate with Prime Minister Bennett or with Mr. Herridge.

Mr. BOWMAN: Or with *The Globe*.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. May I ask you another question based on that one? Did you receive any communication—from the time you made those statements until the time you made the retraction, or since—from either Major Herridge or Mr. Bennett either denying the facts or otherwise?—A. No, never. I never received any communication from either of those gentlemen, nor did I write them. I felt it was common practice which I have seen adopted on many occasions, to speak at the next opportunity I had, if it was fairly close to the time when the error was made, the same as Premier Henry did the other day when he corrected a statement regarding Senator Hardy whom he said received a couple of thousand dollars from Mr. Swezey, the promoter of Beauharnois. He corrected that in the Orders of the Day. I corrected it at the first opportunity I had, when I could give the matter the same publicity and reach the same persons who had received the first information. I felt that was the fair and the better way.

Q. Did you, or have you received any letter from Major Herridge's solicitors or Mr. Bennett's solicitors asking for an apology or threatening action if you did not apologize?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. Don't you think, Mr. Gordon, without having received any letters that when your attention was drawn to those serious charges and allegations that the move, if any, as to an apology or expression of regret should come from you and not from Mr. Bennett or Major Herridge?—A. Yes, I do think so.

Q. And, as a matter of fact, Mr. Gordon, *The Globe*, in the editorial which you say you saw, contains these words:—

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.

So that prior to the time you made your correction at the Lindsay meeting, or rather prior to the time that you made your remarks at the Lindsay meeting, emphatic denial had been given in *The Globe*, in the words which I have just quoted?—A. It doesn't say by whom.

Q. No.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Mr. Gordon, I presume you saw that despatch which Mr. Bowman has just read. Am I right again in saying, or asking you if that is not one reason why after reading that despatch you endeavoured to obtain further information and then made the apology or retraction?—A. I did that. I wrote and made inquiries.

Q. Mr. Gordon, in your remarks at Lindsay—as quoted here in the motion of the Minister of Justice for this investigation—these words appear:—

He also went to 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 preparing and arguing the appeal. . . .

I want to call your attention to those words, "so if he was a full-time Canadian legal adviser."—A. Well, that came to my mind—

Q. Is that a qualification of the statement, that if he was a full-time legal adviser he should not have done certain things?—A. I would like to put it my own way. After I had seen this *Globe* editorial a doubt was raised in my mind, because it said it was a private brief, and I had the impression he was the legal adviser at that time, and if he was the legal adviser he would have difficulty in disassociating himself from his official duties for preparing this brief on the radio case before the Privy Council.

Q. Mr. Bowman mentioned the fact that you had criticized Mr. Herridge's appointment as Canadian Minister to Washington.

Mr. BOWMAN: No, no, I didn't mention that.

Mr. DUFF: Oh, yes, you did. You read it there.

Q. Why did you criticize Major Herridge's appointment? Had you seen anything in the newspapers or heard any comment with regard to his appointment?—A. I considered the matter fair comment. That was the main part of what I had to say about Major Herridge. The other part I said occupied probably two or three minutes; but I did criticize it as a matter of fair comment in the political field, that he had not been a political supporter of Mr. Bennett's for the larger part of his life, and that there were eminent Canadians like Sir Robert Borden, Sir George Foster and Mr. Meighen who were available for that office.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we are getting a little far afield. Are there any further questions?

By Mr. Gagnon:

Q. Mr. Gordon, did you read the article which appeared in *The Fredericton Gleaner*?—A. No, but I heard Premier Bennett speak of what was in *The Fredericton Gleaner*, and I wish to say that *The Fredericton Gleaner* has no foundation for any such statement.

Q. May I read part of the article, as follows:—

Hon. Mr. Gordon confirmed the charge to-day when *The Gleaner* telephoned him at his Peterboro home.

I would like to know from you if at any time you were called over the 'phone by some journalist living at Fredericton?—A. Never in my life.

Q. And were you ever called over the 'phone to speak about the statement you had made the day previous at Hamilton?—A. I was telephoned from several,—a couple of the Toronto offices asking me if I would confirm over the telephone, or explain over the telephone what I had said, and I said I would not. I had once been a newspaper reporter and knew the danger of such methods.

Q. So if I understand you aright, Mr. Gordon, you contend that this article published in *The Fredericton Gleaner* has no foundation whatever?—A. Absolutely none if it says that I was telephoned to to confirm it, because I never received a telephone message from Fredericton in my life.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that all, gentlemen?

By Mr. Gagnon:

Q. I heard you speak also about *The Montreal Star*.—A. Not *The Montreal Star*, *The Toronto Star*.

Q. Oh, yes, *The Montreal Gazette* and *The Standard* as being your sources of information. Will you give us some explanation about that?—A. Well, I have—as many men have—a system of clippings and cuttings which I file, and I use certain newspapers, particularly Canadian Press reports, as the source of my information which I use occasionally when I prepare addresses to be used around the country. There are a series of newspapers which I use that I consider responsible, such as *The Montreal Gazette*, *The Toronto Star*, *The Mail and Empire*, and *The Globe* in part, and *The Saturday night*, and *The Toronto Telegram* at times I use for adverse comments but not for favourable use.

Q. I would like to know if you have ever read in *The Montreal Gazette* or in *The Montreal Standard* such a statement similar to this that was reported by *The Globe*, as having been made by you?—A. I cannot say. I may have but I cannot say at this time. I have a couple of members of my staff who do a certain amount of reading and cutting for me which I don't do myself. Some I do.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Gordon, I took the trouble yesterday to have the Clerk of the Committee—since an extract from *The Fredericton Gleaner* had been put in evidence—to telegraph *The Gleaner* as to the report and whence it came, and a despatch was received reading as follows:—

John T. Dunn, Committees Branch, Ottawa.

Special despatch January 7th re Gordon charges received from Star Newspaper Services Toronto.

(Sgd.) *Daily Gleaner*.

You said that you had had no telephone communication from Fredericton. You have observed what the report said you did say over the telephone. Did you have that conversation with the Star Newspaper Service?—A. No. The Toronto papers which telephoned me asked me if I would confirm or verify, or forward a message stating what I had stated at Hamilton, and I said that I was speaking

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.

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.

The WITNESS: What I am trying to give are the facts which the committee can decide. Whether there was any such circumstance or reasonable ground, I suppose that is really, Mr. Chairman, what you are trying to ascertain.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. Reasonable ground for what, for making the statement contained in *The Globe* of January the 6th?—A. For making the statements as I have outlined them to the committee. I am not tying myself up to *The Globe's* statements by any means.

By the Chairman:

Q. What was in my mind, Mr. Gordon, is that you virtually, in that speech, repudiated the Hamilton charge?—A. Oh, no, not at all.

Q. Well, in what respect does it differ?—A. Well, in the respect that I have disclosed already to the committee—I have repeated it twice, I think, to this committee—it is of record.

Q. Then if it is we need not go at it any further. Then you did make a statement here where they coincide with Hamilton, or are better or are worse?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You made them on clippings?—A. Oh, yes, of the papers I have indicated and Canadian Press reports.

Q. Could you let the committee have any one of those clippings that seem to substantiate this charge?—A. Why no; but they are of record of all these papers. *The Toronto Star* has an article on it. *The Montreal Gazette*, as I recollect it, had the report of the trip, and the Prime Minister's car, and all these things are available in the public press of those dates.

Q. Perhaps this is reptition; but after *The Globe* article of the 2nd and the editorial of the 8th, and your telegram that you intended to explain or correct, or whatever you may wish, at Lindsay, you did not go any further towards checking up those things otherwise than by reference to newspaper files?—A. Yes, and Canadian Press reports.

Q. And you would agree with me it should have been a simple matter to ascertain either one of these dates; the one to the Imperial Conference was in 1930 and the other was in 1931.—A. Well, I do not remember now whether it was immediately after the Hamilton trip, I was probably laid up there with a cold, but I wrote to Ottawa to get certain information and my recollection is that that was not received in Peterborough in time for the Lindsay meeting; but it was subsequently and I used it at the Cobourg meeting, which confirmed the facts, the real facts.

Q. You asked for information for use at Lindsay, but although the information that you were awaiting had not arrived you went on and made your speech?—A. As I recollect it, there were a couple of days there that I was suffering from the cold and not attending to my practice very actively.

Q. Don't you think, Mr. Gordon, that *The Globe* might have been right in this respect at all events, that under all those circumstances it was a somewhat reckless thing to do to make that speech either at Hamilton or at Lindsay with the facts so easily ascertained?—A. I don't think so, Mr. Chairman. I have been speaking for 25 years and my memory has not slipped on any serious matter during that time. I know that other men have made errors. I was just citing the case of the Prime Minister of Ontario who fell into a very serious one the other day and very frankly corrected it on the Orders of the Day being called.

Q. He sent a letter to Senator Hardy, so I saw in the Press.—A. Well, he read the letter on the Orders of the Day.

Q. So you do not agree with *The Globe* that it was a somewhat reckless—
—A. No. There are a lot of things I do not agree with *The Globe* on.

Q. No, but in this particular case it was a reckless thing to do with a serious charge like this to make.—A. No, I do not agree with *The Globe* in that respect.

Q. I am not using the word in a technical sense, but you think that you were right in making the speeches in Hamilton and Lindsay as we have heard them?—A. I don't put it that way, no. I will say this, that I believe I had reasonable ground, upon the information and sources of information available, in saying what I said, and that at the earliest opportunity I publicly made the correction, the retraction, and explained that I had done an injustice to Premier Bennett and Major Herridge.

Q. I have one more question to ask you, and that is this: you have agreed with me that the statement which appeared in *The Globe* of your position, is a correct one. I am referring to the statement in *The Globe* of January 9th, which said: "I have been too long in the public eye to make statements that are not based on facts"—A. I don't believe I said that; I don't think I said "public eye".

Q. You said to me a little while ago that you did not quarrel with that statement?—A. I don't believe I used the words "public eye". I probably said just what I said to you, Mr. Chairman, that I had been too long, I think, at public speaking, to make those statements without foundation of fact. I think that is the way I put it. We were walking on the street, and the reporter—

Q. I am not quarreling with that remark, the reports are not based on facts. I think what you meant was the same thing.—A. I think it means pretty much the same thing.

Q. So that you were then in Lindsay, which is self evident, making a speech on facts which you supposed—A. Which I believed to be true.

Q. You have indicated to us the measures you took to ascertain the correctness of those facts?—A. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Q. In Cobourg—I am trying to find the Cobourg file. There is no record in *The World*, and *The Sentinel Star*, or any of those papers because I am told that *The Sentinel Star* of Cobourg had an identical report to the one *The Globe* carried?—A. I do not know whether there were two reporters there, or one.

Q. Now, in the report, Mr. Gordon, I again call your attention to the fact that there is no mention whatever of your speaking of the Prime Minister. You said you did speak of him; and you felt it important to make the correction in regard to him, did you not?—A. I felt it was important to make the correction in respect to both Premier Bennett and Major Herridge.

Q. You saw, doubtless, the correction as it appeared in *The Globe*?—A. I did. I saw it in *The Globe*. I felt the time had come when I was not going to try to correct any more statements that had been put in *The Globe* from local correspondents.

Q. You knew your intended correction was not reaching the public through the press in regard to the Prime Minister?—A. Well, I felt the correction had reached the public. Not in the complete measure, true, but in the measure that it exonerated Major Herridge altogether, and in the same way would exonerate Premier Bennett from any complicity in the matter.

Q. You took no further steps?—A. I took no further steps except when I found the matter was to be the subject of an inquiry I then knew the opportunity would be given me to state fully what had taken place.

Q. I see.—A. And probably more completely than I could state it at Cobourg.

Q. That was within the last fortnight?—A. Well, what is the date of parliament meeting?

Q. February 4th.—A. It was on the 4th February.

Q. Within the last three weeks?—A. Fourth of February is the date of the Votes and Proceedings, number 1.

Q. Yes, that is right.—A. So it followed fairly closely.

Q. You came to the conclusion, owing to the correction that appeared in *The Globe*, you would— —A. I came to the conclusion I would let the matter rest at that point, because I felt the report I had made, stating as I did at Cobourg, although it did not include Premier Bennett's name, it did include Major Herridge, cleared up the situation, I felt, fully enough to also include the Premier of Canada.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. Were there more people at Cobourg than there were at Hamilton?—
A. Oh, yes, probably 100 at Hamilton, and there must have been 500 or 600 at Cobourg.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. They were not the same people, though?—A. No. Cobourg and Hamilton are a long way apart.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Gordon, I saw in the paper yesterday—I think it is appropriate to this particular line of questioning—that you had been interviewed by *The Journal* and *The Citizen*?—A. And the representative of *The Globe*.

Q. And the representative of *The Globe*; and there again you spoke of Major Herridge— —A. Well, I had a talk with these gentlemen. I did not give an interview to them. I told them that I was coming before this committee to make a statement. I said I did not wish to disclose what that statement would be, or what position I was going to take; because I felt that the committee was the proper place to make the statement. I explained that to the three men. I said they could say that I would disclose what had taken place on those occasions at the three meetings.

Q. You did say something of Major Herridge, and perhaps I might ask you if this is correct?—A. I did not see it. If I might look at it.

Q. Yes, you may read it.

A. Hon. George Gordon, of Peterborough, whose charges and allegations against the Prime Minister will be investigated to-morrow by a special parliamentary committee, arrived in Ottawa this morning, met many old friends on Parliament Hill and said he would likely retain counsel for the inquiry.

Mr. Gordon also stated that a number of witnesses may also be called in his behalf.

Col. G. R. Geary, M.P., will preside over the investigation of statements alleged to have been made at Hamilton and Lindsay by Mr. Gordon that the Prime Minister had financed the honeymoon trip of his sister, Mrs. W. D. Herridge, out of the public treasury and that he also obtained a private railway car costing \$125,000 for his own private use at the expense of the Dominion.

HE WAS MISINFORMED

Indications are that Mr. Gordon will refer the committee to a statement he made at Cobourg, which will be corroborated, in which he stated he had been 'misinformed' about the costs of the honeymoon trip of Major Herridge. It will also be brought out that the name of Mrs. Herridge was not mentioned.

'I would not knowingly like to do anyone an injustice, much less a fellow-member of the Canadian bar,' said Mr. Gordon to-day. 'I explained at Cobourg that I had got the two things confused. I thought that Major Herridge had appeared before the Privy Council while on his honeymoon in connection with the legal battle over radio between the Dominion and the provincial governments, whereas he actually appeared on behalf of a private company in a radio patent case.'

It is expected the committee will be informed that in his Cobourg speech Mr. Gordon declared he had confused the two radio cases, because Major Herridge previously had been the legal adviser of the Prime Minister at the Imperial Conference.

It is expected the witnesses who will be called for Mr. Gordon will corroborate his explanation made at Cobourg.

In regard to the private railway car there may be a partial explanation but not a complete withdrawal. It may be stated that a new railway car was built by the Canadian National Railways but that the chassis of the car formely used by the Governor General was used.

Yes. That is substantially what is contained in the—is this *The Citizen*?

Mr. BOWMAN: *The Journal*.

WITNESS: *The Journal*. That is substantially what I said.

By the Chairman:

Q. There again you made some reference to Major Herridge, but none whatever to the Prime Minister.—A. For this reason: Major Herridge was the man who was chiefly suffering from what was said, as I saw it. Premier Bennett's name was incidentally mentioned only as a member of the government who had retained Major Herridge. But I felt Major Herridge was the one that I owed the greatest duty to correct what I had said about it.

Q. Were you asked?—A. —and I still think so.

Q. Were you asked if you had anything to say about the Prime Minister by the reporters?—A. No; I do not think the Prime Minister was ever mentioned.

Q. That is the reason you did not mention him again when you were speaking to the reporters?—A. No; because I had in mind Major Herridge was the one chiefly concerned in the matter.

Q. It was not in the papers, but I think you said yourself, did you not, that Major Herridge had been sent over to argue a case for the government. Was that the statement you made in your evidence just now?—A. I thought that Major Herridge had been retained by the government to act as legal adviser.

Q. Not to argue a case for the government? You said that.—A. Yes.

Q. You said that?—A. Yes.

Q. In Hamilton?—A. I said that in Hamilton, yes.

Q. Did you ascertain whether that was true, or not?—A. I had been told that it was true by reputable persons. I saw by the paper that he had argued a case dealing with a radio matter, and had been successful in it, when he was on his honeymoon trip. I saw it in one of the papers.

Mr. BOWMAN: A government case? Acting for the government. Did you say that?

WITNESS: No. I was coupling the two facts, that he was an assistant legal adviser to the government, or to Premier Bennett, and he was arguing this radio case; and I knew that the Dominion government had a radio case in which the provinces were interested as to jurisdiction. I coupled the two together.

Mr. DUFF: You were mixing your metaphors.

By the Chairman:

Q. May I just ask a question in regard to that? You thought the important matter was Major Herridge, and not, you say, that the Prime Minister had financed the honeymoon trip out of the public treasury. You did not think that was important?—A. I thought Major—I will put it this way: I thought Major Herridge was the one who was—that the statements regarding Major Herridge were the ones that ought to be corrected, and that the ones regarding the Prime Minister I had corrected, and that the correction of the ones concerning Major Herridge carried with them a correction of the statements respecting the Prime Minister.

Q. Although, later on, on January 16, you thought it was necessary to add the Prime Minister's name, is that so?—A. I did not think it was necessary to—well, I did it as a matter of course, and a matter that I thought was from a sense of duty.

Q. You agree with me, Mr. Gordon, as you see it now, that it was in regard to the Prime Minister, a statement calculated to injure him, and perhaps destroy him in his public office?—A. It is not half as ragged as the things that have been said about Mackenzie King.

Q. I am asking you about this.—A. I do not see it that way. I want to state my position clearly—

Q. If you want to take it that way, all right.—A. I want to be fair. You are the chairman of the committee, and I appreciate you are not counsel prosecuting the case.

Q. I mean— —A. But you have a right to a complete inquiry.

Q. I think we should have.—A. I have been chairman of committees for a great many years, and I have some ideas of the chairman's rights, and the witnesses' rights.

Q. Do you think it is material?—A. No, I am just—I do not want to quarrel with the chairman's rights, and with an inquiry and investigation. I want to make as complete an explanation as possible, and give you all the facts that I can. That is what I am attempting to do.

Q. That is it?—A. I do not want to be inveigled into making admissions that I do not think are fair.

Q. I don't want you to do that.—A. That are not fair to me, or I don't think are fair to the two gentlemen whose names are involved in this matter.

Q. That is the only thing that appears to me. It seems to me quite proper to get your understanding of the case. You have given it pretty well. Then, you do not think that they were calculated to injure in the way that I have described. Perhaps I am putting it in legal language, but put it in your own language. They are serious charges, and calculated to injure the Prime Minister— —A. No.

Q. —in his office?—A. Mr. Bennett had a perfect right, if he so desired, to appoint Mr. Herridge to go to England to argue a case for the government when he was on his honeymoon trip, and to argue it there, and retain him, if he desired, out of the public funds. But the suggestion that a share of the expenses of Mrs. Herridge was paid out of the public funds would be wrong, and highly improper, and that was never made.

Q. Would you be able to tell us why you made the statement?—A. I will be frank with you. I read the speech of the great betrayal of the Prime Minister—he was not Prime Minister then—in Regina, and his statement that Judas did not take nine years to betray. It was so startling to me that the cordial relations that always existed before were somewhat changed in my mind, and I felt that strong language being used merited strong language in return; although I am prepared to admit since Mr. Bennett has become Prime Minister, his attitude has been that of dignity, and caution and care in his expressions. The matter came up largely as to the extravagance of the government, and

then I wanted to say that this was a case of nepotism, in which there was favouritism shown as well as extravagance. That was what was running through my mind, Mr. Chairman.

Q. You were trying to get back at him for the Regina speech?—A. No, I was not.

Q. You were not?—A. I was not. I thought it was a matter of interest; I was trying to entertain an audience. I thought I had the facts from sources that were reliable. I had heard this matter discussed in clubs, and on the trains, and in different places by lawyers of considerable eminence, and I was rather surprised, in fact, I was very much startled when I found my facts were not correct.

By Mr. Duff:

Q. You took the first opportunity to apologize?—A. The first opportunity of any importance to do what was the proper thing to do.

By the Chairman:

Q. You will quite agree that in the circumstances, you were out to do Mr. Bennett what harm you could?—A. No.

Q. In a political way?—A. No, not at all. I was anxious, as I had been doing to thirty years, to deal with matters that were reasonably fair, and what was said in regard to the Major Herridge incident, had been got, I supposed,—

Q. Don't get the idea that I supposed you were trying to be unfair.—A. It was this incident of *The Globe*, that out of practically my whole address they gave me about three or four lines, and that was all there was in it.

Q. One other thing. I hope you will agree with me, and I think you do agree with me.—A. I agree with you in a good many things, Mr. Chairman.

Q. You do agree that such a statement as that should be made with the greatest possible care?—A. The statement was not made as reported in *The Globe*; and I followed the practice of every public speaker in Ontario, in Canada, I would suppose, in obtaining my information from the reliable sources, such as I have outlined, in the press that I have used, particularly the Canadian Press reports. You cannot scrutinize every statute, and every order in council and every ticket that is bought.

Q. You would have some of those press clippings from which you got the information that you gave those gatherings?—A. Well now, I won't say that I got it altogether in that way. I confirmed or supplemented it by information. Details of the case in London came, as I recollect, from *The Toronto Star*, which was very friendly, and had a favourable comment upon Major Herridge's success at this particular time in arguing a very important case when he was on this trip to London. It was very friendly and of a good-natured kind. I am quite sure of that. I am inclined to think that I also got the same thing from *The Montreal Gazette*, but I would not say as to that.

Q. You have given us everything as to the sources of your information? When did you discover, shortly after the ninth, that you had been wronged by some information? I think you made some further inquiries. Was it information that you had already asked for that came to hand after the ninth?—A. Yes, after the Lindsay trip I found out it was wrong as to that. There was a meeting to be held at Cobourg, I found—or at least there was a meeting to be held at Cobourg, and I was asked to be one of the speakers, and I explained on that occasion that I wished to make a statement as to the facts that had been given to me, and which I assumed were true.

Q. I think that is everything that I want to ask you. Is there anything else any member of the committee desires to ask?

By Mr. Howard:

Q. You made your speech at Hamilton on January sixth?—A. If I get those dates wrong again—January 6th, at Hamilton.

Q. That was before the editorial in question in *The Globe*, which appeared on January 7th.—A. January 7th.

Q. You saw the article and wired *The Globe* that you would make some statement in regard to the matter at Lindsay?—A. I saw the article or it was told to me, I don't know. I did not, apparently, read it.

Q. You wired *The Globe*?—A. I wired *The Globe* I would be in Lindsay the next night, or I wired from Lindsay.

Q. January 8th you spoke at Lindsay?—A. Yes.

Q. You got the real facts looked up in the meantime, and on January 15th you spoke again at Cobourg?—A. I spoke at Cobourg. I think I got the real facts from a couple of Senators here in Ottawa; some facts in Toronto.

Q. When, after the meeting?—A. Right after the Lindsay meeting.

Q. On February 4th the inquiry was instituted?—A. January 15th I spoke at Cobourg. I was not told by him at that time. I heard there was going to be an inquiry, and when I saw it confirmed I felt that was the opportunity, and the best opportunity I had of meeting and presenting the facts, as they had come to me.

By Mr. Speakman:

Q. Just to summarize to the lay mind. Mr. Gordon, appearing in the article as it appears on January 7th, reporting the meeting at Hamilton on January 6th, there are in the main two charges reported, the first one of major significance, and the second one of minor significance, the one of minor significance being that the premier had obtained a new private railway car for his own use at a cost to Canada of \$125,000. I think too much mention has been made of that. I am treating it as a minor incident, because if it proved anything, it will merely prove extravagance. That was all.—A. That was the reason it was mentioned; I knew there had been extravagance at a time when—

Q. I am not quarreling with that statement.—A. —economies should be practised. I consider that a matter of fair comment.

Q. Did you ascertain, before you made that statement, whether the new car had been made for his own use?—A. Well, I recollect that George P. Graham, Senator Graham, had an idea that a car cost \$125,000. I think it was stated in the railway committee that those private cars cost \$125,000, equipped.

Q. Did you hear Mr. Bennett's explanation of that yesterday?—A. Yes.

Q. Were you satisfied?—A. I have seen the car.

Q. Were you satisfied with that explanation of the circumstances as being a correct explanation?—A. I don't know whether it is correct or not, Mr. Bennett said it was a correct explanation.

Q. Now, the next thing is—A. If Sir Henry Thornton is throwing around private cars at this time, it will be a matter of inquiry anyway.

Q. There is something to be said for that.—A. I suppose so.

Q. Now, in the other case you are reported as having said that the honeymoon trip of Mrs. Herridge was paid out of the Canadian treasury. You have explained that you did not make that statement; that that statement was not made, and the reporter here yesterday said it was not made.

Mr. BOWMAN: No.

By Mr. Speakman:

Q. But you referred to Mr. Herridge, and based that upon facts that you had assumed to be true?—A. That he was the legal adviser to the government.

Q. And at that time his own expenses were paid by the government. Mrs. Herridge, of course, would be a different matter altogether?—A. Every minister who travels, if he travels with his family, pays his own expenses and estimates the family expenses and pays them separately.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speakman, are you saying that what Mr. Gordon is saying is that that paragraph in regard to his Hamilton address is wrong because Mrs. Herridge is there instead of Mr. Herridge?

The WITNESS: Yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is that the only objection?—A. I won't say that is the only objection to the paragraph, but it is one objection.

By Mr. Speakman:

Q. That particular objection is Mrs. Herridge is used instead of Mister.—A. In addition to that I have half a dozen lawyers and business men who were at that meeting, and who are prepared to state the same fact, but the reporter apparently admits that yesterday.

Q. Then, speaking at Lindsay, you confirm certain parts of the statement, and refute others. I think that is a fair way to put it. You are not quoted as having explained that the reference was made to Major Herridge and not intended to refer to Mrs. Herridge. You are not quoted as having made that explanation.—A. I don't know.

Q. Well, you are not, as it appears in the press.—A. Well, possibly not.

Q. Do you recollect whether you did stress that particular point?—A. No.

Q. Because it is a most serious point.—A. No.

Q. You don't recollect whether you did stress that?—A. No. All I said was that he was on his honeymoon trip and he was taking this retainer.

Q. My point is this. The most serious part of the charge, if it did apply to Mrs. Herridge, and not to Mr. Herridge—A. That cannot be read into it, I submit, anyway.

Q. You had seen—A. The committee must decide that.

Q. You had seen, Mr. Gordon, that it had been reported in such a manner?

—A. I don't think I did at that time.

Q. Because, to my mind, it is a rather important matter?—A. I don't remember.

Q. There is no refuting—A. I had only seen or heard of *The Globe* article. I was told about it the night I had telegraphed *The Globe* I would speak at a meeting at Lindsay in explanation of the matter.

Q. Did you notice in *The Globe* article the mistake that was made as between Major Herridge and Mrs. Herridge's name at the time you made the statement at Lindsay?—A. *The Globe* article? There is an article and an editorial.

Q. Yes.—A. The editorial was the one I had seen. I am not so sure that I say *The Globe* article.

Q. And the editorial also refers to the statement that Mr. Bennett's sister's expenses had been paid.—A. It may have; I don't remember reading it; I remember being told of it.

Q. I am asking, if in making the explanation at Lindsay you did explain that that was a mistake, and that your reference would be to Mr. Herridge and not to Mrs. Herridge?—A. I don't know; I don't know whether I did or not.

Q. It did not strike you as being of very great importance?—A. I don't remember either *The Globe's* notice or *The Globe's* editorial in addition coming to my mind. I remember being told of a lot of criticism being made at what I had said, but that particular feature that you are drawing to my attention, I don't know that it was drawn to my attention.

Q. In making your statement at Lindsay, you said, Mr. Gordon, "that only a small section of his reference to Mr. Herridge had been correctly used by *The Globe*"?—A. Yes, I will explain that. The whole explanation in the proper setting would have explained it very much differently.

Q. It went on to say:

and a large audience in Hamilton heard every word I said, and Mr. Gordon said he followed his notes very closely in making the Hamilton speech.

That meant, I assume, that you had followed your notes very closely and had prepared what you had said. Is not that what it would mean? I assume you brought those notes with you?—A. They are written on a menu or an envelope.

Q. I think that is all I have to ask. What I had particularly in mind was this, that there is a very great difference apart from the propriety of your using a lady's name, and I agree it is not a proper thing to do, and you say you did not do it—apart from that there is a very great difference in the seriousness of the charge as to whether Mr. Herridge's expenses had been paid from the public treasury when he was occupied on government business.—A. That is what I was chiefly concerned about, and about which the Chairman spoke a few minutes ago. Naturally, I was investigating the fact as to whether I had mentioned the Premier's name on each of these occasions. My idea emphasized the fact that Major Herridge was not paid the expenses on this trip. I was particularly anxious that he was not involved in this matter, and that Major Herridge had not been responsible for what the newspapers had reported me as saying he was. And I considered Premier Bennett's position in the matter of responsibility of being involved in the discussion that took place, as minor to Major and Mrs. Herridge's, and that is the reason I had that in my mind to a greater extent than I had Premier Bennett's responsibility.

Q. That is why I was asking Mr. Gordon why the explanation that Mrs. Herridge was not mentioned, and it was not intended that she should be mentioned, had not been made clear.—A. I cannot tell you what was on the Lindsay report.

Q. That is what has been on my mind.—A. There were no shorthand notes taken, and of course, I can only give you a general outline which I remember taking care in saying that he had taken this trip on those occasions.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions? Is there anything you want to say further, Mr. Gordon?

The WITNESS: No.

Witness retired.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Duff, you called a witness yesterday. Do you want to call any more?

Mr. DUFF: Not at the moment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speakman, I believe you wanted to ask some questions either of the Prime Minister or Mr. Herridge.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I said it might be possible that after Mr. Gordon's statement had been made I might wish to ask a few questions.

The CHAIRMAN: Was there anything you, Mr. Prime Minister, or you, Mr. Herridge, wanted to say?

The PRIME MINISTER: Not unless anything is required of me.

The Committee adjourned to meet at the call of the Chair.

SESSION 1932

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

CERTAIN ALLEGATIONS AND CHARGES

MADE BY

THE HONOURABLE GEORGE N. GORDON, K.C.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

No. 3

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 1932
TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 1932
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 1932

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, March 9, 1932.

The Special Committee appointed to enquire into certain charges and allegations made by the Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C., met in camera at 10.30 a.m., Mr. Geary, the Chairman, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Bowman, Cantley, Duff, Gagnon, Geary, Howard, Speakman.

A draft report was submitted by the Chairman as a proposed basis for the third report to be presented to the House of Commons.

The draft report was considered.

The Committee adjourned until 2 p.m.

The Committee resumed in camera at 2 p.m.

The Committee resumed consideration of the draft report submitted by the Chairman.

The Committee adjourned, to meet at the call of the Chair.

JOHN T. DUN,
Clerk of the Committee.

TUESDAY, March 15, 1932.

The Special Committee appointed to enquire into certain charges and allegations made by the Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C., met in camera at 10.30 a.m., Mr. Geary, the Chairman, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Bowman, Cantley, Duff, Gagnon, Geary.

Consideration was again given to the third report to be submitted to the House.

On motion of Mr. Gagnon—

Ordered,—That the claims submitted to the Committee for loss of pay incurred by three witnesses who were examined on Thursday, 3rd March, viz: Mr. A. Patterson of Hamilton, Ont., \$8; Mr. R. Crossin of Hamilton Ont., \$16; and Mr. F. Moynes of Lindsay, Ont., \$15, be paid.

The Committee adjourned until 4 p.m.

At 4 p.m. there was not a quorum, Mr. Geary (the Chairman) and Mr. Cantley were present.

It was decided to call a meeting for Wednesday, 16th March, at 10.30 a.m.

JOHN T. DUN,
Clerk of the Committee.

WEDNESDAY, March 16, 1932.

The Special Committee appointed to enquire into certain charges and allegations made by the Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C., met in camera at 10.30 a.m., Mr. Geary, the Chairman, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Bowman, Cantley, Gagnon, Geary, Speakman.

Consideration was again given to the third report to be presented to the House.

The Committee adjourned, to meet at the call of the Chair.

JOHN T. DUN,
Clerk of the Committee.

WEDNESDAY, March 16, 1932.

The Special Committee appointed to enquire into certain charges and allegations made by the Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C., met in camera at 5 p.m. Mr. Geary, the Chairman, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Bowman, Cantley, Duff, Gagnon, Geary, Howard, Speakman.

Mr. Gagnon moved that the following draft report (marked "A") be adopted as the Third Report of the Committee:—

"A"

The Special Committee appointed to enquire into certain charges and allegations made by the Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C., beg leave to present the following as a Third Report.

After hearing the evidence, your Committee is agreed that the charges and allegations contained in the extracts from *The Globe* newspaper, as set out in the Order of Reference, were, in fact, made upon public occasions in Hamilton, Ont., on January 6, 1932, and in Lindsay, Ont., on January 8, 1932, by the Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C., as reported in *The Globe* newspaper of Toronto, Ont., with the exception that the words "Mrs. Herridge" appear in *The Globe* of January 6, whereas the words "Mr. Herridge" were those used.

As to the statement that a new Private Car was constructed for the use of the Prime Minister at a cost to the people of Canada of \$125,000, your Committee feels that this charge is of a relatively minor character, it being a charge of extravagant expenditure, and not one of misappropriation. It finds, however, that the statements made in this respect gave an entirely erroneous impression of the transaction, and were not warranted by the facts as brought out in evidence. Your Committee points out that there has been no increase in the number of Government Private Cars since the present Government assumed office.

As to the charges and allegations so made, other than that above dealt with, your Committee is of the opinion that they were of a most serious nature, calculated to do injury to the reputation of the Right Honourable R. B. Bennett, Prime Minister of Canada, a Member of the House of Commons; and your Committee finds that the charges and allegations so made were untrue.

Your Committee finds further that these charges and allegations were made with the intention of injuring the Right Honourable R. B. Bennett, Prime Min-

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.

We deprecate public men, on platforms throughout the country, or in Parliament, using language carrying a suggestion of unfairness to other public men or private individuals, when such is not justifiable as a matter of public criticism, and not based upon facts carefully and prudently ascertained.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

The question being put on the amendment, it was negatived on the following division:—

Yeas: Messrs. Duff and Howard.

Nays: Messrs. Bowman, Cantley, Gagnon, Speakman.

The question being put on the main motion, it was agreed to on the same division reversed.

Resolved, That the said draft report marked "A" be the Report of the Committee and that it be presented to the House.

The Committee adjourned.

JOHN T. DUN,
Clerk of the Committee.

SESSION 1932

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

CERTAIN ALLEGATIONS AND CHARGES

MADE BY

THE HONOURABLE GEORGE N. GORDON, K.C.

No. 4

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

We appreciate public men, who in
Parliament, using language carrying a charge of an offence to which public
men or private individuals, who are in a position to be a matter of public
concern, are liable to be subjected.

All of which is shown in the

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The question which we have to consider is whether it is in the public interest that

There is no doubt that

It is the duty of the

CERTAIN ALLEGATIONS AND CHARGES

ERRATA

“Third” Report of the Committee, referred to in the Minutes of Pro-
ceedings of the Committee, should read “Second” Report.

THE HONOURABLE GEORGE H. GORDON, K.C.

No. 4

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

SECOND REPORT

THURSDAY, March 17, 1932.

The Special Committee appointed to enquire into certain charges and allegations made by the Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C., beg leave to present the following as a Second Report.

After hearing the evidence, your Committee is agreed that the charges and allegations contained in the extracts from *The Globe* newspaper, as set out in the Order of Reference, were, in fact, made upon public occasions in Hamilton, Ont., on January 6, 1932, and in Lindsay, Ont., on January 8, 1932, by the Honourable George N. Gordon, K.C., as reported in *The Globe* newspaper of Toronto, Ont., with the exception that the words "Mrs. Herridge" appear in *The Globe* of January 6, whereas the words "Mr. Herridge" were those used.

As to the statement that a new Private Car was constructed for the use of the Prime Minister at a cost to the people of Canada of \$125,000, your Committee feels that this charge is of a relatively minor character, it being a charge of extravagant expenditure, and not one of misappropriation. It finds, however, that the statements made in this respect gave an entirely erroneous impression of the transaction, and were not warranted by the facts as brought out in evidence. Your Committee points out that there has been no increase in the number of Government Private Cars since the present Government assumed office.

As to the charges and allegations so made, other than that above dealt with, your Committee is of the opinion that they were of a most serious nature, calculated to do injury to the reputation of the Right Honourable R. B. Bennett, Prime Minister of Canada, a Member of the House of Commons; and your Committee finds that the charges and allegations so made were untrue.

Your Committee finds further that these charges and allegations were made with the intention of injuring the Right Honourable R. B. Bennett, Prime Minister 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.

G. R. GEARY,
Chairman.





BIBLIOTHEQUE DU PARLEMENT
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT



3 2354 00497 542 4