

Q. You had raised that point in your letter, the possibility that the Vickers people might make that money?—A. Yes.

Q. And you were informed that it was to be one of the conditions that they should not?—A. Yes.

Q. You learned after your information was received that that was not so, did you not?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, then, why did you not, at all events, bring that to the attention of the minister before publishing your letter by itself as you have done?—A. I think in a case of this sort I was justified in doing what I did, report the matter to Parliament.

Q. And you think it was no part of your duty to bring this important matter of half a million dollars to the attention of the minister?—A. No.

Q. You preferred to put it in the report as you have done and let it be ventilated in this way on hearsay evidence? Is that really the position you take?—A. I put it there anyway. I use my best—

Q. I want to be fair. Instead of bringing that to the attention of the minister to give him an opportunity of giving you what information he could, you took the course of putting a single letter in the report, expecting it to be brought up in this committee on hearsay evidence?—A. I had the assurance of the minister that no profit would be made, that the transfer would be made to the Russian Government.

Q. I appreciate that?—A. I got information afterwards which I believed to be correct. I did not think that I had any reason to go back to the minister and tell him that the information he gave me was not correct. I do not think it was my duty.

Q. As a matter of ordinary courtesy, you did not think it was your duty?—A. No, because he was the one who performed the transaction.

Q. I would have thought, Mr. Fraser, that you would have felt, even from the standpoint of courtesy, that you should have communicated with the minister and said to him, "I have information absolutely contrary to the assurance you gave me," and telling him what it was and hearing his explanation.

MR. CARVELL: That would not have changed the situation.

MR. BOYS: It might have. He admits himself that if the correspondence was here it would alter the whole matter.

*By Mr. Bennett (Simcoe):*

Q. What was the date of your return from England?—A. A day or two after Christmas.

Q. Was the Prime Minister here after your return, and when you got this information by way of conversation?—A. Yes.

Q. And the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Hon. Mr. Hazen, was here too. Both were here, after you had this information. You had opportunities daily of seeing them?—A. I could have seen them.

*By Mr. Boys:*

Q. They were here for nearly six weeks after your return?—A. I suppose so, there was time enough to see them.

*By Mr. Morphy:*

Q. Mr. Fraser, do you make it a practice of making memoranda of confidential verbal communications?—A. Sometimes where there are figures concerned; I am not a very good hand to remember figures.

Q. You have stated you think you made a memorandum of this?—A. Possibly, it would only be a memo of the figures.

THE CHAIRMAN: What figures?