arthur block topers MG 32 (68 not anteres canada Val 4/11



MINISTER OF JUSTICE AND ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA

> OTTAWA, August,1st 1946.

Personal

ł

е..... ул 4

> Honourable A. W. Roebuck, The Senate, Ottawa

Dear Senator Roebuck:

I thank you for your letter of July 30th, informing me of your views with respect to the applications for clemency on behalf of Messrs. Adams and Lunan.

You do appreciate, of course, that it is rather a delicate matter to attempt to interfere with sentences for contempt of Court, but we are giving the matter careful consideration.

1

Muis Islaunul

Ottawa, July 30, 1946.

÷.

Rt. Honourable Louis St. Laurent, Minister of Justice, Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. St. Laurent:

1

I have been waited upon by Mrs. Josepha M. Adams and Mrs. Fhyllis Lunan, wives of two men who were cormitted to prison in Montreal when they refused to testify when called as witnesses during one of the Official Secrets Trials on the ground that such testimony would prejudice the hearing of similar charges already laid amainst themselves.

These women tell me that their husbands greatly meed their freedom in order that they may prepare their defence and in view of the accusations which they will be called upon to meet this is readily understandable. I am told that one of them will be released on the very day upon which his trial is scheduled to commence. A fair trial of the accused can hardly be anticipated under such circumstances.

These ladies have seen you, and I understand that the question of public opinion was raised as having some bearing on their continued incurceration. I have little knowledge as to what others think upon this point, but consider it a duty to state to you my own views.

There is undoubtedly precedent at law for the calling of persons charged with one and the same offence to testify each against the other, but in my judgment as a lawyer it is highly improper on the part of the Grown if the giving of such evidence involves the testifying by an accused person against himself. Such action by the Grown is highly improper because it violates that principle of English law which jealously guards accused persons from the risk of being forced into a position in which they must choose between perjury and their own compelling interests, I call your attention to the restrained wisdom of the learned Chief Justice of Ontario, when under exactly similar circumstances, in connection with these very official secrete trials, he declined to use the punitive processes of the Court in order to compel an accused person to give evidence ostensibly against someone else, but in fact against himself. The Chief Justice of Ontario did not find contempt of court in the desire of an accused person for a fair trial.

2.

The fact that these witnesses might have invoked the provisions of the Evidence Act so that testimony given by them which they claimed might incriminate them shall not be used against them in subsequent proceedings, other than a trial for perjury, does not meet the situation in this case, for the court officials who were present would, no doubt, take part in the subsequent trials, and the courtroom was crowded with newspaper men ready to take down what was said and publish it to an eagerly world.

We accept, of course, the decision of the court based upon precedent that the men must testify and its later punishment of the disobedience, but I do not approve the action of the Grown Officers in placing the court in that position.

I need hardly add in a letter to you that this expression on my part in no way indicates my opinion as to the seriousness of the offences with which these men are charged, I look upon the alleged offence as exceedingly serious, but I nevertheless bear in mind the salutary principle of English law that an accused person is to be regarded as innocent until proven guilty, and I suggest that, if the seriousness of the offence has anything to do with the point in question, it should be to impel the authorities to take every reasonable precaution to assure that the accused shall not be hampered in the preparation of defence.

Under these circumstances, graciously permit me to advise that in my judgment these sentences may well be mitigated as an exercise of clemency to allow the accused an opportunity to prepare for trial.

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of

wailing

.

1

this letter to the Solicitor General, and have the honour to remain

Faithfully yours,

3.

음 지역

ķ

1

dia 1

6

A. W. Roebuck.

wards

jury and their own compeliing interests, a cull your as-tention to the restrained wieder of the lammed Galer Fatice concreation and the restrained wisdow of the formed onder a street of Ontario, when under exactly similar whenly to do a con-heation when the processes of the Gord of the order to conjek to and the punitive processes of the Gord of the order to conjek an accused person to give ovidence caten bly a wheet to conjek shae, but in fact against himself. The Chief Chittee of Inwrite did not find contempt of court in the conform of an account of an accuse conform a fair triat. son for a fair trial.

Rt. Honourable Louis St. Laurent. Minister of Justice and Consolity seeds duilt cost ent Ottawa in Untario, Just said or Joa Sousbly Bed to encleivor part of the Illin mode scal front sight beside your doldw meds Dear Hr St. Lairent & docenori insupsedue at acti Janion beer will to your that a boltourie and Jone for acti Janion beer al Jus 9 in have been waited upon by Masy Josephin Millo Jruco Adams and Fre "Thyill's Lunan, wiwns of two methods of the beau off committed to prison in Montreal when they wonsed whose a rate committed to prison in Sontress when may consider when called as witnesses during one of the Official Topse n. Secrets Trials on the ground that such testimony would prejudice the hearing of similar charges already haid a-gainst themselves. A dot done odd dand instances and head had been been all to the formation of the second testing and the secret the second of the second testing and the second second the second of the second testing and the second second testing of the second testing and the second testing and the second of the second testing and the second testing and the second of the second testing and testing and testing and testing and the second testing and testing and testing and the second testing and testing and

Tel lug These women tel Bane What I their shus bands n word out 10

greatly need their freedom in order that they may prepare their defence and in view of the acoustions which they will be called upon to meet this is readily understand bless with a told that one of them will be released long the relation the upon which his trial is beheauled to domning if Asfair the ball i upon which nrg triat is schemied to company is an every set of the scould densite the second densite the sec little knowledge us to what others think upon this moist a doll but consider it a duty to state to you my own views.

adda at the the calling or persons charged with one and the same of fange, an to testify each against the other, but in my judgment as a by of of lawyer it is highly improper on the part of the Grown if the giving of such evidence involves the testifying by an accused person against himself. Such action by the Grown is highly improper because it violates that principle of English law which jealously guards accused persons from the risk of being forced into a position in which they must choose between perwaiting

jury and their own compelling interests, I call your attention to the restrained wisdom of the learned Chief Justice of Ontario, when under exactly similar circumstances, in connection with thuse wery official secrets trials, he declined to use the punitive processes of the Court in order to compel an accused person to give evidence estensibly against someone else, but in fact against himself. The Chief Justice of Ontario did not find contempt of court in the desire of an accused person for a fair trial.

The fact that these witnesses might have invoked and the provisions of the Evidence Act so that testimony fiven by 1340 them which they claimed might incriminate them shall not be used against them in subsequent proceedings, other, then a trial for perjury, does not meet the situation in this case, for the court officials who were present would, no doubt stake part in the subsequent trials, and the quurtroom was provided with news paper men ready to take down what was said and could an it by the most officials an engerly world. Add by see said be accentive as ballao nedw with an engerly world. Add by see said be accentive as ballao nedw with

an eugerly world. Add he see a fuch second we a belle on or your of the second we about the second we about the second we about your your dated down that here the second we about the second we about the second of the second we about the second of the sec

of the Crownsofficers in playing the gount in that position. The Sticks will isly to be all mobes in that best visually isliting and hardly add in a latter visually best visually expression on myspert in no way indicates my opiniences to the seriousness of the noffences with which these men are deared he i I look upon the alleged offences a gragedingly serious of the alleged offences are graded as innocent with the law that an accused person is to be regarded as innocent with the proven guilty, and I suggest that, if the seriousness of the offence has anything to dowith they point in grade prevaulton to assure that the accused person is to be regarded as innocent with the seriousness of the original suggest that if the seriousness of the offence has anything to dowith the seriousness of the interval of the accused person is to be regarded as innocent with to assure that the accused shall not be a seriousness of the offence. A support of the accused shall not be a support of a support to assure that the accused shall not be apprend in the proveming of a support tion of defence. A start of a support of a support of a support . Support and a support of a support of an are proved as in the seriousness of the support of the accused shall not be apprend in the proveming of a support to assure that the accused shall not be apprend in the proveming of a support o

to assure that the accused shall any reasonable to guarded anos tion of defence. A still any of any of an end of a spectrum of all the short and an up of edge of yigh in the blance that Under these circumstances, graciously permit me to advise that in my judgments these (services gay well be mitigated as an exercise of clemenoyato (slows these coused an opportunity to prefare for trial. I due, tondo out deniary four will be at at

this letter to the Solicitor General, and have the honour to remain

Faithfully yours,

A. W. Roebuok.

ottaway Jota July 254 1948.

Right Hone Louis St. Laurent, Minister of Justice, Ottawa, Untarioe

Aight Honorable Birs

We, the wives of mersat present in Hordeaux juil ca charges of contempt of court arising out of the recent trial of Mr. Fred mose, M.P. carnestly request that you give consideration to the following representations:

Our husbands have been sentenced to juil for refusing to give testimony which they believed would projudice their chances of a just trial on charges facing them now. A similar refusal to testify had previously been recognized as justified by Chief Justice McAuer.

We believe that the sentencing of our huebands for periods of three months each in jail gravely hinders them in preparing their defences for the impending trials. This is particularly true is the case of Mr. D. Gordon Laman, whose jail sentence will end on the day he is scheduled to be tried.

Our husbunds are being deprived of the companionship and counsel of their wives at a time when this companionship and counsel is must needed.

The imprisonment of our husbands is imposing severe hardship on us and our children, since it has deprived our husbands of an opportunity to contribute to our support.

Our husbands have already served approximately half of their contences.

In view of these considerations, we unge that in your capacity as Minister of Justice you recommend the dommutation of our husbands' sentences to the time they have already served. In doing so, we believe, you will be serving the cause of justices

Respectfully yourse

(Uno.) Jeplea ar. Edones. (Mrs.) Shylledun an (Hrs.) Regina R. Kerson

Ottawa, July 23, 1946.

Mr. Wilfrid Egglestone, Aylmer Road, Ottawa, Ontario.

E f. Jund. e ~

 $\int_{C} dr$

Dear Mr. Egglestone:

I

In the Resolution attached to your letter of the 8th instant, you mention as one of the breaches of Civil Liberty committed by the Royal Commission, under item No. 4, failure to inform witnesses, of their right to claim the protection of the Canada Evidence Act in answering questions which might incriminate them. The protection of the Canada Evidence Act was asked and granted on behalf of Halperin, and I am under the impression that notwithstanding this, the evidence was used in the Police Court, and may be used at trial. It would be well to look into this for accuracy sake.

Halperin's counsel is R. M. W. Chitty, K.C., 38 King Street West, Toronto.

Faithfully yours,

A. W. Roebuck.

.

Ottawa, May 28, 1946.

Ers. Dorise W. Neilsen, % Mrs. Fred Rose, 4050 Clarke Street, Apt. 8, Montreal, Quebec.

Dear Mrs. Neilsen:

<u>ан</u> 1

I have your letter of the 22nd instant, in which you ask me whether I could give character evidence during the trial of Fred Rose for its affect on the Jury. The only reply I can make is, that I could not do so, as I know practically nothing of his character. Beyond saying "Good Horning" to him when meeting in the halls of the Parliament Buildings, I have not exchanged a half a dozen sentences with him at any time. I have never been in his room in the Buildings, or in his apartment. I have had no touch with him, that I remember, either in politics or in business or socially. We have lived and worked in different cities, so that I am not even familiar with his local reputation.

I could not so testify for the good reason that as I have ho knowledge, there is nothing that I could say.

Such a witness would not serve the purpose you have in mind.

I regret that it is not possible for me to comply with your request, and I am sure that under the circumstances you will agree with me.

Faithfully yours,

A. W. Roebuck.

۰.

File py Heart

Senator Roebuck, House of Commo**jus**. Ottawa.

Dear Senator Roebuck,

11日日日 - 1992年 - 1993年2月1日日 - 日日日日日日日 - 1994年3月1日日

ta et d'ana

9 - A.

مىرى ئىدە. بەربى باردە

I am very sorry indeed that I was unable to see you today, since I had a request to make. Knowing of your interest in the matter of Civil Liberties I hoped that you might lend your good offices as a character witness for Fred Rose.

Mr Arsenault, M.P. and some of the other members have agreed to allow their names to stand as witnesses if the lawyer wishes to call on them, to testify that they knew Fred Ros e as a member of the House. and that his relationships with them were the same as with any other member.

The lawyer who is defending Fred Rose, thinks that any friendly testimony given by other members, might have a good effect upon the jury. The testimony would be of a personal and not a political nature.

There are certain aspects of these trials being held which are sufficient to alarm those who have a healthy respect for our old nd treasured laws, and I am hoping that you will join s ome of the other members in giving this slight aid to Fred Rose. If you will do this may I ask you to kindly send a note to Mrs Rose, Apt 8, 4050 Clarke St. Montreal. as soon as possible.

Thankingbyou, and with kindest personal regards,

I remain, Sincerely yours,

Danse. Wrelsen.

May 22nd, 1986.

٠t,

Dorise W. Nielsen.