

### SECTION III. 16

#### EMMA WOIKIN, Ottawa

Among the materials brought away from the Embassy by Gouzenko was a mailing list of documents sent by Zabolin to "*the address of The Director*", in Moscow, dated in ink January 3. The list itself was typed on a mimeographed form, and the latter was headed "*LIST OF MATERIALS SENT*", with a blank space for the day and month followed by the mimeographed figures "*1944*". From the dates of various documents listed in it, this list was evidently made out in January, 1945. As Woikin did not become a member of the Cipher Division of the Department of External Affairs until February, 1944, and as this list included the documents mentioned below, the date of the list is clearly 1945. Gouzenko explained that such lists were kept for some time in case any question arose with regard to the sending of any particular document. This particular list contained seven columns. Each document sent was given a number and that number was entered in the first column. There were then entered in order, the cover-name of the agent providing the document, the place where it had been obtained with the attendant circumstances, a description of the document, its date and any number borne by it, the number of pages and the markings such as "secret" or "registered".

No. 175 on this list is credited to "*Nora*", the cover name for Emma Woikin. It is said to be "*copies, telegrams, questionnaires, and photos*", to bear date "*Nov.-Dec.*" and to consist of pages as follows: "*telegrams 10, questionnaires 3, photos 11*".

Gouzenko also brought with him five sheets of notepaper written in English manuscript. He testified that when Zabolin translated these into Russian for the purpose of having Gouzenko encipher them for transmission to Moscow he said "material given by Nora". Gouzenko was aware that Nora was Woikin. It was September 5th, 1945, that Zabolin wired the contents of these sheets to Moscow and the sheets themselves he placed in the safe in Room 12 in the Embassy where Gouzenko worked. That evening the latter removed them and brought them away with him.

These documents are copies in whole or in part or summaries of secret and top secret telegrams received from another Government by the Department of External Affairs where Woikin was employed. She has acknowledged in evidence before us that the handwriting is hers. Some of these

secret telegrams cannot yet be disclosed and we do not therefore refer to their contents.

Emma (Gruna) Woikin was born December 30, 1920, at Blaine Lake, Saskatchewan of Russian Doukhobor parents. She applied in 1943 in Saskatchewan for a position in the Civil Service, and there wrote and passed the examination of the Civil Service Commission for a position as stenographer Grade 1. She was at that time a widow and spoke Russian as well as English. On 10th September, 1943, she was appointed by the Commission to a position with the Passport Division of the Department of External Affairs, and began to work there on September 28th. She was transferred to the Cipher Division on February 25th, 1944, as a cipher clerk, remaining there until she was retransferred back to the Passport Office in September 1945, after Gouzenko made his disclosures, and she continued to work as a clerk in the Passport Office up to the date when this Enquiry was begun. In March, 1944, Woikin had already applied to the Government to be sent abroad to Russia as a typist in Government service. She was in a position therefore to make disclosure of the contents of telegrams received and sent by that Department, as well as something of the secret cipher system itself, with which she had to be familiar in the discharge of her work. The materials which Zabotin wired to Moscow on September 5th, 1945, were all telegrams received in Ottawa between August 25th and September 1st, 1945, so that Zabotin in this instance at least, was receiving reasonably prompt service.

The tapping of this information illustrates as well as anything the extremely serious nature of these espionage activities. What was being obtained was not something belonging exclusively to the Canadian Government, but matter entrusted to the Canadian Government by other Governments. The discovery of the identity of all persons concerned in these activities, therefore, was a prime necessity. Otherwise, other Governments could not continue to give to the Government of this country confidential information with the risk that it might become open to the gaze of a Government not intended to see it. If other Governments discontinued giving Canada confidential information for that reason, such a result would seriously hamper the business of government in this country.

On entering the public service Emma Woikin took the required oaths of secrecy and allegiance. She explained that her method of operation with respect to the disclosure of cables coming into or going out of the Department was to memorize the contents of any document she thought would be of interest to her Russian employer and commit it to writing in the room

where she lived. She would admit having disclosed information to the Embassy on only three occasions in addition to that of August-September, 1945. She says she commenced these operations during the summer of 1945, but, as shown by the Embassy mailing list of January 5th, 1945, she had commenced at least by "November-December" of 1944. She admitted that her disclosures were not limited to telegrams she herself deciphered but that they extended to telegrams deciphered by other clerks in the Division.

She objected at some length to being obliged to disclose the name of the person to whom, on behalf of the Embassy, she communicated the above information, but finally stated it was Mrs. Sokolov, the wife of Major Sokolov. According to the evidence, she met Sokolov at dinner in the spring of 1944 at a private house in Ottawa where she had gone with a group of friends from Montreal who were engaged in putting on a concert that evening under the auspices of The Federation of Russian Canadians. She professed to know most of these people from Montreal only by their first names, but she says she knew them better than the Ottawa people who were her hosts at dinner. We mention this only as it indicates in some slight degree the same element of secrecy and reluctance to disclose names displayed by many of the witnesses who were called before us, as to the membership in study groups or the persons with whom they were associating.

Concerning Woikin, Gouzenko testified as follows:—

A. All I know about Emma Woikin is that first she came—I do not know whether she came to the embassy or not, but she became acquainted with Major Sokolov and very soon after they became friends and Major Sokolov proposed to Colonel Zabolin to develop her. This is the time when Milstein was in Ottawa, and they were together, Milstein, Sokolov and Colonel Zabolin. They discussed how to develop her.

Q. You were present, were you?

A. Yes, I was in the room. They made the plan that he must be more friendly with her, invite her to visit him. Moscow said that it was a mistake to make visits in the home, better in a restaurant. Zabolin and Milstein answered, "This is crazy, the best way is in the home." Later, after they had had some meetings—she was doing water colour painting, so she gave a painting to Sokolov and he gave some presents to her. They had friendly relations at that time, in the summer of 1944.

In that time Sokolov suggested that he make her a proposal to work as agent, in October, 1944. However, he developed her much sooner. The first time they had such a conversation, Sokolov had Zabotin send to Moscow the contents of the conversation, that she thought she could perhaps work as a stenographer or some kind of clerk in the Commercial Counsellor's office. She had said that she liked Russia, that she wanted to help Russia. So Sokolov said, "You can help Russia much better if you remain where you are."

Woikin herself testified:—

Q. Did you not try in 1944 to obtain some work at the Soviet Embassy?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Whom did you apply to then?

A. I applied to Krotov; I wrote a letter.

Q. To Krotov?

A. I wrote a letter and then I was referred to see Pavlov, but I never heard about it any more.

Q. How were you referred to see Pavlov?

A. After I wrote the letter I phoned and asked whether they received my letter and whether they considered it and they told me yes, they would give me an appointment with Pavlov. So I did see him but I never heard anything about it.

Q. You saw Pavlov on that occasion?

A. Yes, but I never heard about it later.

She says she was invited to dinner at the Sokolovs' home and had similar engagements with them in other places. Ultimately Sokolov asked her at his home if she would be willing to convey to him information that would be of interest to the Soviet and she agreed to do so a few days later. Some time later, she says he offered to pay her but she refused to accept money. The arrangement made was that she would meet Mrs. Sokolov at prearranged times and places and transmit the information to her. This, the witness said at first, was done exclusively on occasions when the two women went to the theatre together. Being further examined, however, as to visits made by her to the office of a professional man in Ottawa, the following took place:—

Q. You never met there, you never met anyone there in connection with the transmission of information?

A. *Well, seeing that you know, yes.*

Q. Pardon?

A. Seeing that you know that, I did.

She had, according to her evidence, no dealings with the professional man, but the waiting-room, which was apparently used in common by three practitioners, was used under the direction of Moscow as a place of meeting between Woikin and Captain Gorshkov, one of the "drivers" for Colonel Zabotin. The information which enabled Woikin to be examined on this phase of her activities came from Gouzenko. Woikin's answers established its accuracy. Gouzenko had testified as follows:

Q. This name of *dubok*, you say it is a general word for any hiding place?

A. That is right.

Q. Did you have any particular names for special hiding places where meetings were to take place?

A. No.

Q. There was no such place in Ottawa or Montreal?

A. As explained in my report, I said that Colonel Zabotin sent descriptions of possible hiding places under numbers.

Q. But you do not know where the places were?

A. I heard about this; I do not know particularly.

Q. By hiding place do you mean a place where documents are hidden or where people meet?

A. I will explain it more. I learned from telegrams where one such *dubok* was, a place in a washroom of a doctor.

Q. In Ottawa?

A. Yes, in Ottawa. That served as a place for handing over material.

Q. Do you know what doctor that was in Ottawa?

A. I understand from that telegram that this doctor lived on \_\_\_\_\_ Street. I do not remember his address.

Q. The doctor did not know it?

A. Of course not. In this particular case, I remember it because it was quite a strange situation. One of the members of the military attache, one of the staff, Driver Gorshkov, one time was having his teeth fixed by this doctor.

Q. He was a dentist, then?

A. Dentist. At the same time one of the agents, I think it was Nora, was having her teeth fixed at the same place. Moscow found it convenient therefore that during this time the materials would be placed in the washroom and after an hour or more Gorshkov would

go and take the materials out of the washroom. Their visits to the dentist or doctor would be explained by having their teeth attended to.

Woikin's evidence in this matter is as follows:

- Q. You never met there, you never met anyone there in connection with the transmission of information?
- A. Well, seeing that you know, yes.
- Q. Pardon?
- A. Seeing that you know that, I did.
- Q. Just what do you mean by your answer? Give the answer.
- Q. Will you just give your answer and give us all you know, please?
- A. *(No audible answer.)*
- Q. What is the name of the dentist?
- A. I do not know.
- Q. What is his address?
- A. I do not know the actual number, the address; I know it is past the \_\_\_\_\_, that is all.
- Q. Were you being treated by this dentist?
- A. No.
- Q. You simply went to this office, you used the office as a means of transmitting information; is that it?
- A. Yes.
- Q. How could you get to the office if you did not know the dentist's name?
- A. I might have known the number.
- Q. What did you say? I did not ask you what you might have known; what did you know?
- A. It is right next to the \_\_\_\_\_; there was a place there, that was all.
- Q. On \_\_\_\_\_ Avenue?
- A. Yes.
- Q. You were asked whom you met there. You have taken a long time to answer that question. Will you answer it now?
- A. I beg your pardon?
- Q. You were asked whom you met there?
- A. I do not know who it was.
- Q. As I understood it, the procedure was that you would go there and you would leave your information somewhere on the premises?
- A. Yes.

- Q. Or were you to hand your information directly to a person there?  
A. I was to leave it, yes.
- Q. You were to leave it there?  
A. Yes.
- Q. In what particular place?  
A. In the washroom.
- Q. In the washroom?  
A. Yes.
- Q. Whereabouts in the washroom?  
A. Under the cover; I do not know what it is really, what you call it.
- Q. You mean the tank?  
A. Yes.
- Q. Under the cover of the tank?  
A. Yes.
- Q. You raised the cover of the tank and put it under there?  
A. Yes.
- Q. How often did you go there?  
A. Only once.
- Q. Under whose instructions did you go there?  
A. Mr. Sokolov's.
- Q. When was that decided?  
A. I cannot remember when it was decided actually.
- Q. Was that decided after you had transmitted some other information to his wife, or was it discussed at the first conversation that that system would also be adopted?  
A. I think I met his wife once before.
- Q. You met his wife once before?  
Q. If you only met his wife three times for the purpose of handing her information, what was the necessity of going to this dentist's only once and acting in this mysterious manner?  
A. I do not know.
- Q. You simply carried out Sokolov's instructions?  
A. Yes.

Whether these visits were limited to the one occasion, as Woikin testified, it is impossible to say.

The meetings with Mrs. Sokolov were not arranged by a message to Sokolov or his wife as Woikin had information to give, but on each occasion

on which they met a new date was set on which to meet again. The meetings, according to Woikin, were "about once a month".

Woikin ultimately admitted that she had received what she called a "gift" of \$50.00. This was handed to her in bills in an envelope by Mrs. Sokolov on one occasion when they were at the theatre together. Woikin did not know what was in the envelope until she opened it at home. The envelope carried an endorsement in the handwriting of Mrs. Sokolov that the contents were a gift. Woikin thinks that this incident took place on the second occasion when she handed over information.

About the middle of September, 1945, Woikin was told by Mrs. Sokolov that they would not be meeting any more because there was some trouble. Mrs. Sokolov did not particularize and Woikin said they did not meet again. On September 28th she was transferred from the Cipher Division so that she was no longer in a position to obtain secret information.

The evidence of this witness as to why she had agreed to communicate information in the first place is of importance and is as follows:—

Q. Miss Woikin, when you had the proposition put up to you the first time by Mr. Sokolov, and you say in a few days you agreed, why did you agree?

A. Well, that is a feeling one can't quite express.

Q. What is that?

A. That is a feeling that you cannot quite express.

Q. I do not understand that. You were born in this country?

A. Yes.

Q. Your parents have been here since before 1900?

A. Yes.

Q. Then would you explain why you were willing to do what Sokolov asked you to do?

A. Perhaps it is because I have a feeling of love for that country. Perhaps it is because we think that there is—we may be wrong or we may be right, but there is hope for the poor or something.

Q. Yes?

A. I don't know why I had that, but I did.

Q. If I understand what you mean, it is that you were sympathetic with the Soviet Union?

A. Yes.

In January, 1946, Woikin went to the Russian Embassy where she saw Vitali Pavlov, the Second Secretary, and Mrs. Veronina, a secretary in the



Consular Division which is headed by Pavlov, and there made application to become a Soviet citizen. She had not heard at the time of giving evidence whether or not her application had been accepted. Woikin said she wanted to go to Russia to live and for that reason had made her application. She deposed:—

Q. Now you would like to be a Soviet citizen?

A. Yes.

Q. Why?

A. I cannot answer that, I do not know how to answer it.

Q. Take your time and tell us what you believe and what you think?

A. Maybe it was just from the kind of life I had, maybe—just that I look to that country for security and I would like to live there.

Q. Who told you that there was security in that country? How do you know that?

A. Well—

Q. How did you reach that conclusion?

A. I do not know how I reached that conclusion.

Q. You must have had some reason?

A. Well, maybe it was from what I read—what I read, really that is what I mean.

Q. What do you mean by security?

A. Well, there was a time when I was quite poor, I guess, and my baby died because we had no medical care and nobody seemed to care. My husband was sick and to such a stage where nobody seemed to intervene at all.

Q. There was no public health service out where you were living?

A. No, there was not.

She denied being a member of the Communist Party. Her evidence indicates, however, that she had formed a view of life in Russia from what she read and believed. Her attitude of mind thus produced was sufficient to cause her to disregard the oaths of allegiance and secrecy which she had taken. For her they ceased to have any moral force, assuming they had, for her, ever been attended by any. When completing her National Registration application on August 20, 1940, she stated she was a citizen of "no country". When applying for civil service employment in September, 1943, however, she declared she was a British subject of Russian origin.

On April 10, 1946 Woikin pleaded guilty before a Judge of the County Court of the County of Carleton to the following charges:—

For that she, the said Emma Woikin, from the First day of May, A.D. 1945 to the Seventh day of September, A.D. 1945, at the City of Ottawa, in the said County, and elsewhere in the Province of Ontario, did unlawfully being a person having in her possession and control certain documents and information to which she had access owing to her position as a person who held office under His Majesty, communicate such documents and information to a person other than a person to whom she was authorized to communicate with or a person to whom it was in the interests of the State her duty to communicate such documents and information, and did hereby commit an offence under Section 4 (1) (a) of The Official Secrets Act, Chapter 49, Statutes of Canada, 1939.

For that she, the said Emma Woikin, from the First day of May, A.D. 1945 to the Seventh day of September, A.D. 1945, at the City of Ottawa, in the said County, and elsewhere in the Province of Ontario, did unlawfully being a person having in her possession and control certain documents and information to which she had access owing to her position as a person who held office under His Majesty, use the information in her possession for the benefit of a foreign power, to wit, The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and did thereby commit an offence under Section 4 (1) (b) of The Official Secrets Act, Chapter 49, Statutes of Canada, 1939.

SECTION IV. 1

NORMAN VEALL, Montreal

In a document of instructions for Sam Carr, drawn up by Lieutenant-Colonel Rogov, headed *Task No. 2 of 15.6.45*, referred to elsewhere in this Report, are included the following relating to this man:—

FRANK: 1. On the ground of data previously communicated with respect to A. N. Veale (an Englishman), it is known to us that up to 1942 he worked in the meteo-service of the Royal Air Force in Cambridge. Following this he went to Canada on a scientific mission. Before leaving Veale ~~received~~ allegedly received instructions from his director to get in touch with your corporation.

2 copies  
Assigned  
15.6.45

\* At present we would like to know more details about Veale and therefore it is desired that for the forthcoming meeting (15.7.45) you should in written form enlighten us on the following questions:

(a) Did Veale really work in the meteo-service of the Royal Air Force in Cambridge and has his mission (stay) in Canada a direct connection with his service in England.

(b) If these facts are confirmed, you should try to draw ~~him~~ Veale into a frank discussion and ~~put~~ put the question straight to him, what he wants from you.

(c) However, should Veale in the course of the conversation refer to his corporation membership and to the instructions of his director in England to get connected with the Canadian Corporation, then let him give the name of the person who gave him these instructions.

(d) Do not take from Veale any material and do not show any interest in any information whatever.

The details will be cleared up through the engineer Chub-chemist, a friend of Sam, and also by Debouz, both of them along trade-union lines.

The above occupies a page and one-half of the original document. The note in the margin, in accordance with Rogov's practice, is evidently the first information received from "Frank" (Sam Carr) in answer to the instructions

\* Faint type indicates words crossed out in original documents.

With regard to Veall, Gouzenko testified as follows:—

Q. Just stop there for a moment. Do you know anything about Veall?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you tell the Commissioners what you know about Veall?  
Is that his real name?

A. Yes, that is his real name.

Q. What do you know about him?

A. Sam Carr told Motinov that a certain Veall had applied to him for work, and that he was a member of the Communist Party in England; he said he was a member of the Communist Party, and he showed Carr a certificate written by a Communist who had been arrested in England.

Q. Where did you get this information?

A. From a telegram that Colonel Zabotin sent to Moscow, writing about this meeting of Motinov with Carr.

Q. That was a telegram which you coded in the course of your duties?

A. Yes.

On August 9, 1945, Zabotin telegraphed "*The Director*" as follows:—

To the Director,

243

Alek reported to us that he has met Norman Veal (he was at his home). Veal works in the laboratory of the Montreal branch of the Scientific Research Council where he is responsible for the making of testing utensils and other glass work. He came from England in 1943, where he was a member of the party for several years. He worked on meteorology in the British R.A.F. He takes part in the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers and works there as foreign correspondent. In connection with this he visited our embassy and talked with one of our press-attaches who is in charge of the press, distribution of periodicals, etc. He asked the opinion of Alek: Is it worth while for him (Veal) to hand over information on the atomic bomb.

Alek expressed himself in the negative. Alek stated that Veal occupies a fairly low position and knows very little. He is inclined to be careless, as he began this conversation in the presence of his wife. He is pretty well known in the laboratory as a "Red". His age is about 25 years. He is married and has one child. His address is: 2870 Van Horne, Apartment 5, Telephone—

Atlantic 2084. We gave Alek no tasks concerning Veal. The possibility is not excluded that he may have already tied up with the neighbour. I consider it necessary to warn the neighbour. Please correct.

Grant.

9.8.45.

"Alek" is Professor Alan Nunn May, on whom we are also reporting, who, with Veall, was a member of the party of English scientists who came to Canada during 1943 to work on the atomic bomb project under the auspices of the National Research Council in Montreal. The "neighbour" is the pseudonym used by the Russians to refer to their secret police, the N.K.V.D. which in Canada is headed by Vitali Pavlov, the Second Secretary of the Embassy at Ottawa.

On August 22nd, 1945, "The Director" telegraphed to Zabotin in part as follows:—

11924.  
22.8.45

To Grant.

1. Your 243.

We have here no compromising data against Veal, nevertheless the fact that he has in his hands a letter of recommendation from a corporant who was arrested in England (which he did not take care to destroy) compels us to refuse to have any contact with him whatsoever, the more so that many already call him "a Red".

To the neighbour he must surely be known; if not, inform him of the break in my instructions.

Warn Alek that he should have no conversations whatever with him about our work.

"A corporant" means "member of the Communist Party of any country except the Soviet Union itself". "Corporation" is the name used by the Russians for the Party itself.

In a book kept by Dr. Boyer in 1944, one page has the names "Norman Veall, Steinberg, Gerson".

Steinberg's cover-name was "Berger" and Gerson's "Gray".

In speaking of the membership of the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers, Dr. Boyer said:—

- Q. And the executive consists of whom?
- A. There are two others; there is Dr. P. R. Wallace, whom I have already mentioned as Chairman of the Montreal branch, and Norman Veall.
- Q. Oh, you know him?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And what are his leanings?
- A. Definitely L.P.P., Communist. He is British.

Shugar also knew Veall. Both were members of the Association as was Frank Chubb through whom as Carr reported to Rogov "the details will be cleared". Chubb testified in part:—

- Q. It refers first of all to a man named Veall, whom I may say to you has appeared here and has given evidence before this Commission. Do you know Veall?
- A. Yes, I know Mr. Veall.
- Q. How long have you known him?
- A. I have known him since the fall of 1943, I would say.
- Q. How did you come to know him?
- A. I met Mr. Veall in the course of the organization of the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers.
- Q. You are a member of that?
- A. I am a member of their executive of the Montreal Branch.
- Q. Are you a member of the Dominion executive or merely of the Montreal executive?
- A. Merely of the Montreal branch.
- Q. How long have you held a position on that executive?
- A. I held the position from the time I was formally elected, which if I remember correctly was November, 1943, until I resigned prior to leaving for the United States.
- Q. Did you hold any other position than that of a member of the executive; were you secretary?
- A. I was Recording Secretary or Membership Secretary.

As to Chubb, Dr. Boyer said:—

- Q. And what were his political affiliations?
- A. Labour-Progressive.
- Q. Communist?
- A. Yes.

Q. Definitely so, I imagine?

A. Definitely so.

Veall also said as to Chubb:—

A. I knew Chubb was a member of the Labour-Progressive party and I am not sure whether he raised the possibility of my joining. I think Chubb is about the only member of the L.P.P., the only person I knew was a member of the L.P.P.

We find Chubb in association with other persons mentioned in this report who were not members of the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers. For instance in a note-book found in a trunk in Gerson's home the names "*Mrs. Benning, Bert Gerson, Mrs. Schlein, Chubb, Ben B.*" (Burman) "*Agatha*" (Chapman) "*Nightingale*" together on one page. Gerson said this was a list of persons who bought tickets for a raffle of Victory Bonds. As to this Chubb's evidence is:—

Q. It is rather astonishing that your name should be entered in Mr. Gerson's book, with a note that you had paid some money, and yet you never even heard of Gerson. Is that so?

A. That is right.

Q. Did you ever buy any Victory Bonds?

A. Yes, I bought Victory Bonds through the company that I worked for.

Q. What company was that?

A. The Dominion Oilcloth and Linoleum Company.

Q. And when was that?

A. Oh, I bought them in the last two or three loans. I think you could check that with the company's records.

Q. To whom did you make your payments?

A. They were deducted from my salary.

Q. And you never came in touch with Gerson in connection with that matter?

A. No, sir.

Q. Were they the only Victory Bonds you bought?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Well, in this same Exhibit, Mr. Chubb, under the heading *Victory Bonds \$50. Five tickets*, which we were told was a raffle, there are a number of names and one of them is Chubb and opposite that name is the word "Pd." Do you know anything about that?

A. No, sir.

- Q. Then on another page there is a list, and they are all numbered. No. 16 is *F. Chubb. Pd.* No. 18 is *Frank Ch. Pd.* No. 22 is *F. Chubb. Pd.* and No. 24 is *F. Chubb. Pd.* and 26 is *F. Chubb. Pd.*, if you do not know anything about it?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. In this list you are in pretty good company. There are a lot of names which have been mentioned here; and you know nothing about it?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. And equally you know nothing about how your name comes to be in a record in the Soviet Embassy?
- A. That is correct.

The following further evidence of Chubb may be referred to:—

- Q. Mr. Chubb, it may have come to your attention through the public press that certain original and secret documents from the Russian Embassy have been placed before this Royal Commission. In one of them your name is mentioned and it is in connection with that that we want you to assist the Commission, if you can. First of all, what is your present occupation?
- A. Well, I am an organic chemist; I am presently a graduate student at the University of Southern California and I am also doing a little teaching at the time there.
- Q. You went to California when?
- A. I left Montreal on March 1.
- Q. What year?
- A. This year.
- Q. You have been in California continuously since?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You left here on the 1st March?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Prior to leaving for California what were you doing?
- A. I was employed as a chemist with the Dominion Oilcloth and Linoleum Company.
- Q. How long had you been with them?
- A. Ten years; well, eleven years, since August, 1935.
- Q. How old are you?
- A. I am thirty-two years old.



Q. Were you born in Montreal?

A. I was born in Quebec City.

Q. What present qualifications and degrees do you hold, Mr. Chubb?

A. I possess the degree of Bachelor of Science from McGill University.

Q. And you got that in what year?

A. 1935.

Q. Are there various types of chemistry?

A. Well, there is organic chemistry and physical chemistry; then there is a distinction between the straight chemist and the chemical engineer.

Q. What description of yourself do you prefer?

A. I would be a chemist.

Chubb also deposed:—

Q. Does the witness know Sam Carr?

A. No, sir.

. . . . .

Q. Do you know Fred Rose?

A. No, sir.

. . . . .

Q. Did you know Veall as a member of the Communist party?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you know him as a person interested in the ideology of the Communist party?

A. Not particularly.

. . . . .

Q. Are you a member of the Communist party?

A. No, sir.

Q. Could you be described as a Communist?

A. No, sir.

Q. The reason I am asking you this is that you have been described by witnesses before this Commission as a Communist. What have you to say to that?

A. I would say I am not a Communist.

Q. Have you any leanings toward or sympathy for Communism or Marxist ideologies?

A. No, not particularly.

. . . . .

Q. Did you know Professor Allan Nunn May?

A. I did.

. . . . .

Q. Did you know a man named David Shugar?

A. Yes, I knew Dr. Shugar.

Q. How did you come to know him?

A. In the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers.

. . . . .

Q. You did say in your evidence a little earlier that you had either read or listened to some Marxist doctrines, did you not?

A. I don't recall it.

Q. You do not recall saying that?

A. No, sir.

Q. Well, did you?

A. Well, I have read — the only thing — no, I can't recall any outright Marxist literature. I am quite a reader and a student; at least I have read various books on politics and I might have read — perhaps I have read some things which might be called —

Q. Mr. Chubb, you did the reading and I did not, and I have asked you whether you read any Marxist literature or documents?

A. Yes.

Q. You have? All right. Have you done that reading once, or more than once?

A. I would say once.

Q. Just once?

A. Yes.

Q. And when was that?

A. Oh, I would say in about — maybe six or seven years ago.

Q. And what was it you read?

A. It was some extract, I believe, of Karl Marx. I don't recall exactly.

Q. Where did you get it?

A. I bought it at a bookstore.

Q. In Montreal?

A. Yes.

Q. When you were at McGill?

A. No, sir; subsequent to that.

Q. What year would that be?

A. Oh, 1936 or 1937, possibly.

Q. Do you remember the name of the store?

A. No, sir.

Q. What aroused your interest?

A. I just thought I would like to read something about it.

We think the evidence of Veall and Boyer as to Chubb's views is correct. We also think the statement in the Embassy record that Chubb did know Sam Carr and that the "*details would be cleared up*" through Chubb is correct. Chubb, in our opinion, was not a trustworthy witness.

Returning to the document headed "Task No. 2, 15.6.45", Veall deposed that from the beginning of 1939 he worked in the Meteorological Service of the Air Ministry in England until December, 1941, when he was transferred to the atomic energy project, coming to Canada in January 1943. Veall's work was concerned with the production of glass instruments. Veall testified:—

Q. Now, then, was Dr. May, Allan Nunn May, a member of the mission?

A. Yes.

Q. Had you known him in England?

A. Yes, he was working on the project at Cambridge when I was working there.

Q. What are your associations with the Communist Party at any time or at any place?

A. Well, back in 1937 — 1938, I am not quite sure which year it was, I did associate with some organization known as the Young Communist League. A number of my school friends were in it and during the summer holidays I used to go to camp or cycling on week ends. I was about eighteen at the time. I should point out that at that time I was studying for my degree at evening classes and it was just a question that most of the people, at least some of my school friends, were in the Young Communist League and I was connected with them about three months.

Q. You mean you were a member of the League for that time?

A. Yes.

Q. And only for about three months, you say?

A. I would estimate it at that. It was only the time I went around with these people — it was during the summer holiday months.

- Q. Did you then dissociate yourself from the Young Communist League?
- A. Well, I still maintained contact with one or two of my friends.
- Q. Did you as a member of the Young Communist League for the time you belonged to it pay a membership fee?
- A. Yes.
- Q. When did you discontinue paying a membership fee to the Young Communist League?
- A. I cannot say whether it was a weekly or monthly fee, I cannot remember now, but when I stopped going around with them I stopped paying my fee.
- Q. What was the amount of the fee, do you recall?
- A. I cannot remember the exact fee. It was something purely nominal, 3d. a week, or something like that.
- . . . . .
- Q. How many members would there be in that particular branch, Mr. Veall?
- A. I would think at that time there was about fifteen or twenty people, and their ages ranged from sixteen to about twenty.
- Q. Had it a name? Was it called any particular name?
- A. The Hendon Branch of the Young Communist League.
- Q. Did you ever hold office in it yourself?
- A. No, I did not hold any official office.
- Q. Do you know what those weekly payments were used for; can you tell us anything about it?
- A. Well, part of them were retained by the branch and the rest went to the head offices and went to support a newspaper.
- Q. What was the name of the paper?
- A. *The Challenge*. From what I can gather, as far as finance goes, practically every meeting I went to there was always a collection, either to pay the rent of the room or to send more money to *The Challenge*. They never had enough money.
- Q. That is in addition to the 3d. per week, there were requests for money each time you foregathered?
- A. And then always there were collections of money for the dependents of the men in the International Brigade and collections for medical supplies for Spain and China, and so forth. I can assure you it was quite an expensive business.
- . . . . .

- Q. That group to which you belonged, did it make any report to the Communist Party in Moscow?
- A. Certainly not.
- Q. To whom was the money sent?
- A. It went to the National office in London.
- Q. In London?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And the National office in London had connections with Moscow?
- A. Yes, I assume so.
- Q. So indirectly Moscow knew of the existence of your group?
- A. Certainly.

- Q. Then Exhibit 19-D goes on:—

*At the present time we would wish to know with more detail regarding Veale, and it is therefore desirable that you enlighten us in written form for the next meeting (15th July, 1945) on the following.*

I would like you to keep in your mind those dates. The first one when the task was assigned to Sam Carr, is the 15th June, 1945?

- A. Yes.
- Q. One month later. These meetings were being held at regular intervals. So on the 15th July Carr was to report to Rogov on the following questions:—

*(a) Does Veale actually work in the Meteorological Service of the Royal Air Force in Cambridge, and has his sojourn in Canada a direct connection to his service in England.*

That was the first thing Carr was to find out. That is, at the time while you were working in Canada, at that time were you still connected with the Meteorological Service in England, and what was the relationship between what you had been doing in England with what you were doing in Canada? When you came over here on this mission did you still remain attached to the service that you were with in England?

- A. Yes, the atomic energy project.
- Q. And the work that you were doing in Canada was a continuation of the work you had been doing in England?
- A. Yes.

Q. That was the first thing that Carr was to find out and report to Rogov. The second is:—

*If these data are confirmed then try to draw Veale out in frank conversation and put the straight question to him: 'What does he want from you?'*

Then on the margin this is written, Mr. Veall:—

*The details will be explained through the Engineer Chubb, a chemist, . . . friend of Sam.*

That is a friend of Sam Carr.

*And also through Debouz, both along the lines of trade unions.*

First of all, did you know a man named Chubb?

A. Yes.

Q. Who is he?

A. He is — I met him as a member of the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers.

Q. He is not an Englishman?

A. No.

Q. And you met him after you came to Canada?

A. Yes, I met him about eighteen months ago.

Q. In Montreal?

A. In Montreal.

Q. Under what circumstances did you meet him, in connection with the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers?

A. Yes.

Q. When did you join that organization?

A. Actually I took an active part in the formation of that Association. That would be in something like July of 1944, I think.

Q. And did Chubb attend that meeting?

A. Yes.

Q. Was that the first time you had met him?

A. That was the first time I had met him. I think before that meeting there had been one or two informal meetings in Dr. Boyer's house, which were attended by the people whose names I have mentioned.

Q. Was Chubb at any of those?

A. Chubb was at one or two of those. I cannot remember who introduced him.

Q. Then I come back to Exhibit 19-D:—

*The details will be cleared (or explained) through engineer Chubb—*

That is Frank Chubb?

A. Yes.

Q. —a chemist — friend of Sam —  
that is Sam Carr.

*—and also through Debouz —*

The evidence before the Commission is that *Debouz* is the cover name for Fred Rose.

A. Yes, so I hear.

Q. Do you know Fred Rose?

A. I have met him twice.

As stated in Zabotin's telegram of August 9th, 1945, Veall did visit the Soviet Embassy in connection with the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers.

Q. Having started your correspondence with Volenko, did you from time to time see him at the Embassy?

A. I never saw him at the Embassy except on the occasion of this official reception. And one day last summer — and again I cannot give you the date — he was in Montreal. He used to send — when we established contact, he used to send me Soviet scientific journals; I have about two or three hundredweight of them at home, and he happened to be in Montreal and he called me up on the telephone and said he had a couple of parcels of books for me, and I met him at the Windsor Hotel and we had lunch together.

Q. On how many occasions have you been in the Russian Embassy?

A. Once.

Q. Had you met outside of the Embassy —?

A. Perhaps before you go on with that, I also met Volenko some three or four months ago. We had lunch together at the Chateau Laurier.

Q. Just the two of you?

A. Yes.

Q. What month would that be, Mr. Veall?

A. Probably February.

Q. That was in February of this year?

A. Yes.

Q. Lunch with Volenko?

A. Yes.

Q. What was the occasion of that?

A. I happened to be passing through Ottawa, and there were one or two points I wanted to discuss with him, chiefly in connection with the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization. As you know, the Russians did not co-operate in that, and I was rather anxious to find out why the Russians were not co-operating; and also being rather interested in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and again the Russians were not co-operating in that, and I wanted to try and find out the reasons.

Q. Did you find out?

A. To get any information out of Volenko was the most difficult thing I have ever come across.

Q. Did you find out?

A. He just would not talk.

Q. And you got nothing?

A. He just wouldn't talk.

Q. You got nothing?

A. No.

The endorsement on *Task No. 2* that "*the details will be cleared up . . . along trade union lines*" should be read in connection with the following evidence of Veall.

Q. Coming back to Exhibit 19-D, the memo that I was reading:—

*The details will be cleared (or explained) through engineer Chub, friend of Sam, and also through Debouz—*

I told you *Debouz* is really Fred Rose.

*—both along the lines of trade unions.*

Does that mean anything to you, "along the lines of trade unions"?

A. Frank Chubb, I believe, who was a member of a trade union; that is, the Association of Technical Employees.

Q. And the British Association of Scientific Workers, you told us, became a trade union in 1941?

A. In 1940, I think; and affiliated to the Trade Union Congress in 1941.



Q. And was there a discussion as to whether the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers should become a trade union?

A. Yes.

The common membership of Veall and Chubb in the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers was the contact through which Chubb would communicate with Veall.

We return to Veall's evidence:—

Q. You see, Moscow says that you have this in your own hands, and one of the reasons that they were apparently afraid to work you here was because you had this letter and had shown it to somebody. What could that be?

A. Well, I have quite a lot of books and papers and so forth, some of which I brought from England. Several people have told me, in fact May himself, in a conversation which could be the only one referred to there, told me that I was rather foolish to be so outspoken in my political opinions.

Q. May told you that?

A. Yes.

Q. As a matter of fact, you were pretty outspoken, were you not, in your political opinions?

A. Yes.

Q. And those political opinions were ones which, without a great deal of difficulty, could be designated as Red?

A. Well, put it this way; I would not be offended if anybody called me a Red.

Q. Would you be offended if anybody called you a Communist?

A. No, in fact, except that I don't believe that it is an undesirable label on a person. In my own case, my political views change from day to day. I might read a new book, and I like to consider each question on its merits and form an opinion on all the facts I have. If I read a book by somebody and got more facts, I might modify my opinion accordingly. I think it would be fair to say in general I am. I would say that a Communist would closely correspond with my political sympathies, at least the basis of Marxism.

Q. At least what?

A. At least I could call myself a Marxist.

- Q. Let us go back to Exhibit 20-F for a few minutes.  
*Alec reported to us that he met Norman Veale (he was at his home).*
- The address given in the same telegram is 2870 Van Horne, Apartment 5. Is that your address?
- A. That is my address.
- Q. The telephone is Atlantic 2084?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What is your age?
- A. I was born in 1919; that makes me twenty-seven.
- Q. You are married?
- A. Yes.
- Q. You have one child?
- A. Yes.
- Q. So that information was accurate?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Now, Alec is reporting, do you see, and it is quite conceivable Sam Carr was using May to get information from or about you.  
*Veale works in the laboratory of the Montreal Branch of the Scientific Research Council.*
- That was correct at that time?
- A. Yes.
- Q. *Where he is in charge of the preparation of experimental glass recipients and such other glass work.*
- Is that an accurate statement?
- A. Partly. It is not a description I would apply to my work. I am working on measuring instruments. The word "recipient" is rather —
- Q. You have to bear in mind this is a translation from a Russian document written by a man who probably is not familiar with technical language. It is substantially correct, is it?
- A. Yes.
- Q. *He arrived from England in 1943.*
- That is correct?
- A. Yes.
- Q. *In England he was a member of the party for several years.*
- You say that you were a member for several months?
- A. Yes, of the Young Communist League.

- Q. Of the Young Communist League, yes. Do you see a distinction between it and the Communist Party?
- A. Definitely, I think so.
- Q. You definitely think so?
- A. There is a distinction.
- Q. What is the distinction?
- A. For one thing they are completely separate organizations, and apart from that the Young Communist League, at least at the time I was in it, was largely just a youth club, more a social organization.
- Q. We have evidence here before the Commission that in Russia there is the official Communist Party and in addition to that there is the Komsomol, which is the Young Communist League.
- A. Yes.
- Q. The organization in England was similar?
- A. I would say so.
- Q. Apparently?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And you did not belong to the Communist Party in England but you belonged to the Young Communist League for a period?
- A. Yes.
- Q. These people say for several years, but you told us this morning for several months. But you did keep in contact with a number of your friends who were members and who continued as members of the Young Communist League. That is correct, is it not?
- A. Yes, and of course when I was at Cambridge my natural inclinations I think tended to gravitate toward the left wing circles. That is to say, I knew quite a few Communists in Cambridge, and one or two at least were close friends of mine and continued to work in the same lab.
- Q. Were any of those men with whom you came in contact in England Russians?
- A. No.
- Q. They were all native British?
- A. Yes.
- Q. I would rather understand, Mr. Veall, that having the views you had or the associations you had in connection with the Young Communist League in 1938, and having your present views, and having had those views more or less throughout the period you

would be in association with persons holding similar views throughout that period?

A. That is correct.

Q. Even though you were not a member of the Party?

A. Yes.

Q. But you were in close association with other Communists and other Communist organizations even though you were not a member?

A. I never had time for any association with any organization whatsoever. The only people I had association with were people I met in the course of my work or neighbours or people I have met at school.

Q. Individuals?

A. Yes.

Q. But you tended naturally to gravitate toward persons holding views similar to your own?

A. Yes.

Q. How often did you meet Allan Nunn May apart from your contact with him in your work?

A. I first met May in Cambridge. I only saw him in contact with my work. I used to see him at meetings of the Association of Scientific Workers in England. When we came to Canada he was working on the same floor as I was and I naturally saw him if I met him in the lab. At that time the whole team knew each other fairly well. I did not associate much with him socially.

Q. On one occasion at least May came to your house. How often did that happen?

A. That is when we first came over, but then about — I would say the 1st January, 1943, after we had got settled. May was an instructor of the University of London and I was studying for my degree at the University, and I naturally went to him for advice and assistance with my studies and he used to come to my house on an average of about once a week or so to spend an evening with me tutoring in physics.

Q. *Alec expressed himself in the negative.*

Alec reported that you occupied a minor position and that you knew very little. Do you care to make any comment on that statement?

- A. Minor position, I think, is correct. I know very little officially of what is going on in the project, but unofficially I have a pretty good idea of what is going on. I know pretty nearly all the divisions. My situation in the lab is that when somebody in one of the other divisions wants to do an experiment he comes along to me to talk about a particular instrument. Usually the instrument needs to be tailor-made for the experiment, designed to suit his requirements, and he has to tell me what his requirements are before I can design the instrument for him, and consequently I have a pretty good idea of what the experiment is.
- Q. So that May was slightly depreciating the knowledge that you had available when he reported that you knew very little?
- A. As I say, I had very little to do with May apart from my work. May was rather a senior man and I am a junior man in the lab. and we do not move in the same social circles.
- Q. Would this be right: May would have more technical information with regard to the atomic project?
- A. May would have access to practically every document in the lab. where I had no access to documents. I picked up quite a bit of information there in the course of my work.
- Q. In other words, anybody who wanted to know anything about the atomic project could get all you knew from May himself?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Then we come to the next sentence, which is a rather significant one, Mr. Veall.
- Moreover he — that is you — is inclined to be careless as he started the conversation in the presence of his wife.*
- Alec has reported about your qualifications, your source of knowledge, and he has also reported that you are inclined to be careless because you started a conversation in the presence of your wife. This is what I put to you: there would be no reason why you should not start a conversation in the presence of your wife except for the fact that May was coaching you, as it were?
- A. That was until 1943, of course.
- Q. But not since then?
- A. May has visited my house rather occasionally.
- Q. Your house in Montreal?
- A. Yes.

Q. At this address?

A. He used to come to dinner, occasionally.

Q. Can you suggest why it is that Colonel Zabolin is reporting that May suggests that you were careless because you started a conversation in the presence of your wife? That would indicate on the face of it that there was a conversation between you and May of a secret character that any third person, even your wife, should not hear. Can you throw any light on that at all?

A. As you know, since the atomic bomb dropped there has been considerable discussion. I mean, you have only to look at the various journals. The whole question of secrecy in connection with the atomic project and so forth — when any atomic scientists get together there is sure to be conversation on something not to be mentioned. I mean, it has been the opinion of most scientists that it is going to be impossible to keep the secret. You cannot keep scientific information secret because it will be discovered anyway. It may be — I mean May has been to our house and certainly the chief topic of conversation going on in our circle, in all our group, when one or more people get together, is atom politics, as we call it.

Q. Do you remember the day the atomic bomb was dropped first?

A. It was about August, was it? Of course, you know, this whole business has been discussed about a year before that in the lab.

Q. I realize that.

A. It was an open subject of discussion.

Q. This report, Exhibit 20-F, to Moscow is dated 9th August, 1945. Does that relate it in your mind to the date of the dropping of the atomic bomb?

A. No, I do not think so.

Q. So that your suggestion to the Commission is that the reference to carelessness must refer to some talk that you and May had about the atomic bomb?

A. Quite possible.

Q. Then it goes on to say that you are well known in the laboratory "*as a Red*". Then it gives your age and we have checked on that. I think you said you have never made any secret of your Communist ideas or leanings or whatever way you want to put it?

A. Yes.

Q. In fact, Dr. Boyer swore here that you were definitely a Communist.

A. Yes.

Q. That does not meet with any negative response from you?

A. Well, as I say, the way of defining it; I am certainly not a member of the Communist Party. Putting it this way: for any definition as far as you are concerned, you can call me a Communist. I am suggesting a distinction, but I have rather private distinctions of my own.

Q. When Professor Boyer was expressing his opinion here that you were a Communist, it was his opinion?

A. Yes, and I think he was justified in saying that.

The information concerning Veall in the documents in the Embassy is shown by Veall's own evidence to be substantially correct. We think that that and the following evidence given by Veall indicates the trustworthiness of the statement in Zabotin's telegram that *He asked the opinion of Alek: is it worth while for him (Veale) to hand over information on the atomic bomb.* Veall deposed:—

Q. Let me put this question to you. Assuming that you had met Rogov and Rogov had asked you to turn over to him information that you had got working in the National Research Council and which was secret, would you have turned it over to him?

A. I do not think I would.

Q. Have you any doubt in your mind as to whether you would or not?

A. Well, it would naturally depend on the circumstances and the situation at the time.

Q. What do you mean by that?

A. Well, it is rather difficult to sort of just say you would do this. I cannot say quite categorically "No." There may be some doubt in my mind, but certainly if somebody had approached to me in the last six or twelve months to hand over information of this nature I most certainly would not have done it, because I believe that we have to put an end to secrecy in scientific work and —

Q. You believe what?

A. We have to put an end to secrecy in scientific work and that there is no official organization being set up for the purpose of international scientific co-operation under the United Nations Organization. I have done quite a lot of work on the study of

that question since the idea was first mooted over a year ago and I feel I could do very much more good and ultimately get very much more scientific information from the U.S.S.R. if I were to work to build up and to help in building up this international organization in the United Nations Organization.

- Q. Would you say in that period you mentioned if somebody had asked you that you would or would not have given it?
- A. I would definitely have not.
- Q. Why do you limit it to that period?
- A. Because prior to that period I might have had some doubt in my mind as to the moral justification of holding out information which might have helped to shorten the war. After all, I have a brother in the army and a lot of my friends were being killed during the war. I have also had the unpleasant experience of digging dead children out of bombed buildings and if I felt anything I could do would help shorten the war I might have possibly done it.
- Q. Regardless of any oath of secrecy you might have taken?
- A. I have no oath of secrecy.
- Q. You were working without any oath of secrecy?
- A. I am employed by the British Government and when you join the British Government on secret work you sign a declaration that you have read the Official Secrets Act.
- Q. Then substitute that in my question. Notwithstanding that undertaking, that acknowledgement, you would still have given the information?
- A. I think I can honestly say I might have given that information, assuming that I had any information that was worth giving.

In our opinion this evidence indicates that Veall did not communicate information with respect to the atomic work for the reason that the Russians designedly did not ask him.



## SECTION IV. 2

### "SURENSEN"

One of the Exhibits is a page from a small, personal, notebook kept in his own handwriting by Colonel Zabolin. It is one of several pages, which are all exhibits, in which he put down information given to him by Sokolov and Koudriavtzev about the groups which were functioning before his arrival. The notes were obviously made at different times and were added to by Zabolin himself from other sources. Probably they became unnecessary after the system instituted by Rogov of maintaining a file on each agent had been put into full operation. Zabolin gave the pages, torn from his notebook, to Gouzenko with instructions that they be destroyed.

The Exhibit deals with what was called the "Second Group" or the "Ottawa-Toronto" group, of which the Organizer was Sam Carr who lived in Toronto, while the members, Benning, Adams, Poland and *Surensen* lived in Ottawa.

A portion of the notes reads as follows:

4. **Surensen. He works in the Naval Department. He works in Intelligence. Used to give material on the construction of ships. He has left for overseas.**

This is followed by a note which applies to "Surensen" and Poland who is mentioned in the same exhibit:

**Both worked up to April. Did not work for us directly but for Sam's Organization.**

"Sam" is Sam Carr.

The reference is clearly to a person who was in the Navy and in the Intelligence Service. There was no person named Surensen in the Navy. There are two Sorensens, both Lieutenants, in the Navy, but only one in the Intelligence Service. This is a Lieutenant Henning I. Sorensen whose history follows.

Henning Ingemann Sorensen born in Copenhagen, Denmark, came to Canada first on May 5th, 1929. In 1937 he served as a liaison officer in Spain between Dr. Bethune's hospital group and the Spanish Republican Army during the Spanish Civil War. After about a year of this service he returned to Canada in January 1938. In April 1940 he became naturalized. His certificate is dated the 11th of April, 1940. In July, 1940, he left Canada and spent the next two years in South America, returning to Canada on November 6th, 1942.

He applied at once to join the Navy receiving his commission November 23rd, 1942. After a month's course at Halifax he returned to Ottawa and was attached to the Operational Intelligence centre at Naval Headquarters. He is an accomplished linguist speaking Danish, English, French, Spanish and German and having a certain knowledge of the Scandinavian languages other than Danish, and of Portuguese.

The Operational Intelligence Division was mainly concerned with enemy operations, the whereabouts of enemy U-boats and so forth. In the section in which he was working he would acquire information of a highly secret nature, and most of it is still highly secret.

Sorensen served in this Division a little over a year when he requested to be moved to some other branch where his knowledge of languages would be of greater use. At that time a joint-service scheme was being set up to provide Intelligence Officers to serve in prisoners-of-war camps in Canada but it was not ready to function at that time.

He was given a temporary appointment with the Director of Trade Division and was attached to the Convoy Section which handled all convoy movements, orders, special directives from Headquarters concerning routing—routing being the main consideration. He served in this Division for three months until May 1944 when he was lent to the Army and went into the Psychological Warfare Division. He was then sent to England on a short training course in this work and was away approximately 45 days in September and October 1944. On his return he was attached to the Farnham Internment Camp where he has remained. His work at this camp has been concerned mainly with the classifying of German prisoners of war, according to their political leaning, and re-educating the prisoners.

It should be mentioned that his duties would at no time require him to possess or acquire any information about the "construction of ships".

Sorensen, after reading in a newspaper the part of the Exhibit (which was made public in the Third Interim Report of this Commission) referring to "Sorensen", asked to be heard before the Commission. His evidence was taken; he stated that if the Exhibit referred to him he had done none of the things referred to in it, he did not know Sam Carr, and was at a complete loss to understand the entry if it did refer to him.

The documents brought by Gouzenko have been proved to be substantially accurate, allowance being made for clerical errors, and errors in verbal transmission referred to in other cases dealt with elsewhere in this report. The document states that a Naval Officer in the Intelligence Service, and one who at some time left for overseas had been a member of "Sam's

Group", had worked for Sam's Organization, had furnished materials about construction of ships, and had worked up to April of 1943 at least.

The question is whether this applied to Henning I. Sorensen or to some other person?

It has been pointed out that the witness Sorensen was not required to have any knowledge about construction of ships in the course of his work, but other agents were furnishing materials which they were not required to have, and which they should not have had, but which they were in a position to get in one way or another.

We had to ask then what information about the construction of ships would be likely to be wanted by the Russians, where could it be obtained and would Sorensen have access to it? The evidence is that the Navy had developed certain types of war-vessels especially suitable for use in certain waters and climates, and that information about these designs would be of value to the Russians; and this probably was what they wished to know about. It was also shown that information about these designs was readily available to a man in Sorensen's position and that no comment would be made if he sought it out. This evidence was placed before Sorensen and he said:

"Personally I do not know how easy it would have been for me to get access to the files of the Naval Construction Department. In Naval Intelligence we did not have much contact with the other Departments. The only files I have ever drawn affected my own work and I actually don't know how correct the statements of \_\_\_\_\_ are as to the facility with which one could get these documents. I have never been in the Naval Construction Section. I do not know who worked there."

In the Exhibit the name "Sorensen" immediately follows a note on "Polland" identified as F. W. Poland who is the subject of report by this Commission. The names are linked together as already shown. Sorensen met Poland when he entered the Intelligence Branch and their work brought them into contact. We have mentioned that Sorensen came voluntarily before the Commission after he had seen the Exhibit previously referred to in the newspapers. He said:

"I noticed it" (the third Interim Report) "said about Squadron Leader Poland or Polland that he worked in Toronto. Then further down there was a note that Poland worked in Toronto in '42 in April and May. That would indicate, at least, to an outsider, that that was written in '42 in the summer. It was at a time when I was down in South America."

When told that the portion of the exhibit referring to "Surenzen" could not have been written in 1942 he said, "That is too bad". The record continues:

- Q. In fact it is practically impossible it could have been written before August 1943.
- A. I mean I just read the newspaper and I said to myself: "At least in that respect I can prove off the bat that was not me."
- Q. Assuming that this was written in August 1943 can you make any suggestion that would throw any light?
- A. In August 1943; what was I doing in August 1943? I was in Operational Intelligence. I certainly did not have anything to do with the construction of ships or anything of that kind.

Zabotin did not come to Canada until June 1943. It is inconceivable that he should have written these notes before he came. The men from whom he would get his information, Koudriavtzev and Sokolov, were in Canada. The internal evidence shows that the notes were probably compiled at different times and added to as more information was obtained. Some of them would appear to have been copied textually either from written memoranda given to Zabotin by Koudriavtzev or Sokolov or some other person.

This is shown by the references to Poland and Sorensen. The original note or original information relating to Poland must have been recorded by some one in May or June 1942 when Poland was being transferred to Ottawa from Toronto. It could not have been copied or written by Zabotin before June 1943 for reasons already given. The informant records that Poland had given a map of the training schools and that he was not then working.

The note about "Surenzen" also could not have been written by Zabotin before June 1943. The first three sentences could have been written any time between then and September 1944 or later. The last sentence "Left for overseas", could not have been written before September 1944 if it applies to H. I. Sorensen because he did not leave for his special course in England until September 1944.

In our opinion the notes made by Zabotin were made from various earlier notes made by various people at different times, and from verbal information from the same sources, and were added to by himself from time to time. Rogov's system of keeping a separate file on each agent, which he instituted in January 1945, and put into operation over the following months,

would render Zabolin's "bookkeeping" unnecessary, although it was not until August 1945 that he instructed Gouzenko to destroy the sheets.

We now come to the balance of the memorandum, "Did not work for us directly but for Sam's organization". How then did they work? The answer we think appears in the Exhibit. One of the "organization" was Benning, upon whom we are also reporting, who appears in the Exhibit under his cover name *Foster*. Benning contacted with Zheveinov (*Martin*) and is significantly marked by Zabolin as "our", meaning he was one of Zabolin's organization too.

Now Sorensen knew Benning well, as did Poland. He told us that he first met Benning in Montreal after he came back from Spain in connection with the Spanish Committee or the Civil Liberties Union. When Sorensen came to Ottawa it was Benning who got him a room in a house "and the landlady there is a sister of his (Benning's) on Sunnyside."

It is apparent from the desk telephone finder and a notebook, both kept by Benning, that the latter kept in close touch with Sorensen. In the notebook there is the entry "Henning" followed by three telephone numbers, two being struck out, no doubt as there was a change in Sorensen's location, while the telephone finder has the entry "Sorensen" followed by two numbers, one having been struck out.

While the limited facts as to the post in the navy occupied by the "Sorensen" described by Colonel Zabolin, and his departure overseas, do describe facts equally applicable to the witness Sorensen, we do not feel certain that the name "Sorensen" is an actual and not a cover name. It is to be noted that Gouzenko knows nothing about this person beyond what appears in the Embassy document. He testified:

Q. Do you know Sorensen?

A. This is the only time I saw it.

Q. That is the only time you saw that name?

A. Yes, in this exhibit.

Q. You do not know whether it is a real name or a cover or nickname?

A. No.

Accordingly, in discharging the duty laid upon us by the terms of Order in Council P.C. 411 to "inquire into and report upon which public officials and other persons in positions of trust or otherwise have communicated, directly or indirectly, secret and confidential information, the disclosure of which might be inimical to the safety and interests of Canada, to the agents of a Foreign Power and the facts relating to, and the circumstances surrounding such

communication", so far as this witness is concerned we report that we are unable to say he has so communicated.

We have been under the necessity of scrutinizing the facts relating to the witness in discharging our duty under the Order in Council, and the witness' request to be heard and to have his case passed upon by us.

### SECTION IV. 3

## JACK ISADORE GOTTHEIL, Montreal

In the document headed "Task No. 2 of 15.6.45" referred to in Section III. 8 on David Shugar and elsewhere in this Report, which document comes from Sam Carr's dossier in the Embassy and is addressed to *Frank*, one of the cover-names for Carr, there is the following paragraph:—

3. **How does the matter stand with Captain Gotthell (Kingston); where is he at present, and are there possibilities to use him in our work.**

Opposite this there is a note in Rogov's writing, which is evidently Carr's answer to the above query:—

**He was transferred from the college to a training unit in Brit. Columbia for political considerations. He now is in the stage of demobilization.**

Captain Gottheil was born on July 2, 1917 at Lachine, Quebec, of a Polish father and Russian mother. Originally an artillery officer, he transferred to the Canadian Infantry in or about January 1945 and for that purpose took a course at Brockville Training-School where he remained, as he says, until May or June 1945, and then went out to Vernon, B.C. for further training. He was at this latter post for about five weeks, returning to Montreal, where his wife lived. From there he went to Winnipeg. In 1943 had been in Kingston where he took a military intelligence course.

Gottheil said that while he had heard Sam Carr speak he did not think he had met him.

The relevant evidence given by this man is as follows:—

Q. That is what I am trying to get at. You see, there was some reason, quite obviously some reason for considering you as a possibility, no matter how remote. What we want to find out is what that reason was?

A. I cannot—I do not know particularly what I could say—I cannot—I know definitely I have never expressed anything of that sort.

- Q. Let me put it this way: first of all, are your own political ideologies Communist?
- A. I do not know how you would describe them.
- Q. Well, supposing you tell the Commission what your own political ideologies are?
- A. I am interested in what is going on.
- Q. I think we all are.
- A. Yes, I know. I am—you read the various things, liberal journals and so on.
- . . . . .
- Q. Would this be a fair way to put it? Your own leanings are toward, we will start off with, socialism of some kind?
- A. Well, I mean that is a broad definition. Well, shall we say along in certain platforms put forward by—
- Q. If you know what you mean, I do not. Are you sympathetic with the views of the Labour-Progressive Party?
- A. With the left wing, if you want to put it, left-wing liberalism.
- Q. I do not want to put it any way. I am trying to get you to put it. Are you sympathetic with the views of the Labour-Progressive Party?
- A. I do not know whether I would put it sympathetic.
- Q. How would you put it?
- A. I may—I mean—I know that there are certain proposals made, there are certain interests that one does tend to, or rather that one recognizes the C.C.F. and Labour Party in Britain—
- Q. Perhaps we can get it from another point of view. This is all directed to trying to find out why the Russians thought that you, an officer in the Canadian forces, might probably—that is all they put it at—be used by them in their work of getting, improperly and dishonestly, some information that you might have in the course of your duties. The only reason I am asking you about your political ideology is because I want to find out if there was any reason or even a suspicion that you might help them. The primary thing that we want to find out before this Commission is who the person was who was going to come to you some day and say, "Now, Captain Gottheil, we want you to work in this organization and get information to pass on to Russia." My question is directed to this. Have you at any time given expression to political ideas that



would justify anybody in saying, "Now, here is a man we can use in our organization." You see what we are trying to do?

A. I appreciate that, sir. I don't know—I mean in the course of time statements that one makes may be interpreted by some as saying, "There is somebody they want to use to work for them."

Q. And are you about to be demobilized?

A. Within about a month or so, sir, I believe.

Q. Has there been a possibility of your being demobilized before this?

A. No, sir.

Q. You have ever discussed it with anybody?

A. I did. The question of demobilization—I did bring it up last August.

Q. August of 1945?

A. August of 1945. I wanted to get back to school, sir, but they pointed out to me I couldn't and I was held on and frozen.

Q. Whom did you take it up with?

A. My superior officer in Winnipeg, sir.

Q. Who was that?

A. Captain Patrick.

Q. Where is your home?

A. Montreal, sir.

Q. Are you married?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And does your wife live in Montreal?

A. That is right, sir.

Q. And did in 1945?

A. That is right, sir.

Q. Throughout the year?

A. Right, sir.

Q. And she would be familiar in 1945 with your desire to be discharged?

A. That is right, sir.

Q. And you went out to Vernon, you think, towards the end of May, 1945?

A. It was the end of May, sir, the middle of May, the second or third week of May.

Q. And did you have the idea of perhaps obtaining your discharge shortly after V-E Day?

A. That was after V-J Day, sir.

- Q. I asked you if you had that intention shortly after V-E Day?
- A. No, sir, not after V-E Day.
- Q. When would you say you first formed the idea to obtain your discharge if you could?
- A. That was about the second day after a routine order came out saying that personnel who wanted to go back to college, or who could get back to college, could be discharged.
- Q. And that was when?
- A. That was about—I would say the second or third week of August, just prior to the opening of the college term.
- Q. You spoke of having been to Burman's. Have you been there once or more than once?
- A. I have been there about—I would say about two occasions or so.
- Q. Two occasions or so?
- A. About twice, sir, I think.
- Q. It might be more than twice?
- A. It could be, sir.
- Q. And what could it be at the maximum?
- A. I think I have been up there—I would say about on three occasions, and leave it at that.
- Q. And your wife also?
- A. I think she was up with me once. I think we were up one evening.
- Q. And during what period did these visits to Burman's take place?
- A. That would be in the last two or three months.
- Q. That would be all in 1946?
- A. 1946, yes, sir.
- Q. Did you know Burman before that?
- A. I had met him before, sir, as I pointed out, through the Y.
- Q. When did you meet him for the first time?
- A. At the Y, sir—about 1940.
- Q. When you were transferred to Vernon, British Columbia, where were you?
- A. I was at Brockville, sir, was posted at Brockville.
- Q. Brockville was a training establishment?
- A. That is right, sir.

- Q. Well then, it would be right to describe you or refer to you in connection with Kingston if a person had known you when you were at Kingston, would it not?
- A. I am sorry, sir—
- Q. I say it would be not inaccurate to put "Kingston" after your name, in brackets, if a person was making a note on you, if that person had known that at one time you had been stationed at Kingston for some weeks? That would not be inaccurate?
- A. Well, I have been there. I had been stationed at Kingston.
- Q. All right. I say it would not be inaccurate if a person was making a note with regard to Captain Gottheil to put "Kingston" after the name if that person had known that you had been stationed at Kingston? I say that would not be inaccurate, would it?
- A. I imagine not.
- Q. And it would not be inaccurate either to say that you were being transferred to a training detail in British Columbia in May of 1945?
- A. In May, 1945, sir, that I was going out to Vernon—
- Q. That you were being transferred to a training detail in British Columbia; that would not be inaccurate in May of 1945?
- A. In May of 1945, yes, I went out to—
- Q. Will you listen to my question? My question is—and I put it to you for the third time—that it would not be inaccurate to have referred to you as being transferred to a training detail in British Columbia in May, 1945?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You say that would be inaccurate? It would not be inaccurate?
- A. No, I am sorry, sir.
- Q. And in August of 1945 if a person knew that you were desirous of getting your discharge and had taken it up with your superior officer, to say that you were in the process of demobilization, that would not be too inaccurate either?
- A. Actually, sir, I believe I should point out that when he asked me whether I wanted to be demobilized it was a half-hour interview.
- Q. But you had reported to your wife that you had asked for your discharge?
- A. Just to my wife; that is right.
- Q. You had asked your superior officer for your discharge, and you reported that fact to your wife?
- A. That is right, sir.

- Q. Then I say, would it be inaccurate for a person, knowing these facts, to say of you that you were in process of demobilization?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. Then, would you explain to us how the information that I have called to your attention, which you say would not be inaccurate, could get on the books of the Russian Embassy?
- A. I don't know, sir.
- Q. You don't know that, but nobody but you, your superior officer and your wife knew that you had applied for a discharge?
- A. No, sir; I never mentioned it to anyone. It was a thought that came up when the routine order came out affecting demobilization. It was merely a talk for a few moments, and I was told I would be frozen and let it go at that.
- Q. All I asked you is if anybody else knew?
- A. No, sir; I am sorry, sir.
- Q. Then the Russians had pretty good information? It was not very widespread if they knew that fact, was it?
- A. I don't know. I mean if they have got that I don't know how they—
- Q. If that information was limited to such a narrow circle as you say it was, somebody in that circle was communicating with somebody who was passing that on to the Russian Embassy? Doesn't that follow?
- A. I don't know. All I know is it was merely a thought in my mind, as I say.
- Q. You do not like to answer the question as put to you, do you?
- A. I am sorry, sir. I don't know how it got there if it got there.
- Q. Would you read the question.
- Q. If that information was limited to such a narrow circle as you say it was, somebody in that circle was communicating with somebody who was passing that on to the Russian Embassy? Doesn't that follow?
- Q. What do you say?
- A. Well, in speaking—I don't think so, sir. I mean I am trying to think now of that particular point. I don't know. I know we were all talking of demobilization then.
- Q. Captain Gottheil, is your wife a member of the Labour-Progressive Party?
- A. No, sir; I don't think so.
- Q. Is she sympathetic?
- A. I think—I would say I would have sort of expressed her views before?

- Q. Her views are much the same as yours?  
A. I would think by and large.  
Q. So she might have reported to the Burmans your intention to be discharged? Would that be so?  
A. I don't know, sir.  
Q. Could that have been so?  
A. Well, as I remember I think I just wrote her and said there was a routine order out and I would like to get discharged. Whether she sent it on or not I don't know.  
Q. Could it be so that she might have mentioned that fact to the Burmans?  
A. It might be.  
Q. It might have been. She knew Burmans in the summer of 1945, did she?  
A. She knew Burman's wife. They worked in the same place.  
Q. How long have they worked in the same place?  
A. I would say about two years or so.

"The Burmans" are Samuel Sol Burman, reported on in Section III. 10 of this Report, and his wife Elsa Burman.

The channel by which the information endorsed on the document "*Task No. 2 of 15.6.45*" reached the Embassy seems obvious.

Being required by the terms of Order in Council P.C. 411 to "inquire into and report upon which public officials and other persons in positions of trust or otherwise have communicated directly or indirectly secret and confidential information, the disclosure of which might be inimical to the safety and interests of Canada, to the agents of a foreign power" we think that Gottheil is not one of those who furnished information to the Russians. He was being cultivated for that purpose but there is no evidence that he did so.

## SECTION V

### THE FALSE PASSPORT

On the 29th of August, 1945, in a telegram from Colonel Zabolin to "The Chief of the Main Administration", identified by Gouzenko as Colonel-General Kouznetsov, Chief of the General Intelligence Headquarters at Moscow of the Red Army, Zabolin suggests that he be allowed to go to Moscow for a period of from two to three weeks. In the course of the telegram the following occurs:—

I would like to ~~finish~~ complete the fairly complicated task of obtaining ~~the~~ a passport for our man in America (the Director knows about ~~the~~ it) and after this to leave for the Centre. The receipt of the passport is expected in the next few days. I will ~~advise~~ report the receipt of the latter immediately. \*  
\*  
\*  
\*

The "Centre" referred to is Military Intelligence Headquarters, Moscow.

In his evidence with regard to this matter, Gouzenko said that the passport referred to was a passport for a Russian undercover agent then living in Los Angeles who went under the name of Witczak, (pronounced Vitczak), and that the efforts to obtain a Canadian passport for this man had been in progress for approximately half a year at the date of Colonel Zabolin's telegram. To obtain this passport Zabolin worked through Sam Carr. The full story with regard to this matter is as follows:

The real Witczak, whose full name is Ignacy Witczak, came from Poland and landed in Halifax from the S.S. *Frederick VIII* in April, 1930. He had been born in the village of Kurowo, Poland, on the 14th of October, 1906. From Halifax he proceeded to Toronto and after a short stay there went to the Leamington district of Ontario where he became a farm labourer.

In May of 1935 he applied for naturalization, and a certificate of naturalization was granted to him on the 3rd of March, 1936.

In February, 1937, Witczak desired to participate in the Spanish Civil War on the side of the Republican Government, and he applied for a Canadian passport on the 1st of March, 1937, his statutory declaration in connection therewith having been made previously on the 25th of February. The application was taken by a local steamship agent at Windsor. He, in turn, forwarded the documents to the French Line at Toronto, which forwarded them to the Passport Office at Ottawa. At that time of the year, when there was no work on the farm, Witczak was working in a shoe repair

\* Faint type indicates words crossed out in original documents.

shop in Windsor. The passport was in due course issued, after some correspondence between the Passport Office and the local manager of the Canadian Bank of Commerce at Windsor, who had vouched for Witczak. It was dated the 12th of March, 1937, and was forwarded to the French Line at Toronto by letter dated the 13th of March, 1937.

Witczak himself, the bank manager, the steamship agent and the notary public before whom Witczak made his statutory declaration, all appeared and testified before us.

In due course Witczak, who was then and still is an unmarried man, proceeded to Spain as a member of the MacKenzie-Papineau Battalion of the International Brigade. At the military base of Albacete he and some others were relieved of their passports by an officer who stated that such documents should not be taken into the front line as they might be destroyed. When his term of service was through, Witczak applied for his passport but was told at Brigade headquarters that the trucks which had carried the passports had been bombed and that "probably" they had been destroyed. The same reason was given to a number of others for the non-return of their passports.

Witczak returned to Canada on the *Duchess of Richmond*, without his passport, arriving at Halifax on the 3rd of February, 1939. He did not at any time apply for a new passport. He did, however, apply for and receive a new naturalization certificate, which was issued on the 4th of March, 1941. His original certificate, he said, had been lost at Helicoursi, Spain, in 1938 while he was engaged in swimming a river.

The known facts as to "*our man in America*" to use the language of Col. Zabolin in his telegram of August 29th, 1945, may be sufficiently stated as follows:

The records of the United States immigration authorities show that on September 13, 1938, a man and a woman using the names "Ignacy Witczak" and "Bunia Witczak", giving their nationality as Canadian, landed in New York from the S.S. *Veendam* having sailed from Boulogne on September 3rd. On September 19, 1940, one Ignacy Samuel Witczak registered in Los Angeles, California, as an alien in the United States and in this declaration he described himself as "merchant" and stated he had "last arrived in the United States at Detroit, Michigan on September 25, 1938. I came in by railroad unknown". He also stated he had no relatives in the United States.

On the same date, September 19, 1940, Bunia Witczak made a similar declaration, but stated she had a husband living in the United States. Both

declarations showed both persons to be living at the same address in Los Angeles. The man's declaration also states that he was born at Kurowa on October 13, 1910, while the woman's states that she was born at Vilno, Poland on March 29, 1914. A search of the immigration records at Detroit for the relevant time shows no entry of these persons. This was to be expected.

The story now shifts to the files produced by Gouzenko from the Soviet Embassy at Ottawa. Among these files there is a "dossier" on Sam Carr. The first document in the dossier is a form of registration card, upon which is pasted Carr's photograph. The card reads as follows:—

REGISTRATION CARD

No. \_\_\_\_\_

(Photo)

1. SURNAME, NAME, PATRONYM SAM CARR

---

2. PSEUDONYM "FRANK"
3. SINCE WHEN IN THE NET \_\_\_\_\_
4. ADDRESS:
  - a) OFFICE \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) HOME 14 Moutrose, TORONTO. Tel. Ll-7847 (brook).
5. PLACE OF WORK AND POSITION "LABOUR PROGR. PARTY" - polit. worker.
6. FINANCIAL CONDITIONS Financially secure, but takes money. It is necessary occasionally to help.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA:

Detailed material on his biography is available in the CENTRE in the COMINTERN. Has an excellent knowledge of the Russian language, he graduated from the LENIN school in Moscow.

The file also contains a record of meetings and dates for meetings between Carr and other persons. In these notes Carr is referred to as "Sam" and also by the cover name of *Frank*. The narrative of events is best disclosed by a reference to these notes.



The first page of the notes made by Lt. Col. Motinov is headed "Miscellaneous" with the sub-heading "Sam, 14 Montrose, Lloydbrook, 7847". It then proceeds:—

14.6.44 The Commandor met Sam and agreed on meetings between him and Leon once in 3 months. The regular meeting was fixed for 15.9.44 at 21.00, Dominion Boulevard (opposite Windsor Hotel) in Montreal. On 15.9.44 to discuss:

1. Who prepares passports, i.e. what kind of people are they. Are they not the old shoemakers who a few years ago fell through.
2. To take money to the meeting.

In the future the meetings and extra calls are to take place in Toronto at 21.00 in the apartment.

Password—Leon to ring on the telephone Midway 9553 of doctor Harris, 279 College St., Toronto. "I want to say Hollow to Frank". Following this Leon goes out for the meeting at Eaton's Store (Corner College and Young).

Eric calls through Skelton.

13.9.44 to Leon 350 dollars for Sam. A receipt for 200 dollars received, 150 dollars in cash with Leon.

4.10.44 Sam informed that he has handed over the material to Ernst, that he will not be obtaining, he asked to communicate.

5.12.44 asked for a meeting through Foster.

8.12.44 he left— Met 11.12.44. Fixed for 16.12 in my city at 21.00 Somm. Bay.

Handed over 200 dollars. The passport has been detained. The forms were badly filled in. On the 16.12 he will give new ones. 16.12 at 21.00 I met (him) normally. He gave the new forms. We agreed on the transfer of Ernst. I gave the contact with MAT NANTINGALE. I made (him?) acquainted with doctor HARRIS HENRY. I set the next meeting for 20.1.45 at 21.00 at the old place near the hospital if doctor HARRIS does not change it.

*(Sketch in original)*

To assign the question of obtaining a certificate of naturalization and marriage.

20.1.45 meeting was missed, fixed for 7.3.45.

The regular meeting on 15.6.45 at 21.30 on Somerset at the corner of the park. The emergency on 21.6.45. A call by telephone—by the hospital.

3.7.45—Meeting has taken place out of the ordinary schedule with respect to the passport. Everything was normal. The place—at the doctor's. Account of it see in telegram 5.7.45. Handed out 200 dollars.

17.7.45—Regular meeting in the apartment of the doctor. Time 21.00.

The meeting of 17.7.45 took place normally.

The regular meeting on 1.8.45 in Montreal at corner Sherbrooke and Guy near Medical Art. Bldg. Time 21.30.

Emergency meeting on 2.8.45 at the same place and at the same time.

Prior to the Toronto Telephone Directory issued in July, 1945, Sam Carr had resided at 14 Montrose Avenue, Toronto, his telephone number being Lloydbrook 7847. As shown by that directory, he was then living at 74 Rusholme Road, his telephone being the same number however.

The above notes are in the handwriting of Lieutenant-Colonel Motinov down to and including the words and figures "20.1.45 meeting was missed, fixed for 7.3.45", and the balance is in that of Lieutenant-Colonel Rogov. "Commander" is the cover name for the Assistant Chief of the First Intelligence at Moscow whose name is Milstein, while *Leon* is the cover-name for the First Secretary of the Embassy at Ottawa, Koudriavtsev. Milstein arrived in Canada under the cover-name of Milsky in the guise of a diplomatic courier. His purpose was to check up on the whole military spy system on the American continent. He came in company with another alleged courier who, Gouzenko says, was checking up on the parallel spy system operated by the N.K.V.D. on the American continent. Gouzenko did not know the name of this man. Milstein was in Ottawa for a period of about fifteen days.

As the above notes show, Milstein met Carr on the 14th of June, 1944, and arranged for future meetings between Koudriavtsev and Carr every three months, the next meeting being set for the 15th of September, 1944, in Montreal at the time and place indicated. The question of the issue of Canadian passports was to the fore as the object of these meetings.

The reference to "*old shoemakers*" is the expression used by Milstein, who reported his meeting with Carr directly to Moscow through Gouzenko. Gouzenko said in evidence:—

Q. Will you look at this in Exhibit 19-F:—

1. **Who prepares passports, i.e. what kind of people are they. Are they not the old shoemakers who a few years ago fell through.**

I understand that that is a literally correct translation, that the words '*old shoemakers*' are used?

A. That is right.

Q. Has it any other meaning in Russian?

A. It is the cover name for sabot or shoe, the cover name for passport. Shoemakers is the cover name for the man who can arrange to make these passports. In this case it is Sam Carr or somebody else who makes the passport, or it is the civil servant, the man who makes the passport, who is the shoemaker. That is a cover name.

Q. It says, 'Who prepared the passports.' Does that refer to the people who are working in the Passport Office. Check that over carefully?

A. I know what is here. This is by the Assistant Chief of the Intelligence Headquarters who arrived in Canada under cover as a diplomatic courier.

Q. Is that Milstein that you are referring to?

A. Milstein. He checked the whole intelligence system of Colonel Zabotin and he took very strong precautions. There was only one meeting with Sam Carr. He sent the details of that meeting to Moscow without the knowledge of Colonel Zabotin, he sent it through me. In that telegram he said that he talked about the trouble of getting a passport from here for a man who would be sent to Canada and to the United States. I remember the exact words in the telegram; he said that there were great possibilities of establishing this production of passports.

That telegram was sent under the name of the Chief of Intelligence in Moscow and he referred in general terms to the production of passports. When Milstein met him they had a conversation for not more than half an hour and he gave him the details about this production of passports. Then Lieutenant-Colonel Motinov mentioned this task which he must put to Sam Carr, to have passports prepared. The people who do that are really passport makers or "shoemakers"; and the old ones had failed.

Q. In other words, is this the sense of your answer, that that is directed to the type of clerk employed in the Passport Office, whether they were efficient or whether they were just people who had failed in other businesses or other walks of life?

A. Yes, it is like this: if these people who make up the passports for Sam Carr or for somebody else or for Moscow—it is obvious there were people in Canada or in this Passport Office who made up these passports before this time, but that was several years ago, and they had failed.

Q. They were no good?

A. They were discovered or the passports were discovered or something. They failed, so Moscow asked Motinov to be careful, to look up these new people.

Q. Do you mean that sometime before 1944 the Soviet Government had been getting false passports out of the Canadian Passport Office?

A. It is obvious.

Q. That is the meaning you take from that?

A. That is what I understand.

Q. Now in 1944 they wanted to know if the same people were still there?

A. That is right.

Q. Apparently the people with whom they had had dealings prior to 1944 were not satisfactory?

A. That is right.

Q. Or they had been discovered?

A. Yes, or the passport was discovered or the people were discovered. They had failed, the passports they made were not so good and they were discovered.

The "Doctor Harris" referred to is Henry Harris, an optometrist whose business address is 279 College St., Toronto, telephone Midway 9553. He resides in an apartment at 215 College St., Midway 6974, and he had occupied both the above premises for some years. Harris came to Canada about twenty-five years ago, having been born in New York of Russian parentage, and was naturalized in Canada about five years later. Harris says he has known Carr for about ten years and they are on very friendly, if not intimate, terms. Harris claims he first knew Carr as a salesman of advertising in Communist newspapers. Later Carr became a patient of Harris and ultimately contracted the habit of visiting Harris' office, as the latter put it,

"possibly every day for the last five or six years, anyway". Carr is the National Organizer of the Labour-Progressive Party. We have no difficulty on the evidence in concluding that Harris is either a member of or an active sympathizer with that Party. He displayed the same furtiveness and lack of frankness on this subject as was displayed by a number of other witnesses with regard to this same matter.

It is apparent also from the passage in the above notes "*Eric calls through Skelton*" that Eric Adams (whose cover name was *Ernst* by which he is referred to later on in the document) was using his position on the staff of the Bank of Canada to place calls to Toronto over the private line of the bank for the purposes of the espionage organization. "*Through Skelton*" became clear to us through the evidence of Mr. D. A. Skelton, Research Adviser to the Bank of Canada, who stated that the Bank of Canada has direct line communication between Ottawa and Toronto, by which certain employees of the Bank are able to place direct calls to Toronto through the agency of the switchboard of the Bank in Toronto, which in turn connects the caller with local telephone numbers at that point. Adams was thus able to communicate with Harris and by using Mr. Skelton's name, he could cover up the fact that he was connected with these calls.

It is also apparent that *Foster* (J. S. Benning) was also being used in connection with these meetings.

The entry opposite 8.12.44 records a meeting with Sam Carr on the 11th of December, 1944, apparently in Toronto, at which Carr produced some passport forms which were "*badly filled in*", and as a result a new meeting was set for the 16th of the same month when new forms were to be produced. Arrangements were also made for a further meeting to be held on the 20th of January, 1945, "*at the old place near the hospital*", at which, if Carr himself did not attend, Harris would substitute for him and the subject to be discussed was "*the question of receiving the evidence of naturalization and marriage*". This reference is very significant, in that the real Witczak was an unmarried man who had been naturalized in Canada, while the spurious Witczak was married and had not been naturalized. The plotting, as will appear, was as to the best means by which the spurious Witczak could continue to impersonate the real, so as to obtain the benefit of the fact that a Canadian passport had been issued to the real Witczak, which passport, although it had expired in 1942, could be renewed at any time prior to March, 1947.

The notes indicate that the projected meeting in January, 1945, did not take place, but a new meeting was set for the 7th of March following, and a further meeting for the 15th of June in Ottawa on Somerset St. at the park. If for any reason the last mentioned meeting did not take place, there was in reserve an "emergency" meeting set for the 21st of June "by the hospital" which would be in Toronto.

Koudriavtsev left for London in the spring of 1945, at which time his place was taken by *Lamont*, the cover-name for Motinov. This change is indicated on a slip pasted on top of one of the pages of these notes which is in Motinov's writing and reads as follows:—

**Urgent call for Sam. Is accomplished through the optical doctor Harris Henry, residing at 279 College St., Toronto. Lamont calls the doctor by teleph—Midway 95-53. Password—"I want to say Hollow to Frank". This is to mean that the meeting will take place in the hospital area, behind the Eaton Store on the corner of Yonge-College St. at 21.30.**

*(Sketch on original)*

The meeting place in the vicinity of the hospital behind Eaton's College St. store is indicated in the notes by two sketches, one sketch on the slip and the other on the page proper, showing Yonge St. between King and College Streets and Eaton's store. The particular hospital referred to was evidently well known to those concerned, as it is not specifically indicated on these sketches. Both the Sick Children's Hospital and the Toronto General Hospital are in the vicinity.

The dossier also contains the following pages in Rogov's handwriting, and these notes indicate that *Brent*, that is Rogov, had taken over from Motinov on the 7th of May, 1945:—

## COURSE OF MEETINGS

No. P.	No. P.	Substance of the meetings	Remarks
1.		<p><b>Urgent call for Frank (through the doctor):</b></p> <p>(a) Ring on the telephone Midway-9553.</p> <p>(b) <u>Brent</u> says: "Hallo Dr. Henry. How are you? How is your wife?"</p> <p>(c) <u>The Doctor</u> answers: "Very well, I shall see you later." This means that the meeting shall take place at the corner of <u>Lowther and Admiral Rd at 21.00.</u></p> <p>Should, however, the doctor answer: "I am glad to see you again"—it means, that the meeting shall take place at the above mentioned place and at the same time, <u>but on the next day.</u></p>	
2.		<u>7.5.45</u> —The handing over took place of the Doctor from Lamont to Brent. The meeting took place near the hospital, everything was normal.	
3.		<u>15.6.45</u> —The regular meeting took place at the corner of Somerset and the square (Park). Everything was normal. The doctor reported that no progress was made with the passport because of lack of authentic data (see telegram of 16.6.45).	<p><u>Handed out:</u> To Frank— 200 dol. To the Doctor— 100 dol. The meeting took place through the doctor.</p>
4.		<p>Regular meeting—17.7.45 } T=21.30 Emergency meeting—24.7.45 } The place—by the hospital</p>	
5.		<p><u>3.7.45</u>—An urgent meeting took place with regard to the passport. Also here, in the apartment of the doctor, got acquainted with Frank. Everything was normal (see telegram of 5.7.45).</p> <p>Regular meeting—17.7.45 } T=21.30 Emergency meeting—24.7.45 } The place—in the apartment of the doctor.</p>	

## COURSE OF MEETINGS

No. P.	No. P.	Substance of the meetings	Remarks
5.	<u>17.7.45</u>	<p>The usual meeting took place. Everything was normal (see telegram of 18.7.45).            Regular meeting—1.8.45 }            Emergency meeting—2.8.45 } T=21.30</p> <p>The place—Montreal at the corner of Sherbrooke and Guy, near the Medical Art Bldg.</p>	<p>Handed out to Frank 200 dol.</p>
6.	1.8.45	<p>The regular meeting took place. Everything was normal. The doctor was at the meeting. All the business was transacted in the automobile.</p> <p>Handed over V . . . 's passport and four snapshots with his wife. Putting it completely into shape may be accomplished in the first half of September.</p> <p><u>The idea of the substitution:</u> The former photo of V. (not our man) is removed, in its place is put a photograph of our man with wife, but everything is dated from 1937. This is necessary in order to be watertight. After this the exchange is made for a new passport, for this it is necessary to fill out two questionnaires, which afterwards will be attached to the old one.</p> <p>Consequently it is necessary for V, to have signatures on four questionnaires, two of which are for the 1937 form and two for the exchange of 1945.</p> <p>In the case of an exchange it is necessary to find a reason for it. He (Frank) proposes to burn half of the passport, and to leave only the number, but this has not yet been decided; it is possible that it will not be necessary to do this, as the man who is doing the job will do everything himself and not depend on others.</p> <p>The executor has agreed to everything and is ready for the work.</p> <p>As to the costs, Frank confirmed once more that it will not be below three.</p>	<p>Gave a bottle of whisky.</p>



## COURSE OF MEETINGS

No. P.	No. P.	Substance of the meetings	Remarks
		<p>Detailed material concerning the meeting, see telegram of 2.8.45.</p> <p>The regular meeting will take place through the doctor in our city. Regular meeting—8.8.45</p> <p>Place—Corner of Somerset and Metcalf (Ottawa)</p> <p>Time—21.30</p>	<p>The meeting proceeded normally. See the file of "the doctor."</p>

In the notes in the handwriting of Lt.-Col. Motinov already reviewed, a meeting was set for the 15th of June, 1945, in Ottawa. This meeting was kept apparently by Rogov, as his substitution for Motinov, as already mentioned, had taken place on the 7th of May. According to Rogov's notes the meeting on the 15th of June, 1945, was kept at the rendezvous in Ottawa which had been fixed as early as the 20th of January, 1945, and Harris attended with him in the place of Carr. The marginal note confirms that this meeting took place "*through Harris*" and it records that Rogov paid out \$300, of which \$200 was for Carr and \$100 was for Harris. At that meeting a new date was set for a meeting on the 17th of July in Toronto, which Rogov records as having taken place. Before the 17th of July, however, a special meeting appears to have taken place on the 31st day of July, recorded as number "4" of the above and also under date of 3.7.45 in the previous notes, at which meeting Rogov made the acquaintance of Carr.

At the meeting of the 17th of July, Rogov gave Carr another \$200 and a new date was set for the 1st of August, 1945, in Montreal with the 2nd of August "*in reserve*". The notes indicate that this meeting took place and that Harris was in Montreal for the occasion. At this meeting "*Task No. 3*" for Carr was evidently delivered. This document is in Colonel Zabotin's handwriting and reads as follows:—

**TASK NO. 3 of "1.8.45"**

1. **Requirements which a person living as an "illegal" must meet (nationality, citizenship, occupation, education, knowledge of languages, family and financial conditions etc.)**
2. **Ways of legalisation (organization of a commercial undertaking, joining a business firm as a partner, what kind of firm, joining as a member any office, joining the army as a volunteer, accepting employment.)**
3. **Documents which an "illegal" must possess (passport, different kinds of certificates, references, recommendation letters, etc.)**
4. **More expedient methods to slip into the country.**
5. **To provide for secure living quarters and financial means during the period when the "illegal" gets acquainted with the local set-up and conditions.**  
\* **The possibilities of attracting.**
6. **To reveal the channels of influence of the English government on the foreign policy of Canada.**

\* Faint type indicates words crossed out in original documents.

7. Conditions of entry into the country and of moving about in the country.
8. Conditions of adaptation and living in the country.
9. Methods of work of the counter-espionage. The organization of the Federal and provincial counter-espionage services.

The intent of this document is manifest without comment.

On August 16, 1945, a further task was ready for Carr, along the same lines as Task No. 3. It reads:—

Assigned personally 16.8.45

The Task

1. To write a report on the technique of making up passports and other documents, indicating precisely who on your side (Frank's) is engaged in this activity.
2. What documents can be made and can be received through you.
3. To give a complete character outline of Prometheus, indicating his position, the department in which he works in the navy and also to write down his basic biographical facts, his home and office addresses and telephones.
4. The proposed place of work of Prometheus in the event of his demobilization.
5. Your possibilities regarding the selection of people in the General Staffs of the armed forces.

This was prepared for Carr in accordance with instructions to Zabotin in a cable from *The Director*, dated August 14, 1945, as follows:—

Supplement to No. 11438

11436

14.8.45

To Grant.

Reference No. 227.

1. There can be no further delay in obtaining the passport. Therefore the signature on the new application form should be made by Frank's man himself.

2. Prepare for the next regular mail a short report on the procedure of obtaining and putting into shape of passports and of the other documentation for our objectives, indicating exactly who on Frank's side will be engaging in this work.

10.8.45. Director.

Supplement: The pseudonym "Sam" has long ago been changed to "Frank". In the future use the latter.

10.8 Director

Grant

14.8.45

By the time the meeting of the 1st of August took place, plans for the issue of the fictitious passport to the spurious Witzzak had become pretty definite. The sentence "I handed over V . . . 's passport" indicates clearly, we think, that Rogov handed over to Harris for delivery to Carr the original Canadian passport for the real Witzzak, which had escaped the fate which the officer of the International Brigade in Spain had indicated to the real Witzzak that it had suffered. There is no "W" in the Russian alphabet.

The plan as unfolded by the notes is that the picture of the real Witzzak ("*not our man*") on the files of the Passport Office, would be taken from those files and in its place would be substituted photographs of the spurious Witzzak and his wife, but "*everything is dated from 1937*". After this had been done a new 1945 passport would be issued for the spurious Witzzak on the basis that he was the holder of the earlier passport of 1937. To effect this it was necessary to have two 1937 forms and two 1945. One in each case would find its way to the Passport Office, and the other two would be kept. The manufactured 1937 form would be substituted for the original 1937 form on the file, and would be used as the basis for the issue of the new passport.

In anticipation that it might be necessary to surrender the old passport or to produce it for inspection at the Passport Office, Carr made the suggestion that it should be burned leaving nothing but the number and therefore nothing by which a comparison with the 1937 application, which would then be on file, would show to be wrong. The notes suggest that this might not be necessary as the person "*who is doing the job*" was going to see to everything, as events show he did. The price demanded for bringing about the issue of the forged passport which was "*not to be less than three*" was cleared up by Gouzenko as \$3,000.00. Sam Carr had originally demanded \$5,000.00, but Moscow, in a cable, said this sum was "*fantastic*" and Carr agreed to bring it about for "*not less than three*" thousand.

*'The detailed material concerning the meeting'* were apparently reported in a telegram to Moscow of the 2nd of August, 1945, which we do not have. The last recorded meeting was on the 8th of August in Ottawa and the marginal note indicates that it went off *"normally"*.

In a telegram of the 14th of August, 1945, to Zabotin *the Director* instructed him that *"there can be no further delay in obtaining the passport. Therefore the signature on the new application form should be made by Frank's man himself"*. Colonel Zabotin's telegram of the 29th of August, 1945, to Kouznetzev, to which we have already referred, indicated that Zabotin expected to receive the forged passport in a few days.

Gouzenko says that when this passport job was first presented to Carr, the latter demurred on the ground that the actual Witczak might be alive, and that this might prove embarrassing later on. This produced a cable from Moscow stating that the real Witczak had died in 1937 in the Spanish War and that Carr need not be afraid. The fictitious Witczak was at this time in attendance at a university in Los Angeles. From a further exchange of cables, Gouzenko learned that the signature of the fictitious Witczak differed from that on the 1937 application of the real Witczak in the files of the Passport Office. In view of this, Moscow directed that the signature on the new application must be forged by Sam Carr's man himself. At this time, Gouzenko said, the 1937 application had been abstracted from the files and was in Carr's possession. It was at this time evidently intended to have the fictitious Witczak apply for a renewal of passport and to replace the 1937 application, with the addition of the wife of the fictitious Witczak, on its file, in the meantime having substituted the pictures of the fictitious Witczaks for that of the real Witczak. This proved unsatisfactory as the photographs to be substituted were new and the paper of the 1937 application was old, and the contrast would arouse suspicion as the documents were being examined in the course of the passage of the renewal application through the Passport Office. Moscow, therefore, suggested the substitution of an entirely new application in place of the one on the files. This would require that it should be dated back. As will be seen this course was followed.

Gouzenko says that the false Witczak was regarded by Moscow as a very important agent whose continued presence in America was highly desirable, and that Colonel Zabotin had said that a payment of \$5,000.00 was a mere nothing in such circumstances.

Coming now to the Passport Office itself, investigation shows that the 1937 application of the real Witczak is missing from its file. In its place is

a document purporting to be that application. This document is dated the 1st of March, 1937, but a cursory examination reveals its spuriousness. The address of the applicant is given as Stop 31, West Hill, Ontario, the date of birth as the 13th October, 1910, his height 5'8", and occupation merchant. The copy of the passport actually issued in 1937, which was left in the file, shows that the real Witczak was born on the 13th October, 1906, that his occupation was a farmer, and his height 5'9". This file copy of passport in its turn was interfered with by adding (but by the use of a different typewriter from that used when the document was made out in 1937) the name of Bunia Witczak as wife of the applicant with the following description: "profession, housewife; place and date of birth, Kurowo, Poland, March 29, 1914; domicile, Canada; height, 5'2"; colour of eyes, gray; colour of hair, brown".

Returning to the spurious application for passport, the same information with regard to the wife is found on it. As already mentioned, the real Witczak has been at all times an unmarried man. The voucher on the spurious application for passport is signed by John Soboloff, M.D., Toronto, Ontario, who therein declares that he has been acquainted with Ignacy Witczak for three years and believes that the statements made in the declaration are true and that he can from his personal knowledge of the applicant vouch him as a satisfactory and proper person to receive a passport.

Soboloff, who is a medical practitioner carrying on his profession at 583 Bathurst Street, Toronto, was called before us on the 5th of April, the same day on which Witczak gave his evidence. Soboloff admitted that he had not known Witczak nor the applicant for passport at any time and that he had signed the application in April or May of 1945 on the personal request of Sam Carr, who was a friend and patient of his and asked him to do so as a "favour". As he explained it, "he (Carr) was a patient of mine and a public figure and when he asked me to do it, without questioning it at all and without giving it any thought, I did so". He said Carr gave him to understand that it was a question of helping someone to leave the country or to get into the country, he was not sure which.

It is the practice in connection with applications for passports that two photographs of the applicant and two of the wife, if there is a wife to be included in the passport, should accompany the application, one photograph of each being certified by the voucher. The certified photographs remain with the application on file in the Passport Office while the uncertified photographs are attached to the issued passport. In the file in the Passport Office there is no photograph of the real Witczak, but there are photographs

of a man and a woman but neither is certified. The photograph of the man is not that of the real Witczak. Soboloff deposed that no photographs were shown to him when he signed at Carr's request. He also said that he observed when he signed the voucher on the application that the document was dated March 1937.

Under the system in force in the Passport Office for some years, an application for passport passes through a number of divisions and in its course the application is initialed by various employees. There are no initials at all on the application now produced from the Witczak file. Early in its progress through the Office an application receives a file number, and when the passport is issued the number of the passport as well as the file number are placed on a record opposite the name of the person to whom the passport is issued; and an index card is also kept under that name with file number. However, the index card for Witczak is missing, although the file as now produced is duly numbered 3699 of the year 1937; and the index for that year, which according to the usual practice was photographed at the end of that year, shows that originally there was an index card.

The records of the Passport Office also show that on the 30th August, 1945, a passport was issued to the spurious Ignacy Witczak, but although the file number is shown in the records as 2979-45, when that file is produced it is for another person altogether whose passport was regularly issued on the basis of documents duly entered in file numbered 2979-45. It is apparent that when this Witczak passport was issued it was done by some person in the Passport Office who attached the application to the other file and used it to pass the spurious document through the office.

The Passport Office is located at 38 Bank Street, Ottawa, but files more than three years old are kept in the basement of a church located some distance away, and a clerk in the Passport Office is charged with the duty of procuring files from storage from time to time as they may be required and of returning them. For this purpose she has a key of these other premises. This clerk, Mrs. Adrienne Souliere, entered upon her duties in or about the month of October, 1942, and on her own initiative began the keeping of a record of files taken out of and returned to the church. In this record she entered the file number and the name of the person requisitioning it, with the exception of those files requisitioned by a particular clerk in the Filing Section of the Passport Office who, because of her functions in dealing with correspondence, required files practically every day. While her name was not entered, the absence of any name indicated that such files had been given to this clerk.

This record was produced before us and shows that on the 14th of May, 1945, the Witczak file of 1937 numbered 3699-37 and another file in the name of three people by the name of Shepherd, No. 4019-37, were drawn by W. M. Pappin, a clerk in the Passport Office. The function of the section which he heads is, upon the receipt of applications for passports, to enter upon the back of the application the amount of the fee together with the medium in which payment is made. These payments and the names of the applicants are then entered upon cash sheets. It is Pappin's duty each day to sign these sheets. He does not do all this work personally and would not have personal knowledge of all the entries on the sheets he signs.

Investigation shows that so far as the real Witczak and the Shepherds are concerned, no reason had existed for reference to their file at any time since the date of the issue of their respective passports in 1937, except in the case of Mrs. Shepherd who in 1944 applied for a renewal of her passport.

The record kept by Mrs. Souliere shows further that on the 27th August, 1945, these two files, namely, 3699-37—Witczak and 4019-37—Shepherd, were again drawn from their place in the church, this time by the clerk in the Filing Section to whom we have already referred, who almost daily required a considerable number of files. It was on the 30th of August following that the passport to the spurious Witczak was issued. The fee for the issue of the passport was duly entered on the cash sheet for the 31st August and the sheet was signed by Pappin. The clerk referred to gave evidence before us, but has no recollection whatever of having asked for either of the above files although she must have done so. She says there is no reason she can think of why they would be required by her. The inference is that someone in the office used her to obtain the files for him.

Pappin gave evidence before us. He denied receiving either file on either the 14th of May or the 27th of August. He did not know there was any such record as that kept by Mrs. Souliere. On being shown it he nevertheless repeated his denial. Mrs. Souliere stated in evidence that she remembered handing both the files on May 14th, 1945, to Pappin. It is necessary for us to choose between the evidence of these two witnesses. We prefer the evidence of Mrs. Souliere supported as it is by the written record. When advised of Mrs. Souliere's testimony, Pappin did say that he had no reason to doubt her word, but he persisted in his denials.

On the 4th of April, 1946, a subpoena requiring Carr's attendance as a witness before us was served upon his wife, Julia Carr, as it was not possible to serve Carr personally. Subsequently, a further subpoena was served upon Carr by serving his wife, requiring his attendance before us on



April 15th, 1946, and a letter was written to Carr by the Secretary of the Commission advising him that his name appeared in records produced before us from the Russian Embassy and that it was desired to have his attendance so that he could be examined with regard to his activities and to make any explanation in person, or by counsel, that he desired. Carr did not appear and we have received no response to the above letter. According to Harris, Carr left for Cuba in January of 1946 and neither his wife, nor Harris, knows his address or when he is expected back. We have no difficulty in concluding on the evidence with regard to Carr's absence, that he has chosen to absent himself deliberately. With regard to this Harris testified:—

Q. And your conclusion from all that you have seen and read, and your talks with Mrs. Carr is that her husband is hiding some place and even she does not know where he is?

A. That is a question I would not ask her.

Q. But that is your conclusion?

A. Yes.

Carr himself applied for naturalization in Canada before 1937, and in March, 1945, and a certificate of naturalization was issued to him dated the 2nd of that month. He immediately applied for a Canadian passport and the records of the Passport Office contain a receipt signed by him for a passport issued to him over the counter of the Office on the 3rd day of March, 1945. According to the application for this passport, Carr's name at birth was Samuel Kogan, and it states that he was born in Kharkov, Russia, on the 7th of July, 1906.

That the Embassy records produced by Gouzenko deal with actual events has, as we have from time to time pointed out, been substantiated in many ways and by a number of witnesses. These records, of course, were never intended for the eye of any person outside the staff of the Military Attaché in the Russian Embassy and their superiors in Moscow. They are contemporaneous records made at the time by the directors of these activities as the events actually occurred. The truth of these records with regard to the participation of Carr in this passport matter is established by the evidence of Soboloff and, further, by Carr's own flight and concealment.

The accuracy of the records with regard to Carr is established.

As for Harris, he denied any participation in these activities. The evidence of Harris himself shows that he and Carr were intimates, seeing each other continuously in their respective offices or residences. They were also of the same ideology.

In Carr's dossier Motinov reports a meeting held in Ottawa on the 16th December, 1944, between himself, Carr and Harris in connection with passports. The records of a local hotel show that on that date Carr and Harris shared the same room, having arrived in Ottawa on the 16th and departed on the 17th of December, 1944. Harris admitted his handwriting on the hotel registration card and the facts it evidenced.

In the same dossier an entry by Rogov dated May 7th, 1945, indicates that Motinov (*Lamont*) handed over his contact with Harris (*The Doctor*) to Rogov (*Brent*) in Toronto. The records of one of the hotels in Toronto show that on 8th May, 1945, Rogov and Motinov had registered there.

It is also established that Harris was in Ottawa on June 16th, 1945, the date of the "regular meeting" described in the notes set out above, which took place on that date where "*The Doctor reported no success with the passport because of the absence of authentic data.*"

These notes contain a further entry under date "1.8.45" that "*the regular meeting took place. Everything was normal. The Doctor was at the meeting.*" This was in Montreal at "*the corner of Sherbrooke and Guy near the Medical Arts Bldg.*" We were not in possession of any evidence showing Harris' registration in any Montreal Hotel on that date, but he himself admitted being in Montreal in July or August. He was vague about this, as about most other things where independent evidence was lacking. We think this stay in Montreal in "*July or August*" 1945 embraced the date mentioned in the notes.

Harris' explanation of his visits to Ottawa and Montreal were that he came from Toronto to rest.

From all the evidence, regarded from the point of view of *The Official Secrets Act*, 1945, we are of opinion that Harris did what Rogov and Motinov said he did.

He stated that, although he had written to Carr more than once since the latter's departure for Cuba in January last and had received two or three letters from him, he had destroyed these and could not remember the address to which he had sent his letters although his last letter to Carr was within a month of his appearance before us. Harris also told us that, notwithstanding his intimacy with Carr, he never discussed politics with him. We think this too great a strain on the credulity of any ordinary person. He said also that he had known Tim Buck for almost as long as he had known Carr and saw him frequently. But, according to Harris, although he and Buck visit each other's houses back and forth, and while the latter had been in Harris' office within a month of Harris' appearance before us,

they had never discussed Carr's absence nor this investigation. We think this evidence is of the same order as the above. There were other unsatisfactory features of Harris' evidence which we do not mention in detail, but upon which also we have based our conclusion as above.

Before parting with this subject we think it of interest to point out that in a book which appeared in 1939 written by W. G. Krivitsky, former Chief of the Soviet Military Intelligence in Western Europe, entitled *In Stalin's Secret Service*, the author describes the high value placed upon Canadian and American passports by the Soviet authorities from the standpoint of the use to be made of them by Russian agents in foreign countries parading as their true owners. On pages 56 and 57 the author refers to a conversation between himself and a Soviet official named Piatnitsky, as follows:—

I am reminded in this connection of a conversation I had with Piatnitsky. He had a man working for him named Lobonovsky, whose incompetence was always the subject of anecdotes in our circle. I would often run into Lobonovsky in one of the capitals of Europe as he scurried about on seemingly important missions. Later I had occasion to discuss him with Piatnitsky, "Tell me frankly, Comrade Piatnitsky," I said, "why do you keep that idiot on your staff?" The veteran Bolshevik leader smiled tolerantly and replied: "My dear young Walter, the question here is not Lobonovsky's capability. What is important is that he has a Canadian passport and I need a Canadian for the missions on which I send him. No one else will do." "Canadian!" I exclaimed, "Lobonovsky isn't a Canadian. He's a Ukrainian born in Shepetovka." Piatnitsky bellowed. "What do you mean, a Ukrainian born in Shepetovka! He has a Canadian passport. That's good enough for me. Do you think it's so easy to find a real Canadian? We've got to make the best of a Canadian born in Shepetovka!"

At page 95 the author indicates that what happened in the case of the passports held by the real Witczak was a well settled practice. He says:—

All the volunteers' passports were taken up when they arrived in Spain, and very rarely was a passport returned. Even when a man was discharged, he was told that his passport had been lost. From the

United States alone about 2000 volunteers came over, and genuine American passports are highly prized at Ogpu headquarters in Moscow. Nearly every diplomatic pouch from Spain that arrived at the Lubyanka contained a batch of passports from members of the International Brigade.

Several times while I was in Moscow in the spring of 1937, I saw this mail in the offices of the Foreign Division of the Ogpu. One day a batch of about a hundred passports arrived; half of them were American. They had belonged to dead soldiers. That was a great haul, a cause for celebration. The passports of the dead, after some weeks of inquiry into the family histories of their original owners, are easily adapted to their new bearers, the Ogpu agents.

Another passage from page 57 is highly illuminative:—

Practically all matters regarding the manufacture and doctoring of passports and other documents are entrusted to native Russians. Pre-war conditions in Czarist Russia gave them exceptional training in this art. The elaborate passport regulations which have become prevalent in most European countries since 1918 found the Bolsheviks well prepared. In the offices of the Ogpu and the Fourth Department of the Red Army there are experts who can forge consular signatures and government seals wholly indistinguishable from the genuine article.

In the present instance this technique has been extended into Canada and has reared its head in the Canadian Passport Office in Ottawa.

In concluding this Section of our Report, it should be stated that on the evidence before us, there would appear to have been only four male members of the Passport Office, who, as a practical matter, could have obtained the issue of the false passport. Of these four, the evidence which we have discussed above connects only one, W. M. Pappin, with the matter.

## SECTION VI

### GERMINA (HÉRMINA) RABINOWITCH, Geneva and Montreal.

This person was for many years associated with the International Labour Organization, an international body set up, after World War I, in pursuance of Article 23 (a) of the Covenant of the League of Nations. A special Part of the Peace Treaties was devoted to Labour, establishment of the permanent International Labour Organization, consisting of a General Conference of Representatives of the members and an International Labour Office controlled by a Governing Body and a Director.

The principal functions of the International Labour Office, in addition to those assigned to it by the Conference, are: (1) the collection and distribution of information relating to industrial life and labour; (2) the examination of subjects proposed by the Conference; (3) the publication of a periodical paper; (4) the receipt of annual reports to give effect to the conventions to which they are party; (5) duties in connection with complaints. (*Oppenheim, International Law, Volume I page 575*).

Customary International Law confers certain immunities and privileges upon diplomatic persons. Members of the I.L.O. are given by treaty similar status. As such, Miss Rabinowitch was the holder of a Canadian diplomatic card bearing No. A-45, exempting her from the provisions of the National Registration Regulations.

As soon as we were notified that the proper authorities had, in her case, waived such immunities and privileges, Germina Rabinowitch was summoned and appeared before us on the 20th and on the 21st of May, 1946, accompanied by Counsel.

Born in Kaunas, Lithuania, on the 5th October, 1901, she was educated in Moscow, Paris, Geneva and Heidelberg. She holds the degree Ph.D. in Economics and Social Science. She speaks Russian, English, French, Italian and German.

She joined the International Labour Organization at its headquarters in Geneva in 1929, and arrived on this continent, travelling from Lisbon to New York, on a Greek boat, in the early days of September, 1940, to work in the headquarters of the I.L.O. then temporarily transferred to Montreal.

With the exception of several trips to the United States, she always remained in Montreal where she had in fact permanent residence at 539

Pine Avenue, West. The office of the I.L.O. was at 3480 University Street, Montreal.

Most of her relatives are in Europe, but a few are in the United States of America. She had a mailing address care of Leonard Carleton, New York, who is a son-in-law of one Kulischer, a former member of the Russian Economic Institute. She keeps funds in a bank in New York.

As soon as she arrived in the United States she applied there for citizenship; she said that her case is presently under advisement. Her intentions, she said, are to go to the United States and seek employment with the United Nations Organization if and as soon as United States citizenship is granted to her.

Amongst the Russian documents there are five which deal with her.

1. Four pages written in Russian by Motinov headed "*Germina*" and with the marginal note "*History*" and ending "*I await instructions about next meeting also money*" and the addresses and telephone numbers of Rabinowitch.
2. A typewritten letter in English addressed "*Dear Hermina*" and signed "*Gisel*", with an inscription in Russian on the back of it in the handwriting of Motinov.
3. A Report in Russian of an interview between *Leon* (Koudriavtzev) and *Hermina* (Germina Rabinowitch) on the 5th of May, 1944, ending as follows:—"I request your further directives 6.5.44. *Lamont*" (i.e. Motinov).
4. A Report in Russian of other meetings between *Leon* and *Hermina* and task assigned to her.
5. A typewritten letter in English dated August 28th, 1944, and signed "*Germina Rabinowitch*".

Some of the information contained in one of these documents was published in the press in the course of the trial of Mazerall in Ottawa. It was evident during the early part of her testimony that she had come prepared to tell a certain story based on her assumption that what she had thus read comprised all the information with regard to her in the possession of the Commission. When faced with all the documents she became embarrassed and stood mute. She was then asked whether she wanted to consult with her Counsel, who was present throughout her examination, to decide her line of conduct. Both of them withdrew, and after a short recess she changed her story and reluctantly admitted the substance of the documents and furnished many details which they did not mention.

The first of the documents above mentioned relates the history of the phase of Soviet operations involving Germina Rabinowitch and others:--

Hermina

R.H.—513 Grosvenor WA-Inut	3383
R.H.—6050 Darlington AT-lantic	3724
R.H.—4906 Queen Mary Rd. AT-	9148

14.4.44 Davie rang her up on these telephones but she was not there.

History. In December 1943 she rang up Tounkin and asked to be received on an urgent matter. T. refused, but afterwards received her. She outlined to him the gist of the matter. Tounkin inquired, but what she replied to him is not known. After that she wrote him a letter in which she wrote (9.3.44) that she had received through a reliable channel a letter from a friend in Geneva and attached it. The contents of the attached letter:

“We live in the former apartment and are working as previously in the old firm. Some two weeks ago Sisi sent you a telegram. Tell us how did your journey to Gisel’s parents turn out. My health is excellent. Albert is sick and will probably leave his profession for a long time, he is laid up in bed. Relations with Lucy are good, she is a very good woman. Gisel’s family is for some reason no longer interested in her, although up to this time there was support. Lucy’s situation has improved. Sisi’s position is sad. Please inform Gisel’s parents that they must remit 6,700 dollars. This sum must be handed over through you. There are no other possibilities. The Gisels must bear these expenses. Advise me about Aleksander where is he”. Rachel.

After this Pavlov, 2nd Secr. neighbour, asked his boss who, according to Pavlov, allegedly replied that this is their man and you (Pavlov) should do nothing. At the same time he asked Pavlov for her address, which he did not and does not know. To Lamont’s question why they did not inform us about this for so long, Pavlov replied, I had these instructions to do nothing. Not having received a reply to the letter and the inquiries by telephone 13 April, that is on the

day of Davie's journey to Hermina's city, the latter wrote a second letter to Tounkin with a request to take measures in the matter of her first letter and for convincing she attached to this letter a second letter from Rachel of the following contents:—

“I have received your (Hermina's) telegram of 23.1.44. Please inform Gisel's family, that she should advise Znamensky 19. that Sisi is alive and works as of old with Lucy. Lucy wanted to change the personnel, but funds ran out. Albert is sick and is not interested in business. For the work of Sisi, Gisel's family must transfer 10,000 dollars. The transfer must be made by Hermina personally through N.Y. in connection with the wishes of Mr. Helmars”. R.D.

Only after receiving this letter 15.4.44 did Pavlov 17.4.44 advise Lamont that there is a certain Rabinovich. After receiving these data on 19.4 we decided to contact her by telephone, as the latter was on her letterhead and to warn her that she must not write, nor ring up, and that in two weeks Gisel's man will visit her. ~~She was very satisfied~~ 19. This was carried out by Leon as Davie was in Vancouver. We consider that if there is to be a transfer of money, then the money must be transferred Washington and hand it over to Hermina in New York, as it is dangerous to cross the border with such a sum. For one thing our banks are not releasing American dollars.

The letters with copies of Rachel's letters have been sent by mail by Hermina and in all probability passed through the censorship, although there was no censor's stamp. The copy of the second letter, which deals with Znamensky 19, was particularly prejudicial.

Please appoint a man for future procedure, bearing in mind that Davie will not be able to go to New York and Washington. I await instructions about the next meeting, also money. ~~We have~~ \*

Home telephone—Lancaster 76.28

Business—Plateau 25.07

Address. Apt. 539 Pine Av. not far from University St. (2 weeks from 19.4)

\* Faint type indicates words crossed out in original documents.



The following facts are revealed by this document and the evidence.

In December, 1943, Rabinowitch, complying with instructions both cabled and written to her by Rachel D\_\_\_\_\_ (*Sisi*), a Soviet agent in Geneva and one connected with the I.L.O., proceeded from Montreal to the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa seeking to obtain several thousands of dollars for a group of Soviet agents operating in Europe.

After some difficulties she obtained an interview with the Counsellor of the Embassy, Tounkin. She said in her evidence:—

Q. Then would you please follow the Russian document, the original brought from the Embassy, and I will read the translation to you. If you find occasion to correct it, please do not hesitate to say so.  
*'In December 1943 she rang up Tounkin and asked to be received on an urgent matter.'*

Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. You did phone Tounkin and asked to be received on an urgent matter?

A. That must have been before I went there.

Q. That was in December, 1943?

A. Yes.

Q. This is the history they give in the Russian Embassy?

A. Yes.

Q. *'Tounkin refused, but afterwards received her.'* Is that right?

A. Yes.

Germina Rabinowitch then explained to him her mission, but much to her surprise and disappointment had no success, and so reported to Rachel D\_\_\_\_\_ by letter. She also cabled on the 23rd January, 1944. Her evidence is:—

Q. What took place at the Embassy there?

A. I saw this man there, and we were not very friendly received at all.

Q. For whom did you ask when you arrived at the Embassy?

A. I asked for the Chargé d'Affaires.

Q. You asked for the Chargé d'Affaires?

A. Yes.

Q. And you were introduced to—

A. I don't know whom. I don't know whether he was the Chargé d'Affaires.

- Q. Did he have on a military uniform or was he dressed in civilian clothes?
- A. Civilian clothes.
- Q. And what language did you employ?
- A. Well, I speak Russian, so it was either Russian or English; I don't know.
- Q. You speak Russian?
- A. Yes. We spoke Russian at home. And I discussed with him also I.L.O. matters. I asked him what publications he received, because we were interested to receive newspapers from Russia, for the office work. It was a very unpleasant interview, and I was rather furious and went away, and that was the end of it.
- Q. All right. You explained to us what took place as far as the I.L.O. situation was concerned, but would you give us the conversation you had with the gentleman as far as the request was concerned?
- A. I showed him the cable.
- Q. You showed him the cable?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Have you still got the cable?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. What happened to it?
- A. He did not quite understand, and it was—
- Q. I say, what happened to it, to the cable?
- Q. Where is the cable?
- A. I don't know. I must have thrown it away.
- Q. All right. Go ahead.
- A. He didn't know who these people were, and we dropped it. I saw that he didn't know what it was about, and I dropped the conversation. The whole interview lasted perhaps five or ten minutes, because when I saw that he was not prepared to speak with me, I left and went back to Montreal.
- Q. And did you tell your cousin in Geneva the result of the interview you had with the Chargé d'Affaires, or with any other person at the Embassy here?
- A. As far as I remember I must have written to him that the interview was unpleasant, and I didn't think that any kind of result would come out of it. I must have written to him.

She later received from Rachel D\_\_\_\_\_ a letter which, as requested by the latter, she sent to the Soviet Embassy on the 9th of March, 1944:—

Q. And what was in the letter?

A. The letter—it was a letter to me, which I received in the office, and in the envelope was another note which he asked me to forward to the Embassy. That note was not very clear to me, the contents; and I must say that I probably was rather careless in doing what I did.

Q. What did you do?

A. Because I put it in an envelope and wrote a few words and sent it to the Embassy here.

The letter, recited in the above document, is as follows:—

We live in the former apartment and are working as previously in the old firm. Some two weeks ago Sisi sent you a telegram. Tell us how did your journey to Gisel's parents turn out. My health is excellent. Albert is sick and will probably leave his profession for a long time, he is laid up in bed. Relations with Lucy are good, she is a very good woman. Gisel's family is for some reason no longer interested in her, although up to this time there was support. Lucy's situation has improved. Sisi's position is sad. Please inform Gisel's parents that they must remit 6,700 dollars. This sum must be handed over through you. There are no other possibilities. The Gisels must bear these expenses. Advise me about Aleksander where is he.

Rachel.

At one stage of her examination about the various names mentioned in that letter she testified as follows:—

Q. You say that you did not understand as to who these people were?

A. I did not know who they were."

Later, however, she identified *Aleksander* and *Paul*, and stated that *Gisel* is a man in the Soviet Embassy, most likely from Moscow. We know from Gouzenko that *Gisel* is a cover name for the Red Army Intelligence Service.

On being questioned again on this point at another stage of her examination she said:—

Q. If we go back to Exhibit 39†, in addition to the context of the letter which you said you remembered having received, on page 2 I see:

*'I received your telegram of 23.1.44. Please inform Gisel's family. . .'*

You are asked to inform the Soviet in Ottawa, is that not it? That is the Gisel family?

A. Yes.

Q. That is it, is it not? I am reading from Exhibit 39:

*'I received your telegram of January 23, 1944.'*

That is the telegram which you had sent. Do you remember that?

A. Yes.

Q. It goes on:

*'Please inform Gisel's family. . .'*

Gisel's family; that is the Soviet Embassy people here, is it not?

A. Yes.

Gouzenko also said that *Lucy* is a very active agent in Geneva and he added that *Sisi* is quite a famous agent in Geneva.

As to the substance of that letter Rabinowitch testified:—

Q. And he asked you to deliver that to the Russian Embassy here?

A. Yes. It was in the same business, the same aim, to obtain help, financial help to that person.

Q. And was an amount of money mentioned, as a matter of fact?

A. Yes, there was an amount mentioned.

Q. Which was what?

A. Which was quite high; which astonished me somehow.

Q. What was the amount?

A. I saw the papers here, so what I say now is what I read in the *Star* and the *Gazette*. The papers said it was \$10,000. I could not guarantee that that was the amount mentioned in the letter.

The interest of the Soviet Embassy and the use to be made of that money requested from the Soviet Embassy is very clearly shown in the following excerpt from the evidence of Miss Rabinowitch:—

Q. Why would the Russians have an interest in Rachel?

A. Because she probably was working for them. That I could quite understand now.

Q. She was?

A. I do not know what she did.

†Quoted above, p. 568.

Q. You had the idea that *Sisi* was working for the Russians at the time since she could apply to the Russians for money to help her?

A. Yes.

The cautious attitude of the Soviet officials at Ottawa towards Miss Rabinowitch was not modified by the communication she made to them of that first letter from abroad: however, the matter was, according to the Russian document, turned over to Pavlov, whom Motinov further identifies by his official position in the Embassy, "*2nd Secretary*", and then by the use of the word *Neighbour*, the cover-name for the N.K.V.D.

Pavlov communicated with Moscow on the matter and requested instructions. He was eventually "*directed to do nothing*" because Moscow considered "*that this is their person*".

*Sisi* wrote again to Rabinowitch and her letter is also recited in the above document, as follows:—

**I have received your (Hermina's) telegram of 23.1.44. Please inform Gisel's family, that she should advise Znamensky 19. that Sisi is alive and works as of old with Lucy. Lucy wanted to change the personnel, but funds ran out. Albert is sick and is not interested in business. For the work of Sisi, Gisel's family must transfer 10,000 dollars. The transfer must be made by Hermina personally through N.Y. in connection with the wishes of Mr. Helmars.**

R.D.

Following its receipt Rabinowitch telephoned to Tounkin on the 13th April, 1944, and also wrote him a letter received at the Embassy on the 15th April requesting him to take action and, in order to convince of the genuine and urgent character of the request, she enclosed the letter.

The following extracts from the evidence of Rabinowitch relate to the Russian document:—

Q. But if the document says you wrote a second letter, you are not in a position to deny what the document says?

A. No.

Q. I continue reading:

*' . . . a second letter to Tounkin, with a request to take measures about her first letter and for convincing attaches to this letter a second letter from Rachel of the following context.'*

This is the letter that it is said in the document you received from Rachel, and which you attached to the second letter you wrote to Tounkin:

*'I received your telegram. . . .'*

That is, Rachel says she has received a telegram.

*' . . . of 23.1.44. Please inform Gisel's family that she advise Znamensky 19 that Sisi lives and works as of old with Lucy. Lucy wished to change the personnel but finances came to an end. Albert is sick and is not interested in business. For the work of Sisi, Gisel's family must transfer 10,000 dollars. Hermina must make the transfer personally through N.Y. in connection with the wishes of Mister Helmars.'*

Then there are the initials; this is 'P' in Russian, which is 'R' in English?

A. Yes.

Q. And the initials "R.D." would stand for Rachel D\_\_\_\_\_.  
Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. Do you remember having read the context of that letter, which the document says you transmitted to them?

A. I don't remember the fact of two letters. It is driving me completely crazy, but I cannot remember that. I was telling Mr. Charlap (*Counsel for the Witness*) the whole time I was thinking about that, for the two hours, and I can't just remember there were two letters.

Q. Is it not in this letter that you found that \$10,000 that you were speaking about this morning?

A. Maybe it was this letter I only remember receiving. They are very similar.

Q. I suppose if you had taken notes like Motinov did you would not have to worry about recalling things?

A. No.

Q. But the document is there, and you are not in a position to deny what it says?

A. I am not in a position to deny, but I have my doubts.

Q. All right. Then Motinov goes on to say:

*'Only after receiving this letter 15.4.44 Pavlov 17.4.44 advised Lamont that there is a certain Rabinowitch. After receiving these data on 19.4 we decided to contact her by telephone, as*

*the letter was on her letter form and to warn her that she must not write nor ring up and that in two weeks Gisel's man will visit her. 19. This was established by Leon as Davie was in Vancouver. We consider that if there is to be money handed over the money must be transferred by Washington and hand it over to Hermina in New York as it is dangerous to cross the border with such a sum. For one thing, our banks are not releasing American dollars.*

*The letters with copies of Rachel's letters have been sent by mail and in all probability passed through the censor although there is no censor's stamp. The two copies of the letters where the subject touches Znamensky 19 are specially harmful. Please appoint a man for future procedure bearing in mind that Davie cannot go to New York and Washington. I await instructions about next meeting also money.*

*Home telephone—Lancaster 7628*

*Business telephone—Plateau 2507*

*Address—Apartment 539 Pine Avenue,  
not far from University Street.*

Then a date is fixed for the meeting: Two weeks from April 19 the meeting was to take place with you in Montreal. What do you say as to that?

A. It is a fantastic story, completely.

Q. It is not fantastic. It is your own address, is it not; your own telephone number?

A. I gave my address on the letter I wrote to them.

Q. What is fantastic about it?

A. This story about all these people visiting me.

Q. There is nothing fantastic about it. They are only following your telephone conversation, that you have admitted with them; your visit, that you have admitted to them. Then the fact that nothing was coming through, that you had not got the reception that was expected, and that to convince them you have admitted that you sent them a letter that you had received from Switzerland. That was not fantastic. You admitted that, and that is only the sequence of that, is it not? There is nothing fantastic. The sequence is there?

A. But why didn't I remember the second letter, and I don't remember

Later in her evidence she admitted that letter and the facts connected thereto as related in the document.

So far as the Soviet officials in Ottawa are concerned, they were definitely disturbed by this second letter from Montreal sent to them through ordinary mail by Rabinowitch, and Motinov wrote with regard to this the following comments:—

**The letters with copies of Rachel's letters have been sent by mail by Hermina and in all probability passed through the censorship, although there was no censor's stamp. The copy of the second letter, which deals with Znamensky 19, was particularly prejudicial.**

There was evidently some discussion on the matter and a conflict of jurisdiction seems to have arisen for the Russian document says:—

**Only after receiving this letter 15.4.44 did Pavlov 17.4.44 advise LAMONT (~~Motinov~~) that there is a certain Rabinowitch. . . . To LAMONT'S question why they did not inform us/about this for so long, Pavlov replied, I had these instructions to do nothing.**

\*

"Znamensky 19" is the street address in Moscow of the Red Army Intelligence Headquarters, which made it unmistakably clear to Pavlov that Rabinowitch could not be used by his N.K.V.D. network. Zabolotin's Organization, however, without referring the matter to Moscow, thought it to be so urgent that as Motinov puts it in the Russian document:—

**Rabinovich. After receiving these data on 19.4 we decided to contact her by telephone, as the latter was on her letterhead and to warn her that she must not write, nor ring up, and that in two weeks Gisel's man will visit her.**

It was then that Sokolov (*Davie*) tried to contact "that certain Rabinowitch" with the assistance of the Montreal Telephone Directory, as shown by the document. On this point the witness said:—

Q. Then it refers to 513 GROSVENOR, WALNUT 3383; then to 6050 DARLINGTON, ATLANTIC 3727 and then to 4906 QUEEN MARY ROAD, ATLANTIC 9148. None of these was your address?

A. No, sir.

Q. But if we look in the Montreal Telephone Directory, the edition of 1943, which will be filed as Exhibit 559, all these addresses and

\* Faint type indicates word crossed out in original documents.



- telephone numbers are referred to on page 397. H. RABINOWITCH,  
513 GROSVENOR?
- A. Yes.
- Q. WALNUT 3383?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Which is the first name and number mentioned in the Russian document?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Then H. RABINOWITCH, 6050 DARLINGTON?
- A. Yes.
- Q. ATLANTIC 3727?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Which is the second name mentioned in the Russian document?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And then MRS. H. RABINOWITCH, 4906 QUEEN MARY ROAD, ATLANTIC 9148?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Which is the third name mentioned in the Russian document?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And you notice that these names and telephone numbers and addresses mentioned in the Russian document are mentioned in exactly the same order in the Montreal Telephone Directory for the year 1943, which has been filed as Exhibit 559?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. So that would suggest that they were at that time trying to find out who that Hermina or H. Rabinowitch was?
- A. Yes.
- Q. That is clear, is it not?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Then this document goes on:
- Davy rang her up on these telephones but she was not there.*
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. There was a good reason why you could not be found there, the main one being that that was not your residence, that none of these numbers was your residence?
- A. No.
- Q. Is that right?
- A. That is right.

- Q. *Davie* was apparently looking for you through the telephone directory. Would you say that was right?
- A. I guess so. Yes. I don't know who he is.
- Q. And as you said a little earlier, Rabinowitch is a rather common name?
- A. Quite a common name.
- Q. But you can find in Exhibit 39, on page 3, that they found you?
- A. In the office?
- Q. Both places, as a matter of fact, is it not? It says *Home telephone, Lancaster 7628* which you told us a moment ago was your telephone number?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And your residence on Pine Avenue?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And *Business - Plateau 2507*, which you admitted was your telephone number?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. At the place you were working?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And the address: 539 Pine Avenue, was also?
- A. Is my address.
- Q. Is your address?
- A. Yes.
- Q. So at the beginning they did not know where to locate you, and the document says that *Davie* tried hard to locate you at these various phone numbers without success; but in the other document mentioned, that which you are seeing now, written in Russian also —
- A. Yes.
- Q. They located Hermina Rabinowitch?
- A. Yes. I guess they can trace a phone number.
- Q. I just wanted to show you that their records are in order. Then they gave on this page a history, is it not?
- A. Yes.

Two weeks later, that is on the 5th May, 1944, Koudriavtzev went to Montreal and had a meeting with Germina Rabinowitch and allowed her to read a letter addressed "*Dear Hermina*" and signed "*Gisel*". Evidently Koudriavtzev kept this because Gouzenko produced it. It reads as follows:—

**Dear Hermina,**

**Thank you very much indeed for your care in our affairs and we hope that you will help us in future. It is important for us to send a letter to Geneva to Sisi. Can you send this letter with a reliable man to whom you trust. All expenses will be paid. Please let us know about your proposals in this connection as soon as possible. Please inform us about delivery of your service mail to Geneva and why are you sure that it is not censored. Please wire to Rashel or Alexander that Gisel's parents are interested about the health of Sisi and Paul and that they will help them. We ask you to forward 10,000 \$ to that watch company according to the Sisi's instructions. Make arrangements with our representative about forwarding of this sum of money to you in USA. All your personal expenses will be paid.**

**With best regards**

**Gisel**

Before being shown this document Germina Rabinowitch was questioned on this transfer of money and she then admitted having made a trip to New York to have an amount of \$10,000 conveyed to Geneva by the watch company referred to in the evidence now to be quoted:—

Q. Did you send money to Switzerland?

A. I did send money to Switzerland.

Q. How much?

A. I do not know; he was always in difficulties.

Q. You what? You do not know? What do you mean you do not know? How much money did you send to Switzerland in 1944?

A. I did not send any money. I asked somebody to help my cousin out with money if possible.

Q. Listen —

A. I do not know exactly the amount.

Q. Will you listen; you are not going to trifle with this Commission. You just said a few minutes ago you did send money to Switzerland, to that cousin, and then you said you did not remember the amount.

A. I did send but not in that sense that I went and sent it.

Q. I do not care anything about the sense. You did send money?

A. No.

- Q. Now you have said "yes" and you have said "no"; which is it?
- A. May I explain?
- Q. Yes.
- A. I asked somebody who had connections, who had business between Switzerland and the United States to give A\_\_\_\_\_ if possible some money because he also was cut off from his funds in the States which were blocked.
- Q. Never mind the reason; who was the somebody you asked?
- A. That was a big firm.
- Q. What is the name?
- A. *(No audible answer).*
- Q. Was that a watch company?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What is the name of the company?
- A. I do not remember.
- Q. You will make an effort to remember the name of the watch company, will you?
- A. Well, it is a long time ago.
- Q. Yes, all right, but you think of it and you give us the name of the firm.
- A. *(No audible answer.)*
- Q. New York?
- A. Yes, New York-Geneva. It was not—well, can you help me?
- Q. No, we are waiting for your assistance.
- Q. There are not such a large number of watch companies in New York that would send money to Switzerland on your request. You say that you cannot remember the name; what is the name?
- A. Well, I do not know because—
- Q. What is the name?
- A. I know it is "H-e", something like Herman, but not Herman.
- Q. And the amount you sent was \$10,000?
- A. I do not know that he could give him \$10,000.
- Q. The amount you sent was \$10,000?
- A. No, I asked him to give him some money.
- Q. You asked him to give him how much?
- A. I do not know how much he would give him.
- Q. How much did you ask him to give?
- A. Up to \$5,000 or \$6,000.

Q. Up to five or six thousand?

A. Yes.

Q. You wanted to have some assistance as far as the name of that company was concerned?

A. Yes.

Q. You stated that the name of the company was "H-e" and something?

A. Yes.

Q. Helbein?

A. Yes, I remember that.

Q. What is the address?

A. It is somewhere on Fifth Avenue.

Q. Whom did you communicate with there?

A. With a gentleman—Mr. Helbein.

Q. What is his first name?

A. William.

Q. What is his occupation?

A. He is the head of the watch company.

Q. He is the head?

A. Of this company.

Q. What is the name of the company?

A. Helbein Watch Company.

Q. Helbein Watch Company, and what is the address of the company?

A. It is on Fifth Avenue in one of the 40's.

Q. What is the name of the building where the company has its office?

A. I do not know.

Q. Why did you wait so long to tell us the address of the company, you knew it?

A. The address; I did not know the exact address.

Q. You just gave it to us.

A. Fifth Avenue in the 40's. You did not ask me for the address.

Q. May I recall that when you are under oath you have to say the whole truth and nothing but the truth, you should not limit yourself to answering the questions but should tell everything that is implied in the question. You understand that?

A. Yes. You asked me the name, and I could not remember; the address I remember.

Q. How long have you known that firm?

A. I knew it in Geneva.

A. Yes. It is 5th Avenue and one of the forty streets.

Q. 6 West 48th Street?

A. Yes. That is at the corner of Fifth Avenue.

Q. You remember it was at the corner of Fifth Avenue?

A. Yes.

Q. So there is no doubt in your mind as to where the company had its office?

A. I said so before.

Later, and still before being shown the document, Rabinowitch stated that her trip to New York and her visit to the Soviet Embassy were two different things and had nothing in common:—

Q. That is not the question. Why did you go to the Embassy?

A. To transmit the cable A\_\_\_\_\_ sent me to ask for money for this woman, Rachel.

Q. Why did you not go to New York City directly? Why did you trouble the Soviet people here in Canada for that?

A. Well, they had nothing in common, those things. The two things have nothing in common.

Faced with the document, she then testified:—

Q. So we will continue, reading Exhibit 40:—

*Dear Hermina,*

*Thank you very much indeed for your care in our affairs and we hope that you will help us in future. It is important for us to send a letter to Geneva to Sisi. Can you send this letter with a reliable man to whom you trust. All expenses will be paid. Please let us know about your proposals in this connection as soon as possible. Please inform us about delivery of your service mail to Geneva and why are you sure that it is not censored. Please wire to Rashel or Alexander that Gisel's parents are interested about the health of Sisi and Paul and that they will help them. We ask you to forward \$10,000 to that watch company according to the Sisi's instructions. Make arrangements with our representative*

*about forwarding of this sum of money in U.S.A. All your personal expenses will be paid.*

*With best regards,  
GISEL.*

What do you say to that?

A. *It didn't reach me.*

Q. You see the connection between the \$10,000?

A. Yes.

Q. The Soviet Embassy; the watch company; you were travelling to New York; Sisi; A\_\_\_\_\_?

A. *(No answer.)*

Q. Now you might tell us all about it, and take your time, Miss Rabinowitch?

A. But I don't see it exactly.

Q. Just take your time and tell us all about it?

A. I see that they tried to use me as if I would have been their agent, and they put me in a nice mess. That is what I see, but I never was close to them and I don't want to be their agent and I didn't want to be their agent.

Q. Would you care to tell us what took place, then, or if you would prefer not to; and if so, why?

A. *(No answer.)*

Q. Would you like to consult your Counsel?

A. If I might have time to clear my memory. Am I permitted?

Q. Yes; I am waiting for you.

Q. Do you want to talk to your lawyer?

A. Yes.

COUNSEL FOR WITNESS:—Would you like to talk to me?

WITNESS:—Yes.

COUNSEL FOR WITNESS:—In here or outside?

WITNESS:—I would like to talk outside. I could not talk here.

After the return of the witness with her Counsel, the examination continued:—

Q. Well, Miss Rabinowitch, you have had the opportunity to withdraw from the room and consult with your solicitor. What is your decision?

A. I will explain it to you exactly, and explain why I didn't say this.

Q. Will you speak a little louder?

A. Why I didn't say it before; the New York business. But please believe me that I don't remember two letters; I definitely don't remember two letters. I rather remember the second letter, because of the amount of \$10,000. I didn't want to say this about New York, because I didn't want to say about the watch company, which did a favour; but as it is already known I don't change anything, as I see —

Q. But what is already known?

A. That you have the information about Helbein's Watch Company. I don't see why I must be too careful.

Q. Why should you be careful anyway?

A. I don't know.

Q. Do you intend to tell us only things that we know?

A. I didn't want to bring in other people if possible.

Q. But you are here to tell the truth, you see, and all the truth. You are under oath, whether you implicate others or not.

A. That is true.

Q. Go ahead and tell us the story now?

A. I was approached — I went to New York on one of my trips. I went there several times a year, as I have said, and I was approached in New York by a man I don't know. I don't know his name, and he handed me \$10,000, with a request to give it to the watch company, to Helbein, for A\_\_\_\_\_; and I did that.

Q. So what you told us this morning was false; and when you said that now you did not think you had to be too careful, will you explain that?

A. Excuse me.

Q. Why did you tell us something this morning that was untrue?

A. I was confused. I am sorry.

Q. That is no answer. A person does not tell something deliberately untrue because they are confused, but because they have a very definite purpose in mind. Why did you tell us something this morning that was untrue?

A. Because I did not want to implicate Helbein.

Q. To implicate whom?

A. Helbein.



- Q. What you say now is this. You say that you had that letter, which is Exhibit 40, and which refers to a watch company?
- A. Which what?
- Q. Which refers to the watch company?
- A. Yes.
- Q. *You had that letter?*
- A. *Yes, sir.*
- Q. You received it from *Gisel*; and you say in addition to that you went to New York and that someone in New York whom you do not know — ?
- A. Exactly.
- Q. Just a moment; just listen to my question carefully. You say that someone in New York, whom you did not know, approached you with \$10,000 and asked you to give that amount of money to the watch company. Is that what you say?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And then that person must have known that you were coming to New York?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Because you do not meet people in New York — any person in New York would not meet at the very moment in that city a person going there, to arrange a transaction of that kind, which would fit in so beautifully with that document, and all that as a coincidence?
- A. They knew I was going there.
- Q. They knew? How did they know? You told them that?
- A. I told them.
- Q. You told who?
- A. I told the man who brought me this letter.
- Q. Who was the man who brought you the letter?
- A. I don't know him.
- Q. That is Exhibit 40?
- A. I don't know his name.
- Q. Where did he bring you the letter?
- A. It was in Montreal.
- Q. He brought you the letter in Montreal?
- A. Yes.
- Q. He is a Russian, but you don't know his name. Is that it?
- A. I don't know even if he is Russian.

- Q. What did he tell you when he brought the letter to you?
- A. He asked me my name, and he said he had a letter for me.
- Q. And he gave you that letter?
- A. Yes.
- Q. When was that?
- A. That must have been in the spring of 1944.
- Q. And where were you when he handed the letter to you?
- A. In the office.
- Q. In your office?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Had you ever seen this man before?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. How did he introduce himself?
- A. Just brought me that letter.
- Q. He said he had a letter for you?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And handed you the letter?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And Exhibit 40 is the letter?
- A. Excuse me? This letter.
- Q. Exhibit 40; and did he tell you anything else?
- A. He asked me whether I will be going to New York soon, and I said I would be going in the spring; and then he said that a man will approach me and give me the money for A\_\_\_\_\_, and would I transmit it to Mr. Helbein for transfer to A\_\_\_\_\_, and I said yes, I would.
- . . . . .
- Q. But you had had Exhibit 40 and had read it?
- A. Yes. I knew it was to be given to her, but the money was going to A\_\_\_\_\_.
- Q. Just to hand over to D\_\_\_\_\_. Is that so?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And who was *Gisel*?
- A. I think that must be a friend of Rachel's.
- Q. Anybody ever tell you who *Gisel* was?
- A. No.
- Q. Did you ever ask?
- A. No.

Q. I see. So you got this letter signed *Gisel*, and you got these instructions about going to New York and everything you have told us, and you never even asked anybody who the person was who signed the letter. Is that so?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I see. So you must have been satisfied where the letter came from; quite satisfied in your own mind. Would that be right?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And satisfied that it came from somebody who knew you well enough to address you as "*Dear Hermina*." Is that so?

A. I didn't quite understand that the letter came from somebody—

Q. Who knew you well enough to address you as "*Dear Hermina*"?

A. It doesn't mean that that person knows me well enough if she writes "*Dear Hermina*".

Q. And following that meeting in New York, did you send any cable or write any letter?

A. I sent a cable saying that I saw Helbein and that I did what was asked, or something like that.

Q. You sent a cable to whom?

A. A\_\_\_\_\_.

Q. What did you say?

A. That I saw Mr. Helbein in New York and I did what I was asked to do.

Q. Did they offer to pay your expenses?

A. Yes.

Q. Who did?

A. The fellow who brought the letter.

Q. Who brought the money?

A. Who brought the letter.

Q. But the one who brought the money did not mention anything about it?

A. No.

Q. And you did not ask him?

A. No.

Q. When you got the money you went to see the watch company?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you saw the President of the company?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You said, Miss Rabinowitch, that the man who brought you that letter in Montreal came from the Russian Embassy in Ottawa?

A. Yes, sir. Well, I don't know whether he came from the Embassy.

Q. You stated he was a man from the Embassy?

A. Well, I assumed that.

Q. You had good reason to assume that?

A. Exactly.

Q. I want to have that clear. When this man brought this letter to you in Montreal, was the letter sealed or not sealed?

A. Not sealed.

Q. Did the man ask you to read the letter, or did he just hand an envelope to you with the letter in it?

A. No, he asked me to read the letter.

Q. The man from the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa brought a letter to you and asked you to read it, and you read it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. After you read that letter did you speak to him or did he speak to you?

A. He asked me whether I would be going to New York.

Q. He asked you whether you would accept to do what was asked of you in the letter?

A. Yes.

Q. And you agreed?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you told him so?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did he say to that?

A. He asked when I would be going to New York.

Q. He asked what time you would be ready to accomplish the task, and you gave him a date when you would leave?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what else was said?

A. Where I could meet that man.

- Q. Did you ask him where you could meet the man, or did he ask you where you would suggest the meeting take place?
- A. (No answer.)
- Q. Put it this way. Whether you suggested it or whether he suggested it, you agreed with him as to the time of the trip, as to the time of the meeting, and as to the place of the meeting?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. That is right?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And you came to that agreement after having read the letter at the request of the man who brought it to you?
- A. Yes.
- Q. You did not ask the man who is *Gisel*?
- A. No.
- Q. Because you knew who he was? You do not take instructions that way from anyone, do you?
- A. No.
- Q. You knew that *Gisel* was the man in charge of the Intelligence Service at the Soviet Embassy here?
- A. No. I don't know that.
- Q. You knew he was connected with these activities, didn't you?
- A. Who?
- Q. The man who signed "*Gisel*"?
- A. No, I didn't know.
- Q. Who did you think that *Gisel* was, then?
- A. I knew that it was somebody connected with the Soviet —
- Q. The Soviet Embassy in Ottawa?
- A. Or maybe in Moscow.
- Q. All right; maybe in Moscow. You read the letter, as you stated. It said, *thank you very much indeed for your care in our affairs*. What care did you have in their affairs up to then?
- A. Transmitting the letter.
- Q. That was not agreed yet?
- A. Transmitting the letter I got from Geneva.
- Q. That is right; you had already transmitted the letter; so this man, either from Moscow or from the Soviet Embassy, was thanking you indeed for the care you had in their own affairs; and he con-

tinues, *We hope you will help us in the future.* That is along the same line of business, is it not?

A. That means to transmit the money.

Q. Yes, but it is not qualified; it is not limited. What *Gisel* says is that he hopes you will continue to help in the future; isn't that it?

A. That is what it says.

Q. And that is what you understood, too?

A. No.

Q. What did you understand, then?

A. I was prepared to come and to transmit that money.

Q. You thought it was in connection with the balance of the letter?

A. Yes. I was not prepared to do anything any more; I had enough to do.

Q. I think you were doing your share?

A. More than that.

Q. I continue:

*It is important for us to send a letter to Geneva to Sisi. Can you send this letter with a reliable man to whom you trust?*

Was that letter, the letter directed to *Sisi*, handed over with this letter, or were they speaking about a future transaction?

A. I believe they referred to something more, and I refused to do anything more.

Q. You did not tell me that when I asked you what took place between you and the man. If you refused, you refused afterward, but not at that time?

A. At that time I told him I can't do that.

Q. You told him that?

A. Yes.

Q. You told him you could not arrange for a letter?

A. No.

Q. All right. Did you tell the man from the Embassy who handed you Exhibit 40 why you were sure that such material was not censored?

A. Well, I told him —

Q. You must have told him, because you read the letter in his presence, at his request, and you must have given him the reason why you were sure that it was not censored?

A. Maybe.

- Q. Well, did you tell him, as a matter of fact? Here is a man who comes to your place?
- A. Yes.
- Q. With a request in writing; and who asked you to read the letter. You read the letter, and you agreed to what is asked in the letter, and there is a query in the letter about your assurance about the fact that these letters are not censored?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Is it not reasonable to deduce, and is not that the only deduction possible, that you explained why to him?
- A. Yes, I explained to him, saying that such facilities exist, but that I refused to use them.
- Q. All right; we will leave it at that, and we will continue the reading of the letter. In the letter the man from the Embassy asked you:  
*Please wire to Rachel or Alexander that Gisel's parents are interested about the health of Sisi and Paul and that they will help them.*
- That is in connection with the \$10,000 is it?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. As a matter of fact, *Sisi* was not sick, but she was in financial difficulties?
- A. Does it say that she is sick?
- Q. Yes; about her health. It is a word to cover the financial assistance to which reference was made in the previous documents. Is that right?
- A. I don't know.
- Q. Well, is it what you understood yourself? You are asked by *Gisel*, the man from the Embassy, to wire *Rachel*, which is *Sisi*, or *Alexander*; which is A\_\_\_\_\_?
- A. Yes.
- Q. That *Gisel's* parents — that is the friends of the man in the Embassy here — are interested about the health of *Sisi*. That is about her financial position?
- A. Yes, her financial position.
- Q. *And that they will help her.* In other words, it means to inform these people that "we have agreed to do what was asked of us; that is, to get financial assistance"?
- A. Yes.

Q. But who is *Paul*?

A. *Sisi's* husband.

Q. Did you wire *Rachel* or *Alexander*, as you were asked in this letter, that finally you had succeeded in interesting the people in the Soviet Embassy here, and they would look after them and send \$10,000 to them?

A. I think so. I am not very sure, but I think so.

Q. It is reasonable to deduce that you did?

A. Yes.

Q. It goes on:

*We ask you to forward \$10,000 to that watch company according to the Sisi's instructions. Make arrangements with our representative about forwarding of this sum of money to you in USA*

In that letter they are asking you to make arrangements with the Soviet representative in New York—?

A. Yes.

. . . . .

Q. When you gave the money, the \$10,000, to William Helbein, what did you tell him? What did he say?

A. That he would try to do his best to transfer it.

Q. You stated a moment ago that you did not want to implicate him, so you have a conviction that he knew the nature of the transaction?

A. No. I don't know.

Q. You don't know whether he did or not?

A. No. I really don't know.

Q. But did you explain it to him?

A. Explain what?

Q. You did not give \$10,000 without telling him what you want to do with it. Did you explain to William Helbein the nature of the transaction?

A. I explained to him that I would like him to transmit it to A\_\_\_\_\_; that is all.

Q. Would you tell me why the Russians would have to go through you to do that? Could they not do that in New York, without you going there? That gentleman who came to see you at the



hotel with the \$10,000 could have gone to the watch company and asked them to do that. Why did they have to use you?

A. I really don't know.

Q. You have no idea?

A. Perhaps because I was the cousin of A\_\_\_\_\_, and there was nothing so particular about that.

Q. Well, you were the cousin of A\_\_\_\_\_, but that was not a gift as between relatives, was it?

A. No.

Q. Then why would they have to use you to do that?

A. I don't know why.

Q. Is it because they wanted to avoid suspicion of that?

A. Maybe.

Q. Well, what is your idea? Or was it because you were known to them?

A. I think rather that they wanted to avoid suspicion.

Q. That is the impression you had?

A. Yes.

Q. Suspicious of what?

A. Of Helbein, perhaps.

Q. You speak of secrecy and of suspicion, but what did you think the suspicion would be about? You believed that other people would find it strange?

A. Yes.

Q. That the Russian Embassy would send \$10,000 to *Sisi* in Switzerland?

A. Yes.

Q. But did you not find it strange yourself?

A. I did.

Q. You thought it was for what? Strange in what way?

A. Strange because the amount of money was high, and because of this whole secrecy.

Q. So the high amount of money and the secrecy brought in your mind that there must be something behind that, so that is why you found it strange?

A. Yes.

Q. What did you think was behind that?

A. I thought that *Sisi* must be working for the Russians.

Q. Be working for the Russians?

A. Yes.

In document number three already referred to†, Motinov has recorded the report made to him by Koudriavtzev, upon the latter's return from Montreal, of his interview with Rabinowitch referred to in the evidence just quoted. This document reads:—

**On May 5 Leon met Hermina, the latter reported:**

1. **The correspondence with Geneva is carried on by means of letters and telegrams. The letters are sent as part of the mail of her organization and are not subject to scrutiny. The letters take from three weeks to a month to come. Telegrams a few days. The last letter took about one month to arrive, she does not know the exact number of days.**
2. **She knows not Geta A \_\_\_\_\_ but Aleksander A \_\_\_\_\_. She does not correspond with him, but she could. She knows that everything is in order with him. She also informed that in June 1941 he intended to go to Moscow but the beginning of the war interfered and he remained there. His visa was of 24 June.**
3. **She knows Sisi as a good friend and she helped her as a good acquaintance. She did not know anything about Sisi's work previously. Sisi's first letter was for me unexpected. She knows nothing of the change in Sisi's life.**
4. **She is completely certain that the letters were written personally by Sisi. Indications:—handwriting and signature, which were well known to her.**
5. **The insistent request of Sisi to deposit the money in the company was unknown to her, and furthermore she does not know anybody in the said company. As for herself she considers that Sisi told the firm about me (Hermina).**

Hermina will be able to deposit the money, however she would like to receive a cheque, as it is difficult to carry such a large sum over the border. Hermina enjoys rights equal to persons who have diplomatic passports.

†See p. 566 above.

**Conduct**—natural. She wrote the letters to Tounkin because Tounkin had received her very severely once, while the other requests about a meeting and the telephone conversations were rejected, which sharply contrasts with my reception in Moscow where the reception was very warm.

She considers that there is no suspicion whatsoever about her. In her opinion letters sent from her town to our town appear to be not subjected to censorship.

The regular meeting was set for 17 of May, on May 20 she leaves for Philadelphia on her own office business and could take advantage of this journey as a good pretext, for handing over the money.

**Appearance**—A stout woman about 45 years, lame in both legs, moves with the aid of two sticks, but at the same time drives her own car.

**Conclusion**—the meeting under the cover of both contacts passed entirely normally.

I request your further directives.

6.5.44 Lamont.

On this Rabinowitch testified as follows:—

*With regard to the first paragraph:—*

Q. . . . I refer you now to Exhibit 41, another Russian document brought by the cipher clerk. It is headed *5 May Leon*—that is Koudriavtzev—*met Hermina*. The latter reported:—

*1. The correspondence with Geneva is carried on with the aid of letters and telegrams. The letters we sent as part of the mail of her organization . . .*

That is, the I.L.O.

*. . . and are not subject to scrutiny. The letters take from three weeks to a month. Telegrams several days. The last letter took about one month, she does not know the exact number of days.*

That is in the documents of the Russian Embassy, a recital of a conversation, of information that you gave to that Russian gentleman, and which was asked, as you can see, in the letter that was addressed to you and which is signed *Gisel*. Do you remember now having had that conversation?

A. That is the conversation I referred to.

- Q. And that is the information you gave to the man as indicated by this Russian document here?
- A. Yes.
- Q. All right.
- Q. Does that, paragraph No. 1, which has been read to you, correctly set out that part of the interview between you and Koudriavtzev?
- A. What should I say?
- Q. The truth.
- A. Yes.
- Q. All right. We will go to the next one.
- Q. Then if that sets out the truth, there is a statement in there:—  
*The letters we sent as part of the mail of her organization—*  
 That means that the letters which the Russian Embassy sent as part of the I.L.O. mail?
- A. Excuse me? I did not understand the question.
- Q. That says:—  
*The letters we sent as part of the mail of her organization—*  
 That says that the Soviet Embassy sent letters through the I.L.O. organization?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. And you said —?
- A. No. That does not say it.
- Q. You read that, and you said that correctly —?
- A. No, he doesn't — it is not that.
- Q. Then what do you say it is?
- A. It doesn't say anything about letters of the Embassy through the I.L.O.
- Q. Then will you translate the Russian for me and tell me what it does say, that second sentence?
- A. It speaks in general about letters.
- Q. Will you translate it, please?
- A. *The correspondence with Geneva is carried on through letters and telegrams.*
- Q. I asked you to translate the second sentence.
- A. It is a kind of code.
- Q. Never mind; just translate it?
- A. I can't translate it word for word. *The letters are sent—* I don't understand. There are words missing. I don't understand what it means.

Q. The translation we have, and to which you agreed, is this:—

*The letters we sent as part of the mail of her organization and are not subject to scrutiny.*

A. But it does not say *we sent*. It says *sent*, in the third person. It does not say *we sent*.

Q. That is what you have to say about the translation?

A. Yes.

Q. But other than that, you accept that as being correct?

*The letters take from three weeks to a month.*

A. Yes.

Q. And:—

*Telegrams several days.*

A. Yes.

Q. And:—

*The last letter took about one month, she does not know the exact number of days.*

A. Yes.

In fact Rabinowitch had received the two letters from Geneva which are recited in first of the above-mentioned documents; the first about 9th March and the second before the 13th April, 1944.

2. *As to the second paragraph:—*

Q. Then let us go to the second paragraph:—

*2. She knows not Geta A\_\_\_\_\_ but Aleksander A\_\_\_\_\_. She does not correspond with him but she could.*

Q. Meaning that you can in the future?

A. (No answer.)

Q. Are you satisfied with the translation now, witness?

A. It is difficult, because there are words missing in the Russian.

Q. Are you satisfied with the translation of the sentence, *She does not correspond with him, but she can do so?*

A. I can't say satisfactorily, because I don't understand the Russian text. It was done — you see what I mean; there are words missing in the Russian. Therefore I have no opinion on the translation.

Q. I see.

Q. You agree that whatever the translation of the document may say, the document as we have it says that you reported to Koudriavtzev

on May 5 that you did not know Geta A\_\_\_\_\_ but Alexander A\_\_\_\_\_. Is that true?

A. I don't remember that we spoke about that, but I know now that I don't know anybody by the name of Geta A\_\_\_\_\_.

Q. All right. The report also says that you stated to Koudriavtzev that you did not correspond with A\_\_\_\_\_ but that you could in the future?

A. I don't agree with that.

Q. Continuing to quote:—

*She knows that everything is in order with him. She also informed that in June 1941 he intended to go to Moscow but the beginning of the war interfered and he remained there. His visa was of 24 June.*

Do you remember having said that to Koudriavtzev in the course of that interview between you and him on May 5?

A. I don't remember.

Q. But you do not deny it?

A. I don't deny the fact that A\_\_\_\_\_ was supposed to go to Moscow.

Q. That is not the question. Do you deny the facts which are stated in that paragraph, which I read to you; that on the occasion of the meeting you had with Koudriavtzev of the Soviet Embassy, you reported to him that you did not know Geta A\_\_\_\_\_, but that you knew Alexander A\_\_\_\_\_? That you did not correspond with him, but that you could? That you knew he was all right, that everything was in order with him, and that you informed that in June of 1941 he intended to go to Moscow but the war interfered and he remained there, and that his visa was of 27 June? Is that right? Did you give that information to Koudriavtzev on May 5?

A. No, I don't remember that.

Q. You don't remember, but do you deny that you did; or do you just say that you don't remember?

A. I just say I don't remember.

Q. Did you know that he intended to go to Moscow in 1941?

A. Yes. That is what I mean; I knew the fact that he was supposed to go to Moscow in 1941.

Q. You knew that fact, but the Russians did not? Who told them?

A. I don't know. It is astonishing that they would know. They didn't know me.

Q. It is astonishing that they would know it, unless you told them?

A. No. They could have known all about it without me.

Q. How did you know he was going to Moscow in 1941, or that he intended to go to Moscow in 1941?

A. He told me so. He wrote me so. It is long ago, in 1941.

Q. And did you know his visa was of June 27?

A. I don't know that. That is what I think I could not have told that.

3. *As to the third paragraph:—*

Q. The third paragraph goes:—

*3. She knows Sisi as a good friend and helped her as a good acquaintance. She did not know anything about Sisi's work previously. Sisi's first letter was for me unexpected. About Sisi's circumstances she knows nothing.*

Did you report that to Koudriavtzev, or did you not?

A. Yes, I told him that I didn't know what Sisi was doing.

Q. So you agree with that paragraph?

A. Yes, sir.

4. *As to the fourth paragraph:—*

Q. Then paragraph 4:—

*She is fully convinced that the letters were written personally by Sisi.*

That is the letter which you received.

*Indications:—handwriting and signature, which are well known to her.*

A. I didn't say that, because as I said before the letter was typed; I remember.

Q. It is a fact that Sisi's handwriting was well known to you?

A. No. I never corresponded with Sisi. That I affirm definitely, that can't be true. I never had in my life a letter from her.

5. *As to the fifth paragraph:—*

Q. Then paragraph 5:—

*5. The insistent request of Sisi to deposit the money in the company is unknown to her and furthermore she does not*

*know anybody in the said company. As for herself she considers that Sisi told the firm about me.*

That is about Hermina?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that right; did you tell him that?

A. Yes.

6. *As to the sixth paragraph:—*

Q. Then the next paragraph:—

*Hermina will be able to deposit the money, however she would like to receive a cheque as it is difficult to carry such a large sum over the border. Hermina enjoys rights equal to persons who have diplomatic passports.*

That you told him also during the interview?

A. No. I refused to carry money across the border.

Q. That is what he says. Is that right?

A. Yes. I refused to carry money, but also cheques I refused.

Q. That is what the document says you told him?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. So that is right?

A. Yes.

Q. I will read it to you again:—

*Hermina will be able to deposit the money, however she would like to receive a cheque as it is difficult to carry such a large sum over the border. Hermina enjoys rights equal to persons who have diplomatic passports.*

So you say what appears in that paragraph is right?

A. Yes.

7. *As to the seventh paragraph:—*

Q. Then the next paragraph apparently says that your conduct is natural?

A. (No answer).

Q. It goes on:—

*She wrote the letters to Tounkin because Tounkin had received her very severely once—*

That is right?

A. Yes.



Q. It goes on:—

*—while the other requests about a meeting and the telephone conversations were rejected,—*

That is right, too?

A. Yes.

Q. It goes on:—

*—which sharply contrasts with my (Hermina's) reception in Moscow, where the reception was very warm.*

A. What?

Q. Is that right?

A. No.

Q. Well, maybe the weather is different in Moscow than in Montreal, but what do you say to that last part? You say that all the paragraph is right except that particular sentence about the reception in Moscow?

A. No; there are other paragraphs.

Q. No; I am talking about that paragraph. Let us talk about it. We took long enough about the other things. You say everything in it is right, except about the reception in Moscow, which was very wrong. I did not write that; the Russian gentleman in the Soviet Embassy wrote it, and that is what they say you reported to Koudriavtzev during the interview you had with him in Montreal?

A. (*No answer.*)

Q. What do you say?

A. I say that I don't see what kind of reception he refers to.

Q. That is not what you are asked. You are asked if everything else in that paragraph but the reference to the reception you received in Moscow is correct?

A. I don't understand it. I don't know what it means.

Q. Would you listen to the question. Is the paragraph, with the exception of the reference to your reception in Moscow, correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And how do you explain that Koudriavtzev would have made that report about your conversation in relation to Moscow, unless you referred to that?

A. In a very general way I told him it could have been. That is the way I understand it, but that is not the way I think people generally meet somebody.

Q. So the whole paragraph, with that qualification, recites exactly what you told him? The whole paragraph, with the qualification that you make about what is said about Moscow, is true?

A. With that qualification, yes; it could be true.

Q. I am not asking you whether it could be. I am asking you whether you did not in fact, as it is reported in that Russian document, tell that to Koudriavtzev while he visited you in Montreal on May 5?

A. Yes, I could.

Q. It continues:—

*She considers that there is no suspicion whatsoever about her.*  
Did you tell Mr. Koudriavtzev that you considered yourself not suspected?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then, it says:—

*In her opinion letters being sent to her town from our town —*  
COMMISSIONER:—That is from Ottawa to Montreal.

Q. —*appear to be not subject to the censor.*

A. What does that mean?

Q. Koudriavtzev reports that you told him on the occasion of the visit on May 5, that the letters coming from Montreal to Ottawa were not censored. Do you remember having said that to him?

A. No.

Q. You might, but you don't remember?

A. I don't remember.

Q. It goes on:—

*The regular meeting was set for 17 of May, on May 20 she leaves for Philadelphia on her own office business and could take advantage of this journey as a good pretext, for handing over the money.*

Is that true? You remember that this morning we had a few references to that Philadelphia trip of yours?

A. Yes, as I said, I went to Philadelphia.

Q. And what this man reports that you told him during that interview of May 5, then, is correct?

A. Yes.

8. *As to the eighth paragraph:—*

Q. All right. It goes on:—

*Appearance — stout woman 45 years, lame in both legs, moves with the aid of two sticks, but at the same time drives her own car.*

*Conclusion — the meeting under the cover of both contacts passed entirely normally.*

Is that right, what I have just read to you?

A. Yes.

With regard to the first sentence just above quoted Germina Rabinowitch testified:—

Q. What is the make of car that you were driving?

A. Ford.

Q. Ford, what year?

A. 1939.

Q. Have you your licence?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you show it to me, please? You are exhibiting licence 4913 as issued by the Quebec Revenue Office for coach, Ford serial G-5719105, issued to Miss Germina Rabinowitch, Montreal, 539 Pine Avenue West, on April 25, 1946. The other licence bears No. 59162 issued by the same bureau in the same province. That is your driver's licence?

A. Yes.

Q. Which was issued on the same date?

A. Yes, sir.

Reverting to the eighth paragraph mentioned above:—

Q. And then Mr. Motinov says, possibly, to *Gisel*:—

*I request your further directives.*

This is quite accurate, this document, is it not?

COMMISSIONER:—Miss Rabinowitch, you told Mr. Fauteux a few moments ago that you had told Koudriavtzev that you considered that there was no suspicion whatever about you. That was true? You told him that?

COUNSEL:—Yes, she told me that.

COMMISSIONER:—Mr. Fauteux read you the following sentence:—

*She considers that there is no suspicion whatsoever about her.*

You told that to Koudriavtzev?

A. That was in the letter. I don't remember.

COMMISSIONER:—Now don't start to change that. You understand perfectly the questions put to you.

COUNSEL:—In the interview of May 5 you told Koudriavtzev that you considered you were not suspected. You told that to me a moment ago?

A. Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER:—You were not suspected of what?

A. I don't know.

Q. Why would you tell him you were not suspected if there was no possibility of your being suspected?

A. I really don't know. I am not suspected; that is all.

Q. Well, I do. It is as plain as anything. You told him you were not suspected of working in collaboration with the Russians. That is what you meant, didn't you?

A. If I meant it, it is true.

The fourth document, written in Russian by Motinov, reads as follows:—

31.7.44. Leon met Hermina, the latter reported that she had handed over the money to the owner of the firm, but he did not know anything about this money. After this she sent a telegram to A \_\_\_\_\_ and a few days later he answered her that he had not received the money. Leon advised her to send another telegram to A \_\_\_\_\_ and one to the owner of the firm.

Regular meeting on 1 or 4.9.44 at 21 (possibly 15?) Leon has the times of the meeting smudged. On McTavish St.

Task—the characteristics of the institution.

28.8.44. Leon met Hermina, the latter reported that she had not received confirmation from A \_\_\_\_\_ about receipt of the money, but she received a telegram from the head of the firm in New York, who advised that he had received a telegram from A \_\_\_\_\_ with the contents "Thanks for the warm

greetings." She considers that the money has been received. At the present time it does not seem possible to send a man to Geneva. There is no reliable man and link with Geneva.

Address of A \_\_\_\_\_:

Business: Geneva International Labour Office.

Home: \_\_\_\_\_ Chemin \_\_\_\_\_, Geneva  
Regular meeting 28.9 at 9.00 (21) McTavish St.

Questioned on this document, Rabinowitch testified:—

Q. It says "*Leon*" — that is Koudriavtzev — "*met Hermina*".  
Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And it goes on:—

*... the latter reported that she had given the money to the owner of the firm but he did not know anything about this money.*

Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And it goes on:—

*After this she sent a telegram to A \_\_\_\_\_.*

Did you?

A. Yes.

Q. And it goes on:—

*... and after a few days, he answered that he had not received the money.*

Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Then it says that *Leon*, which is Koudriavtzev, —  
—*advised her*—

That is, advised you

*—to send another telegram to A \_\_\_\_\_ and one to the owner of the firm.*

Is that right? Did you send a telegram to A \_\_\_\_\_, and a telegram to the owner of the firm, to William Helbein?

A. I don't remember.

Q. You don't remember, but you don't deny it?

A. I don't deny it.

Q. All right. Then there is another meeting on August 4, 1944, at 21 hours. Koudriavtzev arranged a meeting on McTavish Street; the time of the meeting is apparently smudged.

Q. Did you meet him on McTavish Street?

A. I met him once there.

Q. That is the third time?

Q. The next paragraph starts with the word *Task* so you were given a task. It goes on:—

*The characteristics of the institution.*

Presumably that is the place you were working. Do you remember that he asked you that?

A. He asked me some information about the I.L.O.; that is all.

Q. So the document is true, then?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you furnish that information?

A. Yes.

Q. In what form?

A. I gave him some publications of the I.L.O. which are public; and I gave him a short description of the structure.

Q. Written by yourself?

A. Yes.

Q. Anything else?

A. No.

Q. Did you express any opinions?

A. No.

Q. As to the staff; as to their abilities; as to their ideas; as to their political views?

A. I gave certain characteristics of some of the members of the staff.

Q. That is not my question. Did you give your opinion —

A. I gave some characteristics as to the various persons on the staff.

Q. And their political views?

A. No.

Q. Their sympathy with Russia?

A. I don't think so. No.

Q. Their sympathy with Communism?

A. No.

Q. You say you don't think so?

A. Certainly not Communism.

Q. But Russia, perhaps?

A. Russia, perhaps.

Q. Exhibit 42† goes on to say that on August 28, 1944, Koudriavtzev again met Hermina. Is that true? Is that right?

A. Maybe.

Q. All right; let us see what took place:—

*The latter informed that she had not received confirmation from A\_\_\_\_\_ about receipt of the money—*

Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. It goes on:—

*—but she received a telegram from the head of the firm in New York, who advised that he had received a telegram from A\_\_\_\_\_ of the contents, "Thanks for the warm greetings."*

Do you remember that?

A. No.

Q. It goes on:—

*She considers that the money has been received.*

Did you tell him that?

A. (No answer.)

Q. I think if you read the document very slowly you will agree to all that is there?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you agree to that? I don't want to go through all the process of putting questions to you?

A. Yes.

Q. You remember that?

A. Yes.

Q. You remember that you met him; you met Koudriavtzev on August 28, 1944?

A. Yes.

Q. And that you informed him that you had not received confirmation from A\_\_\_\_\_ about receipt of the money, that is the \$10,000, but had received a telegram from the head of the firm in New York, that is William Helbein, who advised that he had received a telegram from A\_\_\_\_\_ of the text, "Thanks for the warm greetings", and that you considered that the money had been received?

†The fourth document; see p. 604 above.

- A. Yes. I don't remember the details, but that is the substance.
- Q. That is the substance of what took place at that interview on that date?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Then this exhibit goes on:—  
*At the present time it does not seem possible to send a man to Geneva. There is no reliable man and link with Geneva.*
- Is that right?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And it continues:—  
*Address of A\_\_\_\_\_: business: Geneva, International Labour Office.*
- That is a good address?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And Sisi was also working there, in the I.L.O.?
- A. Years ago.
- . . . . .
- Q. . . . I want to ask this. You told us a little earlier that you handled this \$10,000 transaction, and that you did not want to have anything more to do with the matter. The \$10,000 transaction was all over and done with on August 28th, when you had this last meeting with Koudriavtzev; and if you did not want to have anything further to do with Mr. Koudriavtzev, why did you arrange with him on August 28th to meet him on McTavish Street on September 28th?
- A. There is one thing; I don't remember dates. The last time I saw him I gave him this information on the I.L.O., and after that I didn't see him any more.
- Q. I did not ask you that at all. I suppose we will have to go through all this again. You just got through telling us that at your last interview with Koudriavtzev you made an arrangement to meet him on September 28th. Is your answer still the same, that you did make that arrangement, or do you want to change that?
- A. No, I don't want to change it.
- Q. All right, then; you did make that arrangement to meet him on the street, on McTavish Street, on September 28th, at nine p.m.?
- A. He suggested that.
- Q. And you agreed to it?
- A. Maybe.



- Q. That is what I am asking you, and I thought you just got through saying you did agree to that. Did you, or did you not?
- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. All right. Then will you go back and pay attention to the question I asked you a few minutes ago? If, as you say, you did not want to have anything further to do with this business, and the \$10,000 transaction was all over and done with, what were you proposing to meet Mr. Koudriavtzev on the street in Montreal on September 28th for?
- A. I just said that I don't remember was it that time that I promised him to give the information on the I.L.O. and then I met him once more. If it was after that when I made the arrangement I changed my mind afterwards, but I didn't see him after the meeting when I gave him the information on the I.L.O.
- Q. But I put the question to you in this form. You made an arrangement to meet him on McTavish Street in the month of September, and for what purpose was that meeting; to discuss what?
- A. I don't know. I don't remember.
- Q. And you made up your mind in the meantime not to go, and you did not go?
- A. I didn't see him again.
- Q. The task about the characteristics of the institution, of the I.L.O., was given to you previously, at the meeting previous to the one of August 28th, as you can see?
- A. Yes, I see.
- Q. So you must have given the characteristics on the occasion of the meeting of August 28th?
- A. Yes; so that was the last talk.
- Q. But when you had that meeting on August 28th, 1944, you agreed to meet him again?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And the meeting was set for September 28th?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And you promised you would give him any other information he would like to have?
- A. No, I didn't promise anything.
- Q. Didn't promise that?
- A. No.

Q: Didn't make any offer to him?

A. No.

The last of the above-mentioned documents is a letter written by herself August 28th, 1944, and reading as follows:—

**Enclosed a short Memorandum on the International Labour Organization.**

**I am entirely responsible for the views and opinions expressed in it. They are based on a long experience in the I.L.O. and on personal knowledge of most of the members of the staff.**

**I am, of course, at your disposal for any supplementary information as well as for the translation into Russian. Enclosed also a certain number of annexes.**

**Germina Rabinowitch**

**August 28, 1944.**

Questioned on the above exhibit she testified:—

Q. Then let us read Exhibit 38 together. That exhibit was shown to you when you recognized your signature this morning?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it is dated August 28, 1944, the same day you had that meeting which you say was the last?

A. Yes.

Q. In that letter you said:—

*Enclosed a short memorandum on the International Labour Organization.*

A. Yes.

Q. Then you go on:—

*I am entirely responsible for the views and opinions expressed in it. They are based on a long experience in the I.L.O. and on personal knowledge of most of the members of the staff.*

*I am, of course, at your disposal for any supplementary information as well as for the translation into Russian.*

*Enclosed also a certain number of annexes.*

Then you signed that, *Germina Rabinowitch* and dated it August 28, 1944?

A. Yes, sir. I told him if he wants some more information on the I.L.O. he could have it. That is no secret.

Q Well, I don't know whether there was any secret or not. You knew. You were in the habit of meeting people on street corners, and setting meetings in advance, and so on; or is this the only person with whom you did that?

A. The only person.

Q. It is quite a strange procedure, is it not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It is a secret procedure, is it not?

A. Yes.

Q. And why does it have to be secret?

A. That was not my idea.

Q. You shared the idea, did you not?

A. Well, I agreed.

Q. The question you are asked is, why did it have to be secret?

A. It doesn't need to be secret as far as I am concerned.

Q. Then why did you not send the gentleman all that information from the office of the I.L.O. on the stationery of the I.L.O. instead of giving him this information on a street corner, at street corner meetings?

A. Because Russia is not a member of the I.L.O.

Q. And was not entitled to this information?

A. Yes, anybody is entitled to it.

Q. Why did you not send it through the regular channels, then?

A. He asked personally for this information.

Q. That is not my question. Even if he asked personally for it, you could have written that from your office.

A. I could have.

Q. Why did you not?

A. Because he asked me to give them to him personally.

Q. Why did you persist in having meetings on street corners?

A. He asked for them, not I.

Being offered the opportunity to make any explanation she cared to, she said:—

Q. . . . Now, is there anything that you did not have the occasion to say, and that you would like to say to the Commission; or any explanation or any excuse, or anything? You may feel free to say anything you like; and if there are some questions that you thought should have been asked you and have not been asked, you may be free to make any statement.

A. Thank you. I would like to say first of all that whatever I did was very careless; I admit it, and I am very sorry for it. It was never done in any way to harm anybody or any country. I was very happy about being in Canada, and I never had the slightest thought or act to do anything against the hospitality which I received here, or which could do any harm to this country.

I never was connected with any political activities here. I did not know anybody mixed up with any political activities; and when I had certain contacts with the Soviet Embassy, there were certain ideas behind it which have nothing to do with being an agent or no agent.

As I said before, I had seen my family at that time in Russia, and I once already had a visa for them to come to this continent; and because of the Russians they were not released out of Lithuania and perished there later on. But at that time I still had reason to hope they were still there and still alive, and as a matter of fact I learned only much later that they died just at the end of the German occupation.

I had perhaps the foolish idea that with rendering service to A\_\_\_\_\_ and to Rachel I might have some kind of possibilities in helping my parents, who were in very great danger there in Lithuania. My parents were already old at that time, and also some younger people; but of course I thought mainly of my father and mother.

As I said before, this whole business, I was used just like a tool, and was foolish enough to let myself into that business. I did not get anything from them, because the small service I asked for they did not render it to me, even when I asked for my parents.

The other thing is that I did not do anything disloyal to the International Labour Office, nor the United States, either. I should like to say that I feel very sorry about being so careless, but at that

time that was the whole attitude during the war still. I didn't feel that I was doing any harm in contacting these people. Only later, when I saw all this secrecy and all that business, I disliked it very much, and I have never seen them again and I hope never to see them any more, and I don't know their names and I didn't care to know their names.

We consider that the evidence of this witness substantiates the documents brought by Gouzenko relating to Rabinowitch. It is unnecessary to elaborate.

SECTION VII

**EVALUATION OF INFORMATION AND MATERIAL  
HANDLED OVER**

Questions which naturally arise are how much information was obtained by the Russians by means of the illicit operations described in this Report, and what was the importance of that information.

It is impossible to say how much information was obtained, or of what it all consisted. These operations have been going on for a number of years, and the evidence does not by any means disclose the full extent of the information given, even within that one of the networks which we have been able to investigate in some detail. Enough is disclosed, however, to show that a very great deal of secret information from a number of Departments and Agencies of Government was regularly finding its way to the Russians.

The statement handed by Mr. Lozovski, the Soviet Deputy Commissar of Foreign Affairs, to the Chargé d'Affaires of the Canadian Embassy at Moscow on February 21, 1946, which is set out fully in Section IX, contains the following:—

*“In this connection, after appropriate investigation, the Soviet Government consider it necessary to make the following statement:*

*“Soviet organizations have become aware that in the latter periods of the war certain members of the staff of the Soviet Military Attaché in Canada received, from Canadian nationals with whom they were acquainted, certain information of a secret character which did not, however, present great interest for the Soviet organizations. It has transpired that this information referred to technical data of which Soviet organizations had no need in view of more advanced technical attainment in the U.S.S.R., the information in question could be found in published works on radio location, etc. and also in the well known brochure of the American J. D. Smyth, “Atomic Energy”.*

*“It would, therefore, be ridiculous to affirm that delivery of insignificant secret data of this kind could create any threat to the security of Canada.*

*“None the less, as soon as the Soviet Government became aware of the above mentioned acts of certain members of the staff*

*of the Military Attaché in Canada, the Soviet Military Attaché, in view of the inadmissibility of acts of members of his staff in question, was recalled from Canada."*

While it admits the operation of the Military Attaché, this statement is also significant because of its attempt to minimize the importance of the information and data obtained.

We did not consider it part of our duty to inquire whether there is in fact "more advanced technical attainment in the U.S.S.R.," but we are impressed by the elaborate nature of the organization set up by Russians to obtain information, and by the lengths to which their agents were prepared to go in the furtherance of that purpose.

We can say that our investigation has satisfied us that none of the secret information and data which the evidence shows was handed over could, at the time it was handed over, be found in any published works. If it could, it would not be secret as the Russian statement admits it was. The Smyth report is dealt with in Section VIII.

The witnesses who appeared before us were not able to speak with any authority about what the Russians knew or had achieved along scientific lines because they were unanimous that the Russians told no one what they knew or what they were doing. As one witness put it, the Russians "took everything and gave nothing out". It is clear that the information sought was considered of the greatest importance by the Russian espionage leaders, and that alone might be a fair test on the question of value.

But the evidence is that some of the information supplied standing alone would appear to have little, if any value. This, however, does not mean that it was in fact valueless. The evidence indicates that there were agents working along the same lines in the United Kingdom, the United States, and elsewhere. The Russians would know from their agents in Canada that information was being pooled: by getting some information on a subject here, some in England and some in the United States, and then assembling it, a very large body of data could be built up. It is therefore impossible to say that any information handed over, no matter how trivial it might appear by itself, was not of some value.

Furthermore the fact that work carried to a certain stage in one country, would be carried a stage further or to completion in another, would mean that for adequate evaluation the material obtained in one place would have to be checked against that obtained in another.

However much secret and valuable information was handed over. Some of it is so secret still, that it can be referred to only obliquely and with

the greatest care, and this is especially so in the case of certain secret information shared by Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

From the beginning there was the closest co-operation in scientific research between Canada, the United Kingdom and, later, the United States. While some secrets were not fully shared, as in the case of some details concerning the atomic bomb, the results of continuing research work by scientists in one country was in almost all cases at once communicated to their opposite numbers in the other two. Work carried to a certain stage in one would be further advanced in another; and experimentation and research did not stop when a reasonably satisfactory result appeared to have been achieved but further improvements were sought and frequently made.

As to the question of atomic energy and the work done by nuclear physicists, we are able to say in the first place that on the evidence before us no one in Canada could have revealed how to make an atomic bomb. There was no one in Canada who had that information. In the second place there is no suggestion in the evidence that anyone who had any information on the subject made any disclosures except May. As to May, he did have certain information that would be of value to the Russians. He was in a position to get, where we do not know but possibly in Montreal, samples of Uranium 235 enriched and Uranium 233; he did get them and did deliver them to Lt. Angelov. These samples were considered so important by the Russians that upon their receipt, Motinov flew to Moscow with them. May also possessed considerable knowledge of the experimental plant at Chalk River, Ontario, which was described as "unique". In addition to May's work in Canada, he also did some work in the United States in collaboration with American scientists, but the evidence before us is that in such work also he could not properly have obtained the full story. How much of his information he handed over we are not able to say, but what he is known to have given, as shown by the documents and by his own written statement, we are told would be of considerable help to the Russians in their research work. May, in his written statement, did not particularise about the extent of the information he gave, but stated in effect that it was more than has since appeared (i.e. in the *Smyth* Report). He said that he gave his "contact" a "written report on atomic research as known to me. This information was mostly of a character which has since been published or is about to be published."

Next to the atomic bomb it would appear to us that the development of Radar was perhaps the most vital work accomplished by the English-



speaking Democracies in the technical field during the period in question. British scientists had already done valuable pioneering work before 1939, but the improvements made since then have been considerable and many of these are still in the Top Secret category. Information of the greatest importance in this field was communicated to the Russians by agents.

The work done in connection with anti-submarine devices, Asdic, is as important as the work done on Radar—some authorities say that it is more important. Much of it is still in the Top Secret category. The information before us leads us to the conclusion that much, and very possibly all, of the information available in Canada on this subject has been compromised. It would at least be unwise to assume anything else.

The advances made in Canada by Canadians in developing and improving explosives and propellants were outstanding. Canadian scientists were given very full information on the work being done in the same fields in the United Kingdom and the United States. The very names of many formulas are still supposed to be secret: the production methods even more so. But the names and much of the secret information were given to the Russians as well as continuing information about trials, experiments and proposed future research. This information was of great value.

Another development in which Canada played a leading role is the "V.T. Fuse", the name being a code name. "This is the fuse that knocked the Japanese Air Force out of the air", and it was used against the Germans in the latter part of the European War. The wiring details and the details of manufacture are still classified as secret. This fuse was developed in Canada. "We started to work in 1943", said a witness, "and developed it to the place where we had to put it into manufacture; but we had no place to manufacture it so we gave this secret to the Americans, and they, with their own knowledge and ours, produced this fuse. Canadians have been in on this right from the very beginning". One of the agents upon whom we are reporting had the wiring diagram of this fuse. There are certain details of the manufacture which were known only to the Americans; and the United States of America is, we are told, the only country that can build the fuse at the present time. This fuse is the "electro bomb" referred to in some of the Russian documents. None of the armaments sent to Russia during the war included this fuse.

In conclusion, therefore, we can say that much vital technical information, which should still be secret to the authorities of Canada, Great Britain and the United States, has been made known to the Russians by reason of the espionage activities reported on herein. The full extent of the

information handed over is impossible to say; as we have already pointed out, these operations have been going on for some time. We should emphasize that the bulk of the technical information sought by the espionage leaders related to research developments which would play an important part in the *post-war* defences of Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Much of the information handed over by agents such as Adams, Benning and Gerson comes in a different category from the technical and scientific information dealt with above. This second category may be described briefly as economic information. It included information on production, location of industries, transportation, and planning. It included also information regarding a wide variety of financial matters and matters pertaining to international trade and commercial policy. It is sufficient to say here that the amount of material in this category which was handed over was very great indeed, and that much of it was classified as Secret or Top Secret. Regarding the evaluation of this material, we will say only that this information appears to have been such as would be designed to facilitate detailed estimates of Canada's post-war economic and military potential. Parts of this information could also be useful in connection with possible sabotage operations.

There is a further category of information which we should mention briefly. In addition to material on technical, scientific and economic subjects, the espionage leaders also sought—and obtained from agents in the cipher division of the Department of External Affairs and in the registry of the Office of the United Kingdom High Commissioner at Ottawa—political information. Much of the political information obtained was classified as Top Secret and related not only to the policies of the Canadian Government but to those of the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States. The value of information of this type needs no particularization.

Again, Canadian citizenship documents such as passports, naturalization certificates, and marriage or birth certificates were sought for illegal purposes and in some cases obtained. Such documents were sought not only for use in Canada but also, as illustrated for example by the Witzak passport case dealt with in Section V of this Report, for use in the United States. Sam Carr accepted in 1945 an assignment to facilitate the entry of other planted agents into Canada in the future, and it is clear that this type of operation, which was not a new development, was intended to be used more extensively in the future. Such planted agents could in time be used not only for espionage but for sabotage, leadership of subversive political groups, and other

purposes. It is unnecessary to comment on the possible gravity of these operations.

The other aspect of this whole matter should not be lost sight of. Of paramount importance is the fact that Canadians were willing to give secret information no matter what its importance, and were carrying out their agreements. Some gave all they had or all they could get; others apparently gave only some of what was in their possession; some had not much to give but were in positions where they would, in the future, have been able to give more and they would undoubtedly have done so. The most important thing is the agreement of certain Canadian Communists to work under foreign orders in a conspiracy directed against their own country.

## SECTION VIII

### ARRANGEMENTS MADE BY THE CANADIAN DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE FOR SUPPLYING INFORMATION OFFICIALLY TO THE SOVIET MILITARY ATTACHE

The Canadian Department of National Defence had set up an organization to maintain liaison with the Military Attachés of the various foreign governments represented in Ottawa, including the Soviet Military Attaché, and to supply them officially with all authorized information which they might seek.

This official system was described in a directive of 18th December, 1943, sent to all foreign Military Attachés in Ottawa and to the various branches of the Canadian armed forces, and was reprinted in booklet form in July, 1945. Requests for information or for permission to visit any officer in National Defence headquarters were to be made to the Secretary, Department of National Defence. Requests for technical information would then be referred to the technical directorate concerned to assemble the information and then to the Directorate of Intelligence which was responsible for deciding whether or not such information could be handed over.

Colonel Jenkins, the Canadian staff officer in charge of liaison with foreign Military Attachés in Ottawa, has stated to us that this system worked very well in general. He mentioned that his Department was slightly concerned about the activities of Major Sokolov. This Soviet officer, while wearing uniform, was not officially on the staff of the Military Attaché of the Soviet Embassy but on that of the Commercial Counsellor. (As has been stated in Section II, Sokolov was in fact one of Zabotin's espionage agents, and his ostensible position on the staff of another section of the Embassy was deliberate).

Major Sokolov disregarded the official procedure laid down for foreign Military Attachés and officers of their staffs, and made direct enquiries of technical units. Colonel Jenkins drew Colonel Zabotin's attention to this breach of regulations on October 25, 1944. Zabotin replied that he had no authority over Sokolov as the latter was working for the Commercial Counsellor although wearing a uniform. Colonel Jenkins stated before us:—

“Other foreign officers in Canada with other Governments, we were able to bring under the control of the Military Attaché but not in the case of the Russians.”

Colonel Jenkins has testified that his Department had been aware of certain irregularities by Major Sokolov in connection with minor abuses of Canadian business contacts made in the course of his duties in connection with the Mutual Aid programme.

Regarding official requests from Colonel Zabolin for information, Colonel Jenkins detailed such requests and submitted a complete list, which we reproduce:—

<b>Date</b>	<b>Request</b>	<b>Result</b>
1943		
Sept.	Authorization for Col. Zabolin to visit Artillery and Engineer Demonstrations at Petawawa Military Camp and Armament Corps Training at Camp Borden.	Granted.
Dec.	Authorization for Col. Zabolin to visit anti-aircraft defences at Arvida.	Granted.
1944		
June	Miscellaneous Canadian Training pamphlets.	Supplied.
June	Authorization for Col. Zabolin to visit certain military establishments in Halifax in connection with his trip there with R.C.A.F.	Granted.
Nov.	Cold weather reports.	Supplied.
Nov.	Comparative ranks of the three services' badges, etc.	Supplied.
Nov.	Canadian Army Manual of Maintenance and Lubrication.	Supplied.
Dec.	Publications dealing with infantry weapons used in the Canadian Army.	Supplied.
Dec.	List of Canadian Army Uniforms.	Supplied.
Dec.	Authorization for visit of Col. Zabolin to R.M.C.	Granted.
Dec.	Authorization for visit of Lt.-Col. Motinov and Major Rogov to Paratroop Training Centre.	Granted.
1945		
Mar.	List of German Divisions on the Western and Eastern fronts.	Supplied.
May	Miscellaneous Training pamphlets.	Supplied.

Date	Request	Result
1945		
Oct.	Information about the expedition "Mulberry".	Press release supplied and Col. Zabolin invited to exhibition of model.
Nov.	Information on Canadian post-war army organization.	Given copy of Minister's speech in House of Commons 16 October 1945.

In June, 1945, Col. Zabolin was advised that the Department of Munitions and Supply had given permission for him to visit Scarbow Fuse Loading Plant at the invitation of the President of General Engineering Co. In September, 1945, he was advised of an invitation by the R.C.A.F. to all foreign Military Attachés to attend a demonstration of jet-propelled aircraft (*Meteor*).

In fact no information whatsoever, officially asked by Colonel Zabolin was refused.

Zabolin apparently considered this surprising even between allies, and attributed it to what he considered an unusual personal generosity on the part of Colonel Jenkins. This is illustrated by the following document, a telegram signed by Zabolin and sent to Moscow on 23rd August, 1945:—

260

To the Director,

1. In your letter is indicated as No. 1—the Chief of the operational division, Colonel Jenkins—but the character outline was taken from the file of Dick. Colonel Jenkins has not been a candidate of ours for development. With Jenkins have been established good mutual business relations. From him I am getting quite valuable materials. Thus for example, recently I received from him a series of materials on the tasks mentioned in your telegram No. 10921. I have never planned the development of the latter, as he is a Reserve Officer and must soon retire. His retirement is not in our interest as it is hardly likely that his future replacement will be as good a man as he is. So far there has been no occasion when Jenkins refused us anything whatsoever. I consider that the

**subject of your letter was about Dick. Please elucidate.**

**Grant.**

**23.8.45.**

("Dick" is the cover-name of another Canadian Colonel, referred to in Section II, 5. a).

On 26th September, 1944, Colonel Zabotin wrote asking permission to visit German prisoner-of-war camps across Canada. While this request was under consideration, the Soviet Ambassador approached the Department of External Affairs on the matter, which was then handled by that Department and is dealt with elsewhere in this Report.

The Soviet Military Attaché accompanied the other foreign Military Attachés on conducted visits to Canadian Army Exercises at Wainwright in August of 1944 and at Churchill in January, 1946.

The evidence showed that Zabotin did not make any official enquiries in respect of important matters, and Colonel Jenkins' comment to us was that the list above quoted "brings out the point which we had often discussed among ourselves, and that is how, not futile, but how reasonable were . . . (Zabotin's) . . . official requests. We see the reason now".

The reason, or rather reasons for this official restraint on Zabotin's part are obvious. The very innocuous nature of the official requests was calculated to lull the Canadian authorities into a sense of security, so they would have no suspicion of the secret activities of Zabotin and his assistants or the staff of the Soviet Embassy, and also to convince them how correct the Russian attitude was.

When asked whether any of the official requests for information indicated that the Russians were in possession of information that they could not properly have obtained, Colonel Jenkins replied, "No, as far as we were concerned we were absolute fools, had no idea at all."

The evidence further shows that Zabotin at no time ever indicated a desire to exchange information. Colonel Jenkins said that all his section got from Zabotin was bundles of pamphlets or magazines, *Military Thought* and *Air Fleet News*, which Zabotin would bring in every three months or so.

In fact, it appears that Zabotin was embarrassed by an official invitation from the Canadian General Staff to lecture at the Royal Military College, Kingston, on the organization of the Red Army. He was afraid that any misleading information which he might give might not tally with informa-

tion given in Moscow to the foreign Military Attachés there. He decided, however, that this difficulty could be solved by limiting himself to material published in a Soviet magazine. On 22nd August, 1945, he sent the following telegram to Moscow on this matter:—

268

To the Director,

A letter was received from the General Staff, signed by Colonel Jenkins, asking us to give a lecture on the organization of the Red Army, at the Military College in Kingston. I visited that place in the spring of this year. I consider that no lecture on that subject should be given. There is a plan at the General Staff whereby all Military Attaches were requested to make reports. A number of attaches have already made these reports. I therefore find myself in a disadvantageous position. I think it expedient to make a report along the lines of two articles from No. 3 of the magazine "Voyennaya Misl" ("Military Thought"), namely the article by Marshal Rotmisterov of the tank troops and the one by Colonel General Samsonov. After this I will be able to press Jenkins and get a series of materials to fulfill your tasks for 1945.

A somewhat similar report to be made by Rogov on the materials from the magazines "Vestnik Vozdooshnovo Flota" ("Air Force News"), and to make use of the occasion I should together with him visit the Staff College of the Air Force in Toronto. I beg you to make the desired corrections.

N. Zabotin.

22.8.45

It will be observed that Zabotin signed official telegrams to Moscow, the subject matter of which did not concern his espionage activities, with his real name. It is not surprising, however, that he occasionally became confused. One of his telegrams laid before us by Gouzenko, dealing with purely personal matters, is significant. It is in Zabotin's handwriting and he had signed it *Grant*. Realizing his error, Zabotin then crossed out *Grant* and substituted his real signature, "N. Zabotin". We give this telegram because of its significance in further authenticating the documents:—



To the Director,

My son Vladimir has successfully completed his Ten-Year School. He declined to enter the institute of international relations and is preparing to enter the first Moscow Artillery School which is named after Krasin, from which I graduated in 1924. In order to send my son off I ask to leave for a very short term. It appears to me that the time has come also for me to be at the centre to discuss a series of questions regarding our work. If it is indeed impossible for me to leave, I ask to send my wife with my son. I beg you facilitate the entry of my son in the Artillery school and to advise me of the time of departure. My wife cannot fly in an aeroplane.

\*

Grant N. Zabolin

\*

2.8.45.

In this section we have referred to one of the arrangements made by the Canadian authorities for the official supply of information to the Soviet military authorities. This has been necessary because of the light it throws on the abuse which Zabolin made of his official position in Ottawa. We have, therefore, not considered it necessary to deal in this Report in any other way with the official supply by Canada of material or information to the Soviet Union through the various channels set up for this purpose. In particular, we are not here concerned with the material or information supplied during the war by Canada to the Soviet Union through the Canadian Mutual Aid programme or through the joint arrangements made for this purpose by Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States.

\* Faint type indicates words crossed out in original documents.

## SECTION IX

### AUTHENTICITY AND ACCURACY OF THE RUSSIAN DOCUMENTS

Gouzenko carried away with him on the night of the 5th September, 1945, when he permanently severed his connection with the Soviet Embassy, the documents which have already been referred to in this Report.

No occasion was neglected throughout the inquiry to test their authenticity and accuracy. We were, however, steadily and increasingly impressed by the evidence as it developed during these numerous and lengthy sessions. It brought to light an unhappy but unfaded picture of organized and progressing spying activities in Canada.

We have before us certain admissions made by the Soviet Government; admission by conduct of certain members of the Soviet Embassy at Ottawa; and express admissions by certain persons in the service of the Canadian Government. We have before us other relevant evidence which we shall also discuss.

#### **The Admissions Made in Moscow by the Soviet Government**

In the capital of the Soviet Union, on the 20th February, 1946, at 10.15 p.m. Deputy Commissar of Foreign Affairs, Solomon Lozovski, invited Leon Mayrand, Chargé d'Affaires at the Canadian Embassy in Moscow, to call at his office and then read to him a two-page statement from the Soviet Government in reply to that made by the Canadian Prime Minister of Canada on the 15th of the same month. A copy of this note recited in a telegram has been filed before us as Exhibit No. 519, the text of which is as follows:—

**On February 15th this year the Canadian Government published a statement about the delivery in Canada of secret information to persons not having the right of access to this information, including certain members of the staff of a foreign Mission in Ottawa. On handing this statement to the Soviet Charge d'Affaires, N. D. Belokhovostikov, the Prime Minister, Mr. King, stated that the reference in the Canadian Government's statement to certain members of the staff of a foreign Mission referred to members of the staff of the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa.**

In this connection, after appropriate investigation, the Soviet Government considers it necessary to make the following statement:

Soviet organizations have become aware that in the latter periods of the war certain members of the staff of the Soviet Military Attache in Canada received, from Canadian nationals with whom they were acquainted, certain information of a secret character which did not, however, present great interest for the Soviet organizations. It has transpired that this information referred to technical data of which Soviet organizations had no need in view of more advanced technical attainment in the U.S.S.R.; the information in question could be found in published works on radio location, etc., and also in the well-known brochure of the American, J. D. Smyth, *Atomic Energy*.

It would, therefore, be ridiculous to affirm that delivery of insignificant secret data of this kind could create any threat to the security of Canada.

None the less, as soon as the Soviet Government became aware that the above-mentioned acts of certain members of the staff of the Military Attache in Canada, the Soviet Military Attache, in view of the inadmissibility of acts of members of his staff in question, was recalled from Canada. On the other hand, it must also be borne in mind that the Soviet Ambassador and other members of the staff of the Soviet Embassy in Canada had no connection with this.

At the same time the Soviet Government finds it necessary to draw attention to the unbridled anti-Soviet campaign which began in the Canadian press and on the Canadian radio simultaneously with the publication of the Canadian Government's statement. In spite of the complete lack of significance and importance of the circumstances which gave rise to the Canadian Government's statement of February 15th, this anti-Soviet campaign is being supported by many Canadian organizations, and at the same time the position taken up by the Canadian Government is directly aimed at encouragement of this anti-Soviet press and radio campaign which is incompatible with normal relations between the two countries.

In this connection, surprise is occasioned by the unusual fact that the Canadian Government published its statement on February 15th instead of, as is customary between countries in normal relations, previously asking for an explanation from the Soviet Government. Inasmuch as the Canadian Government did not consider it necessary to approach the Soviet Government for a previous explanation, it must be admitted that the Canadian Government herein was pursuing some other ends having no relation to the security interests of Canada.

It must be admitted that the above-mentioned unbridled anti-Soviet campaign formed part of the Canadian Government's plan aimed at causing the Soviet Union political harm.

It cannot be considered a mere chance that Mr. King's statement was made to coincide with the ending of the session of the Assembly of the United Nations where the Soviet Delegate spoke in defence of the principle of democracy and independence of small countries. Evidently Mr. King's statement and the anti-Soviet campaign in Canada which has been developed in connection with it are something in the nature of an answer to the unpleasantness caused to Mr. King's friends by the Soviet Delegate at the session of the Assembly.

The fact that the Soviet Government made the admissions contained in this document within five days after the public announcement of the Canadian Prime Minister is cogent evidence that the documents taken from the Russian Embassy by Gouzenko were genuine and that the statements in them were true.

#### **Admission by Conduct of Certain Russian Officials in Ottawa**

Two sets of circumstances in immediate sequence of Gouzenko's sudden departure from the Embassy, established by several witnesses, have now to be considered in relation to the question of authenticity and accuracy of the documents brought before the Commission by Gouzenko.

The first lies in the extraordinary steps taken by night by certain members of the Soviet Embassy staff, led by Pavlov, the head of the N.K.V.D. in Canada, at apartment 4 of 511 Somerset Street in the City of

Ottawa, the residence of the Gouzenko family, evidencing an anxiety over the situation that had arisen.

The second set of circumstances following immediately these nocturnal activities consists in the exchange of official communiques between the Soviet Embassy and the Department of External Affairs in Ottawa.

These two sets of circumstances, which are fully dealt with in Section X, establish, we think, the authenticity of the documents, the knowledge of their disappearance contemporaneously with Gouzenko's departure, and the extreme eagerness to repossess them.

We think also that Colonel Zabolin's departure from Ottawa in December 1945, without notifying the Canadian authorities to whom he was accredited, and his departure from New York on a Soviet ship, S.S. *Alexander Suvorov*, which sailed clandestinely at night without complying with port regulations, is also significant from the point of view here being considered.

### **Some of the Stationery Traced to Soviet Embassy**

While activities of the kind with which this report deals are conducted very secretly, they involve a certain amount of unavoidable recording, written communications, notes and reports.

Oral and documentary evidence (invoices and ledger sheets) show that during 1945 the Military Attaché purchased, from a local dealer in Ottawa, black folders of the same make and type as those produced by Gouzenko marked *Back, Badeau and Frank* which record the activities of Gordon Lunan, Durnford Smith, Sam Carr, and those working with them.

The evidence also established that similarly there was purchased in Ottawa in 1945 by the Soviet Embassy, blue sheets and pink sheets of paper identical with those produced by Gouzenko on which the telegrams to and from Moscow he brought were written. The sheets of paper produced by Gouzenko were examined by a witness who testified that the ruling and perforation on the same were specially made by his firm on the order of a representative of the Soviet Embassy.

### **Handwriting of Colonel Zabolin, Colonel Rogov and Lieutenant Colonel Motinov Identified**

Gouzenko identified the handwritings on the various documents he produced.

While in Canada, Colonel Zabolin, Colonel Rogov and Lt. Colonel Motinov were extended hospitality by Canadians. We had before us several

pages with the printed heading "*Friends of Ours*", extracted from a guest-book kept by an Ottawa resident at his hunting lodge. Colonel Zabin on the 15th October, 1944 and Colonel Rogov and Lt. Colonel Motinov on the 26th October, 1944, were guests at this Lodge, and each wrote several sentences, in addition to his signature, in the guest-book.

A handwriting expert, having compared the handwritings in the guest-book with the handwritings in the Russian documents, testified that the handwritings in the documents were rightly attributed by Gouzenko to Zabin, Rogov and Motinov respectively. We accept this evidence.

### **Handwritten and Typewritten Documents from the Russian Embassy Traced to Employees of the Canadian Government or Agencies Thereof**

1. Gouzenko filed with us as Exhibits 24-a, 24-b, 24-c and 24-d four documents written in English on common correspondence stationery, which he says he took from the vault in room 12 of the Soviet Embassy. These documents were found to be in fact copies or summaries of actual telegrams from the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, London, to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Ottawa, respectively dated August 24th, 1945, August 24th, 1945, August 25th, 1945 and August 31st, 1945, as the Russian documents purported to be.

Emma Woikin was, on all these dates, a cipher clerk on duty in the Department of External Affairs, and she admitted that the documents brought by Gouzenko had, in fact, been written by her and given by her to Mrs. Sokolov.

2. A single photostat sheet of a document handwritten in English, filed as Exhibit 27, also came, said Gouzenko, from the brief case of Lt. Col. Rogov kept in the vault in room 12 of the Embassy.

This document purports to be a report on the activities of an agent named *Badeau* later identified as Durnford Smith.

David Gordon Lunan admitted before us that he had written the original of this photostat document, and had handed it to Rogov.

3. Three photostat sheets, handwritten in English, filed as Exhibits 26-a, 26-b and 26-c, Gouzenko also said he took from Rogov's brief case.

These documents contained notes, formulae and drawings, the substance of which was, after investigation, traced and related to a certain project of the Micro-wave Section of the Radio Branch of the National Research Council.

A handwriting expert testified before us that these three documents were in the handwriting of Durnford Smith, a member of that Section.

Heard as a witness, Smith did not deny that it was his handwriting. He said it "looked like" his.

4. Filed as Exhibit 28 is one sheet of ruled paper written in English on both sides with perforations on the left-hand side, which Gouzenko said he took from the same safe. This document, handwritten, describes the operation of a gun and a method of filling shells with RDX/TNT.

Searches were made in the files of the Ammunition Branch of the Department of Munitions and Supply with the result that the original of the above document was located in a secret file of the Ordnance Board. This particular document is No. 31,719 and is dated 25th July, 1945.

Harold Samuel Gerson, an employee of the Department at that date, admitted that the document filed with us by Gouzenko had been written by him.

5. Two sheets from a small loose-leaf notebook, each written on both sides in English, and purporting to give the names of the Heads and Assistant-heads of the Radio Section, the Air Force Section, the Naval Micro-wave Section, and the Special Research and Development Section of the National Research Council, were filed by Gouzenko as 17-k, 17-l, 17-m and 17-n.

A handwriting expert gave evidence that these documents had been written by Durnford Smith. Smith himself, connected with the Micro-wave Section, would not admit but would not deny that these documents had been written by him.

6. Gouzenko also brought several sheets pasted into a black-folded file headed *Back*. These were typewritten in the English language, and have been marked as Exhibits 17-d, 17-e and 17-f. These purport to be reports from *Back* to *Jan*.

Captain David Gordon Lunan, identified by Gouzenko as the agent acting under the cover-name of *Back* was shown these documents and admitted having typed them himself on his own typewriter and delivered them to Rogov.

**The Connection Shown in the Russian Secret Documents between the various Canadian Agents is reflected and amplified in the private documents found in their possession.**

The majority of names appearing in the documents brought by Gouzenko have been identified by him as being cover names for places, organizations and persons.

Gouzenko easily identified the cover names used for all the Russians and from information which he had obtained by perusing the dossiers on individual agents, and the notebooks, incoming and outgoing telegrams and other documents, and from conversations in which he took part or which he heard at the Soviet Embassy, he was able to identify some of the persons who were not Russians and were mentioned under cover names, although with one exception he had not met any of them. A few of the names, he said, were real names, though inaccurately and phonetically spelled by the Russians in the English or in the Russian language.

The searches carried on in the respective residences or offices of those who were detained under Order in Council P.C. 6444, revealed that many of them had been in close contact with each other.

**SUMMARY OF EXHIBITS ON THE MATTER**

<i>Found at residence or office of</i>	<i>Nature of document</i>
MAZERALL . . . . .	Calendar pad taken from office desk—mention of LUNAN.
LUNAN . . . . .	Telephone number finder taken from office—mention of MAZERALL, MISS CHAPMAN, DURNFORD SMITH, POLAND, SHUGAR.
LUNAN . . . . .	Book of addresses and telephone numbers—mention of NIGHTINGALE, POLAND, ROSE, BOYER et al.
LUNAN . . . . .	Small book of addresses—mention of BOYER, AGATHA CHAPMAN, POLAND et al.
NIGHTINGALE . . . . .	Diary—mention of AGATHA CHAPMAN, FRITZIE LINTON (Grierson's Secy.), SHUGAR, BENNING et al.
BOYER . . . . .	Diary—mention of SHUGAR, LUNAN.
BOYER . . . . .	Booklet—mention of SHUGAR.
BOYER . . . . .	Letter—ROSE to BOYER "Dear Comrade".
BOYER . . . . .	Letter—signed "Arthur & Edith" (Steinberg).
BOYER . . . . .	Letter—signed "D. S. SHUGAR".
	Letters between BOYER and LUNAN.
BOYER . . . . .	Book containing names of STEINBERG, NORMAN VEALL, GERSON, LUNAN et al.
BOYER . . . . .	Group photo. of BOYER, LUNAN et al.
	Letter "Dear Nicholls" signed "STEINBERG".



<i>Found at residence or office of</i>	<i>Nature of document</i>
GERSON . . . . .	Notebook from Gerson's home—mention of Mrs. BENNING, CHUBB, AGATHA CHAPMAN, NIGHTINGALE et al.
ADAMS . . . . .	Booklet found in Adams' home—mention of DURNFORD SMITH.
ADAMS . . . . .	Calendar pad from Adams' office—mention of BOYER.
ADAMS . . . . .	Calendar pad from Adams' office—mention of SAM.
ADAMS . . . . .	Calendar pad from Adams' office—mention of AGATHA CHAPMAN.
SMITH . . . . .	Notebook found in bedroom of DURNFORD SMITH—mention of DAVID SHUGAR.
HALPERIN . . . . .	Address book found at Halperin's home—mention of ERIC and JO ADAMS, DR. BOYER, NIGHTINGALE, FRED ROSE, DAVE SHUGAR et al.
BENNING . . . . .	Notebook from Benning's office—mention of AGATHA CHAPMAN, FRED ROSE, NIGHTINGALE, POLAND, ADAMS, GERSON, SHUGAR et al.
POLAND . . . . .	Telephone finder from Poland's office—mention of AGATHA CHAPMAN, LUNAN.
POLAND . . . . .	Calendar pad for 1945 from Poland's desk—mention of PAVLOV.
POLAND . . . . .	Calendar pad for 1946 from Poland's office—mention of PAVLOV.
POLAND . . . . .	Notebook from Poland's home—mention of NIGHTINGALE.
POLAND . . . . .	Ottawa-Hull Telephone Directory for 1945 from Poland's home—AGATHA CHAPMAN'S name written in.
POLAND . . . . .	Letter found in Poland's home—mention of LUNAN.

### **Conclusion**

The conclusion that the documents which Gouzenko brought are authentic, is inescapable. We have given as illustrations some of the factors which establish the authenticity of particular documents. Many other illustrations could be given, and perusal of the Sections of this Report dealing with the illicit activities of the Russian Fifth Column agents will provide further instances. In addition to the admissions of the accuracy of statements in the documents regarding their participation in illicit activities made by the persons concerned, and already set out in this Section, Boyer, Mazerall, Willsher, Rabinowitch and May made similar admissions, the last named when questioned after his return to the United Kingdom. These admissions are dealt with in the relevant Sub-Sections of Section III of this Report.

On the other hand no evidence has been forthcoming from any source which casts the least doubt on the genuine nature of any of the documents.

There are instances, of course, of inaccuracies in matters of fact due to the human element; had such been entirely absent, there would have been cause for suspicion. It is in some of the small things which the documents record, that there is furnished significant confirmatory ground for our conclusion. Two examples may be given:—

1. Opposite an entry of August 25th, 1945, in Motinov's handwriting, in the Smith (*Badeau*) dossier, which entry records a street-corner meeting in Ottawa, there is a marginal note, under the heading "*Remarks*" reading:—

**Was a torrential downpour, but he nevertheless came.  
Gave instructions not to come in the future in such  
weather; it is not natural.**

The meteorological records for Ottawa, including an automatic rain gauge chart, for the 25th August, 1945, and a rainfall chart for the entire month of August, show that there was very heavy rainfall on the evening of the 25th August, and that this was by far the heaviest rainfall of any day during the month.

2. In Lunan's (*Back's*) dossier, a Russian record of another secret meeting between Lunan and Rogov held on the 6th August, 1945, includes the statement:—

**Concerning Bacon and Badeau he communicated that  
he had not seen them, that both are on an official  
journey; he also communicated that both to him and to  
Bacon a child had been born.**

The fact of these births was confirmed in evidence by both Lunan (referred to as "*he*" in the document) and Halperin (*Bacon*). We think we need not say more on this subject.

## SECTION X

### IGOR GOUZENKO

As we have already said, this witness, Igor Gouzenko, arrived in Canada in June, 1943, to act as cipher clerk for the Military Attaché, Colonel Zabolin, who came at the same time. Gouzenko's duty was to decipher messages from Moscow for the Military Attaché and to encipher Zabolin's messages for transmission to Moscow. Gouzenko also had charge of a safe in the room where he worked, in which papers of the Military Attaché and members of his staff were kept from time to time, and it was part of his duty to burn such papers as Zabolin indicated should be destroyed. On September 7th, 1945, under circumstances hereinafter set out, Gouzenko turned over to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police a number of papers from the Embassy relating to espionage activities of certain members of the Embassy, and made disclosure of the facts within his knowledge relating to the matter.

It will, perhaps be convenient that we should, at this point, deal with the facts leading up to the making of these disclosures by Gouzenko. We propose to deal with this branch of the evidence rather fully, for it has a bearing upon the weight to be attached to Gouzenko's evidence. Having heard that evidence and the evidence of other witnesses who came into contact with Gouzenko on September 6th and 7th, 1945, we have been impressed with the sincerity of the man, and with the manner in which he gave his evidence, which we have no hesitation in accepting.

Gouzenko is a young man, born in Russia in 1919. He holds the rank of Lieutenant in the Red Army and received special training in Russia leading up to his coming to this country. When he was sent out from Russia he says he had the understanding that he was being sent out for a two or three year period. In or about September of 1944, a telegram was received from Moscow by Colonel Zabolin indicating that Gouzenko's return to Russia was required. Owing to representations then made by Colonel Zabolin, this did not take place and Gouzenko was allowed to remain. Ultimately however, in August, 1945, definite instructions came from Moscow that Gouzenko must return with his wife and child. Gouzenko says that he had been having a struggle with himself as to whether or not he should return to Russia. He says that when he arrived in Canada he was impressed by the complete freedom of the individual which he found existing, which was utterly foreign to his experience in Russia and foreign to the information which he

had received in Russia as to life in the democratic countries. He was impressed with the things that were on sale in the stores and the fact that these things were there to be purchased by anybody who wanted to buy. He was also greatly impressed with the freedom of elections in Canada and the contrast between the freedom of nominating candidates and voting in Canada and the system which he had known in Russia, where one name only appeared on the ballot. He also says that he had seen how the Canadian people had sent supplies to the Soviet Union and collected money for the welfare of the Russian people, while all the time members of the Russian Embassy were developing under-cover espionage activity directed against Canada.

He says that in the Embassy, the fact that the Soviet Union was preparing for a third world war was freely talked about. He says there were two schools of thought there. Those who were not really tied in with the Communist Party feared another world war, while those who were ardent Members of the Party and its subsidiary organizations really wished for it, because they thought that to be part of the process leading toward a general upheaval throughout the world which would result in the establishment of Communism. Asked as to what antagonist was considered in these conversations to be facing Russia, he says that capitalism still remained to be overthrown. He further said that the announced abolition of the *Comintern* was merely a sham; that the work of the *Comintern*, which formerly, by reason of its preponderance of representatives therein, had always been controlled by Russia, is now directed exclusively by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

We report this evidence without comment, except to say that we see no reason to doubt that Gouzenko has reported what he in fact heard, and that he regards what he heard as serious. He has said, and we believe that he thinks, that any such ideas are not in the true interests of the Russian people themselves. On the 10th of October, 1945, he made a formal statement, upon which he was examined before us. We reproduce that statement here:—

**I, Igor Gouzenko, wish to make the following statement of my own will:**

**Having arrived in Canada two years ago, I was surprised during the first days by the complete freedom of the individual which exists in Canada but does not exist in Russia. The false representations about the democratic countries which are increasingly propo-**

gated in Russia were dissipated daily, as no lying propoganda can stand up against facts.

During two years of life in Canada, I saw the evidence of what a free people can do. What the Canadian people have accomplished and are accomplishing here under conditions of complete freedom—the Russian people, under the conditions of the Soviet regime of violence and suppression of all freedom, cannot accomplish even at the cost of tremendous sacrifices, blood and tears.

The last elections which took place recently in Canada especially surprised me. In comparison with them the system of elections in Russia appear as a mockery of the conception of free elections. For example, the fact that in elections in the Soviet Union one candidate is put forward, so that the possibilities of choice are eliminated, speaks for itself.

While creating a false picture of the conditions of life in these countries, the Soviet Government at the same time is taking all measures to prevent the peoples of democratic countries from knowing about the conditions of life in Russia. The facts about the brutal suppression of the freedom of speech, the mockery of the real religious feelings of the people, cannot penetrate into the democratic countries.

Having imposed its communist regime on the people, the Government of the Soviet Union asserts that the Russian people have, as it were, their own particular understanding of freedom and democracy, different from that which prevails among the peoples of the western democracies. This is a lie. The Russian people have the same understanding of freedom as all the peoples of the world. However, the Russian people cannot realize their dream of freedom and a democratic government on account of cruel terror and persecution.

Holding forth at international conferences with voluble statements about peace and security, the Soviet Government is simultaneously preparing secretly for the third world war. To meet this war, the Soviet Government is creating in democratic countries, including Canada, a fifth column, in the organization

\*Sentence underlined in original document.

of which even diplomatic representatives of the Soviet Government take part.

The announcement of the disolution of the Comintern was, probably, the greatest farce of the Communists in recent years. Only the name was liquidated, with the object of reassuring public opinion in the democratic countries. Actually the Comintern exists and continues its work, because the Soviet leaders have never relinquished the idea of establishing a Communist dictatorship throughout the world.

Taking into account least of all that this adventurous idea will cost millions of Russian lives, the Communists are engendering hatred in the Russian people towards everything foreign.

To many Soviet people here abroad, it is clear that the Communist Party in democratic countries has changed long ago from a political party into an agency net of the Soviet Government, into a fifth column in these countries to meet a war, into an instrument in the hands of the Soviet Government for creating artificial unrest, provocation, etc., etc.

Through numerous party agitators the Soviet Government stirs up the Russian people in every possible way against the peoples of the democratic countries, preparing the ground for the third world war.

During my residence in Canada I have seen how the Canadian people and their Government, sincerely wishing to help the Soviet people, sent supplies to the Soviet Union, collected money for the welfare of the Russian people, sacrificing the lives of their sons in the delivery of these supplies across the ocean—and instead of gratitude for the help rendered, the Soviet Government is developing espionage activity in Canada, preparing to deliver a stab in the back of Canada—all this without the knowledge of the Russian people.

Convinced that such double-faced politics of the Soviet Government towards the democratic countries do not conform with the interests of the Russian people and endanger the security of civilization, I decided to break away from the Soviet regime and to announce my decision openly.

\*Our underlines.

**I am glad that I found the strength within myself to take this step and to warn Canada and the other democratic countries of the danger which hangs over them.**

**(sgd) Gouzenko.**

**I have read the foregoing translation which was made from my original statement in Russian, and have found it to be correct.**

**October 10th, 1945.**

**(sgd) Gouzenko.**

It was under the influence of such considerations as we have mentioned, that Gouzenko finally decided to leave the Soviet service and to take with him documents which would establish the kind of activity being carried on under the cover of the Russian Embassy.

During the last few weeks prior to his departure from the Embassy on the 5th of September, 1945, he selected a number of documents which he left in their places in the files, the edges or corners of which he turned over in order that he might pick them out quickly at any time. On the 5th of September he left the Embassy, with the documents, at about 8.00 p.m.

The first thing he did was to go immediately to one of the daily newspapers published in the city, with the intention of asking that newspaper to publish his decision and the reasons for reaching it. Whoever he interviewed at the newspaper office did not act in accordance with his desire. On leaving the newspaper office he proceeded to the apartment where he resided, and the next morning, September 6th, he, his wife and child, left the apartment to remain away until between 6.00 and 7.00 o'clock in the evening.

He made a number of calls during the day to various official offices and called again upon the newspaper. He was unable that day to have anyone accept him seriously.

On returning to his apartment he was evidently under some apprehension as to his personal safety and that of his wife and child. He says that he had not been long in the apartment, which is No. 4, when he noticed two men standing on the opposite side of the street who appeared to be keeping it under observation. Shortly after that someone knocked on his door and called his name. While he did not answer the door, his presence in the apartment was disclosed by the noise of his child running across the

room. He says he recognized the voice of the person at the door as that of Under-Lieutenant Lavrentiev, one of the drivers for the Military Attaché.

Gouzenko thereupon went out through the back door to the adjoining apartment, No. 5, occupied by a Non-Commissioned Officer of the R.C.A.F., and asked if this officer and his wife would be willing to keep his child for them overnight. The Non-Commissioned Officer and his wife have both appeared and given evidence before us.

He said:—

“Well, my family and I were out on our balcony at about 7 o'clock in the evening, between 7 and 7.30, and Mr. Gouzenko came over from his balcony and asked if he could speak with me. I told him sure he could speak with me, if he had something to say; so he asked me if the wife and I would look after their little boy if anything should happen to him and his wife. So about that time I figured maybe we should go inside, so we went into our apartment, and while in there he said he figured that the Russians were going to try to kill him and his wife, and that he wanted to be sure that somebody would look after his little boy if anything should happen to them.

So after a bit of a conference my wife and I decided we would look after him, because we didn't want to see him stuck with nobody to look after him should anything happen to them.”

On coming out the back door of the R.C.A.F. Non-Commissioned Officer's apartment, which opens on to a balcony, both men saw a man walking along a lane at the back of the apartment house. As a result of this incident, Gouzenko became so apprehensive that he asked the N.C.O. if he, Gouzenko, and his wife could also be taken in by them and they agreed to do that. At this juncture the wife of the tenant in another apartment, No. 6, on the same floor, appeared and, on hearing the story, agreed to take the whole Gouzenko family for the night as she was alone in her apartment. The R.C.A.F. man thereupon, on his own initiative, set off on his bicycle for police assistance.

The lady who took in the Gouzenkos was also called as a witness before us, and we have heard her evidence as to these and the later events of the night. These later events were also described to us by the police officers who subsequently appeared on the scene, and may be summarized as follows:—



As the result of the request for the assistance of the municipal police, two constables, Walsh and McCulloch, in a prowler car were sent to the apartment and arrived there sometime after 7.00 p.m. They interviewed Gouzenko in Apartment 6 and he told them he was a member of the Russian Embassy and had information of value to Canada. He told the police officers he thought he was being trailed and he wanted protection. Arrangements were accordingly made that the police officers would keep the apartment building under surveillance and that, if their help was needed, the light in the bathroom of apartment 6 was to be turned out. In the meantime it was to be kept on.

Between 11.30 and midnight four men arrived in the building and proceeded to Gouzenko's apartment, No. 4, on the door of which they knocked. The Non-Commissioned Officer occupying apartment 5, thinking it was the police returning, opened his door. The men in the hall asked if he knew where Gouzenko was, but he said he did not. Then they continued knocking, but, not getting any answer, went downstairs, as though to leave. Instead of doing so, however, they returned quietly, knocked again, and then broke in the door and entered. The Non-Commissioned Officer, who had in the meantime gone into his apartment, could hear this operation.

In the meantime the police had been summoned and they arrived. The door was not closed tight and the two constables entered and found the lights on and the four men evidently ransacking the apartment. One who turned out to be Vitali Pavlov, the Second Secretary and Consul of the Embassy proper, and head of the N.K.V.D. in Canada, was in a clothes closet. One, in uniform, identified as Lieutenant-Colonel Rogov, the Assistant Military Attaché, Air, was in a closet just off the room into which the constables entered, which in the opinion of the constables he was engaged in ransacking.

Walsh asked what the men were doing there. Pavlov, who did practically all the talking, said they were Russians and they were looking for papers which belonged to the Russian Embassy; that the owner of the apartment had left town and was in Toronto and they had his permission to go into the apartment and get what they wanted. Walsh remarked that it was funny if they had permission that they had broken the lock to get in, and he picked up from the floor the keeper of the lock and said "This does not look as if it has been done with a key. You must have used a bit of pressure to get in and from the marks on the door you did not put them there with your fingers." Constable McCulloch testified that Pavlov

said they had "lost the key but there was something in there they had to get." Pavlov then said the premises were Russian property and they could do as they liked. Rogov said the constables had insulted them and Pavlov ordered them out, but the policemen refused to go until their Inspector arrived. Walsh asked for their identification cards and they identified themselves as:—

Vitali G. Pavlov, 2nd Secretary, Embassy U.S.S.R., 285 Charlotte Street,

Lieutenant Angelov, Member of the staff of the Military Attaché,  
Lieutenant-Colonel Rogov, Military Attaché, Russian Air Force,  
Alexandre Farafontov.

The last named is one of the cipher clerks of the Embassy used by Pavlov for the purposes of his communications to and from Moscow.

The Inspector ultimately arrived and sized up the situation. He asked the members of the Embassy to remain while he went out to make some inquiries, but while he was gone they left. No attempt was made by the police to hold them.

Pavlov took an ordinary door key out of his pocket and locked the ordinary lock in the door, the Yale lock of course being out of commission. Both Constables, Walsh and McCulloch, as well as the Non-Commissioned Officer of the R.C.A.F., all stated that the door of apartment 4 was locked and in good condition at the time of the previous visits of the constables. McCulloch, on arriving with Walsh the first time, had been met by the R.C.A.F. Non-Commissioned Officer at the top of the stairs and, on McCulloch asking for Gouzenko, they were referred to apartment 6 and apartment 4 was indicated to them as Gouzenko's apartment. McCulloch tried the door of apartment 4 before proceeding to number six.

Gouzenko, his wife and child, remained in apartment 6 for the rest of the night, under the care of the city police. There was a later caller at apartment 4 in the night but he retired in a short time without incident. On the morning of the 7th of September, Gouzenko was taken to the office of the R.C.M.P. where he turned over his documents, told his story and asked to be kept in protective custody as he feared for his safety and that of his wife and child.

On the 8th of September, 1945, the Department of External Affairs received from the Soviet Embassy at Ottawa a note, dated September 7th, a translation of which reads as follows:—

The Embassy of the U.S.S.R. in Canada presents its compliments and has the honour to inform the Department of External Affairs of the following:

A colleague of the Embassy, Igor Sergeievitch Gouzenko, living at 511 Somerset St., failed to report for work at the proper time on the 6th September.

In connection with this and for the purpose of clarifying the reasons for the failure of I. Gouzenko's reporting for work, Consul V. G. Pavlov and two other colleagues of the Embassy visited the apartment of I. Gouzenko at 11.30 on the 6th September.

When Mr. Pavlov knocked at the door of Gouzenko's apartment no one answered. After this the apartment was opened by the above-mentioned colleagues of the Embassy with Gouzenko's duplicate key, when it was discovered that neither Gouzenko, nor his wife, Svetliana Borisovna Gouzenko, nor their son Andrei, were in the apartment.

It was later established that I. Gouzenko robbed some money belonging to the Embassy and had hidden himself together with his family.

At the time when Consul Pavlov and the two other colleagues of the Embassy were in Gouzenko's apartment, i.e., about 11.30 p.m., Constable Walsh of the Ottawa City Police appeared together with another policeman and tried in a rude manner to detain the diplomatic colleagues of the Embassy, in spite of explanations given by Consul Pavlov and the showing of diplomatic cards.

As a result of the protest expressed by Mr. Pavlov, Walsh called Inspector of the City Police Macdonald, who appeared at the Gouzenko apartment in fifteen minutes, and also in a rude manner demanded that Consul V. G. Pavlov and the other diplomatic colleagues of the Embassy go with him to the Police Station, refusing to recognize the diplomatic card shown by Consul Pavlov.

Upon the refusal of Mr. V. G. Pavlov to go to the Police Station, Mr. Macdonald went away, leaving a policeman in the Gouzenko apartment with the colleagues of the Embassy, for the alleged purpose of

finding out who it was who had notified the police of the forced entry into the Gouzenko apartment.

Consul V. G. Pavlov and the other two colleagues of the Embassy, after waiting for Mr. Macdonald to return for 15 minutes, left, having locked the Gouzenko apartment.

The Embassy of the U.S.S.R. asks the Department of External Affairs to take urgent measures to seek and arrest I. Gouzenko and to hand him over for deportation as a capital criminal, who has stolen money belonging to the Embassy.

In addition the Embassy brings to the attention of the Department of External Affairs the rude treatment accorded to the diplomatic colleagues of the Embassy by Constable Walsh and Inspector of the City Police Macdonald, and expresses its confidence that the Department will investigate this incident and will make those guilty answerable for their actions.

The Embassy asks the Department that it should be informed of action taken in relation to the above.

Ottawa, 7th September, 1945.

The reference in the above note to Gouzenko as a *capital* criminal may be noted. We are satisfied that the suggestion that there was a theft of money was an afterthought. Gouzenko, whose evidence we accept, denied it.

In a note of the 14th of September, 1945, from the Russian Embassy to the Department of External Affairs, the following, as translated, appears:—

**Confirming its communication in the Note No. 35 of Sept. 7th of the fact that Gouzenko had robbed public funds, the Embassy, upon instructions from the Government of the U.S.S.R. repeats its request to the Government of Canada to apprehend Gouzenko and his wife, and without trial, to hand them over to the Embassy for deportation to the Soviet Union.**

**The Soviet Government expresses the hope that the Government of Canada will fulfill its request.**

It only remains to add that Pavlov settled for the damage done to the door and frame of apartment No. 4 and paid the owner of the premises \$5.00 therefor. Further, although the Department of External Affairs

asked the Soviet Embassy for particulars of the monies stolen, this inquiry was never answered. We think these circumstances dispose of the theft suggestion.

We may add that the evidence of the witnesses we have heard respecting the happenings of the 6th and 7th of September fully corroborates that of Gouzenko.

It seems pertinent at this point to amplify what is said of Gouzenko's history in Section II. He was born in 1919 in Russia. He received education in primary and secondary schools and later entered the Academy of Engineering in Moscow, but after two months was sent to a special school conducted under the aegis of the General Staff of the Red Army. Gouzenko never became a member of the Communist Party, but became a member of the *Komsomol*, or *Young Communists*, at the age of seventeen. According to him, it was not usual in peacetime to admit *Young Communists* to this Academy, but during the war, owing to shortage of suitable candidates, it was decided to admit *Young Communists* for training.

It was in this school that he learned the secret codes he later employed. From here he was sent to the Main Intelligence Division of the Red Army in Moscow, and was then sent to the front in May, 1942, where he remained for about one year. The Soviet authorities decided toward the end of 1942 to send Gouzenko abroad, but had not then decided to which country to send him. His "documentation" took approximately six months to complete and included a very careful investigation of him by the N.K.V.D., the Russian Secret Police. The final stage in such investigation of Soviet officials about to be sent abroad was the approval of the head of the Foreign Branch of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party, or one of his assistants. In the case of Gouzenko, he was attended to by one Goussarov, who later became one of the Secretaries of the Embassy at Ottawa. It has been observed in Section II that Goussarov was the representative of the Communist Party in the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa, and that communications between him and Moscow were through the medium of a secret cipher also independent of the Ambassador. Goussarov's particular cipher clerk was one Patony.

Gouzenko says that all persons of his category, at least, sent abroad, were given a "legend" for the purpose of covering the fact that they were engaged in intelligence work.

This "*legend*" is a fictitious biography which the person concerned had to commit to memory. By this means, inquiry in Moscow by representatives of foreign powers there, as to the antecedents of such individuals, would be rendered fruitless. All documents made up for use abroad by such an individual are made up from this "*legend*".

. . . . .

In our opinion Gouzenko, by what he has done, has rendered great public service to the people of this country, and thereby has placed Canada in his debt.