

Documents in support of Mr. Karlheinz Schreiber's testimony


KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

INDEX

Binder #5: Correspondence between Prime Minister Harper and Karlheinz Schreiber

TAB	Document
1.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated June 16, 2006 <u>3rd party document</u>
2.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated July 31, 2006 <u>3rd party document</u>
3.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated August 4, 2006 <u>3rd party document</u>
4.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated August 23, 2006 <u>3rd party document</u>
5.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated August 30, 2006 <u>3rd party document</u>
6.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated September 26, 2006 <u>3rd party document</u>
7.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated October 27, 2006 <u>3rd party document</u>
8.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated November 30, 2006 <u>3rd party document</u>
9.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated December 13, 2006 <u>3rd party document</u>
10.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, copying BM, dated January 16, 2007 <u>3rd party document</u>
11.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated January 24, 2007 <u>3rd party document</u>
12.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated March 29, 2007 <u>3rd party document</u>
13.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated April 8, 2007 <u>3rd party document</u>
14.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated April 10, 2007 <u>3rd party document</u>
15.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated May 3, 2007 <u>3rd party document</u>

16.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated September 26, 2007 <u>3rd party document</u>
17.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated November 19, 2007 <u>3rd party document</u>
18.(a)	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated November 20, 2007 (Version #1) <u>3rd party document</u>
18.(b)	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated November 20, 2007 (Version #2) <u>3rd party document</u>
18.(c)	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated November 20, 2007 (Version #3) <u>3rd party document</u>
19.(a)	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated November 22, 2007 (Version #1) <u>3rd party document</u>
19.(b)	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated November 22, 2007 (Version # 2) <u>3rd party document</u>
19.(c)	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated November 22, 2007 (Version # 3) <u>3rd party document</u>
20.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated November 25, 2007 <u>3rd party document</u>
21.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, copying Stephane Dion, Jack Layton, and Gilles Duceppe, dated January 10, 2008 <u>3rd party document</u>
22.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated February 7, 2008 <u>3rd party document</u>
23.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated February 21, 2008 <u>3rd party document</u>
24.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated September 24, 2008 <u>3rd party document</u>
25.	Letter to Prime Minister Harper from Mr. Schreiber, dated March 1, 2009 <u>3rd party document</u>



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

61740161

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper P.C., B. A., M. A.
Prime Minister
80 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A2

June, 16 2006

Subject: The Liberal legacy of scandal

Dear Prime Minister,

The insidious, destructive poison which your government inherited from its predecessors may very well prove to be, in terms of its international repercussions and its impact on Canada's reputation, by far the greatest, most fateful and most damaging scandal in Canadian political history.

The evidence under oath by RCMP Staff Sergeant Fraser Fiegenwald in an Examination for Discovery on March 8, 2006 in a civil action between myself and the Attorney General of Canada and Her Majesty the Queen and at the preliminary hearing in the "Eurocopter" case have finally shed light on the beginning of the fictitious "Airbus Affair" and confirmed the existence of a far more pernicious "Political Justice Scandal".

Staff Sergeant Fiegenwald, the RCMP officer in charge of the investigation, confirmed that the RCMP had no evidence of any criminal behavior involving Prime Minister Mulroney, Frank D. Moores or myself. What he did confirm, in fact, was that the stories came from a convicted Swiss criminal, Giorgio Pelossi, and since 1988 from Stevie Cameron, a journalist, writer and later a confidential RCMP informant and complainant.

As we know, the involvement of the Hon. Allan Rock, then the Minister of Justice, in the "Political Justice Scandal" was not the beginning, but merely one further element in the Liberals consistent strategy of undermining the Mulroney government and thereby seriously damaging the Progressive Conservative Party, with the willing assistance of the Liberal bureaucracy, support from the media, the RCMP and through the Canadian Embassy in Germany the involvement of the district attorney in Augsburg, Germany.

MackAY LAKE ESTATES
7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9
Tel: 613-748-7330 Fax: 613-748-9697

The players that were responsible for the "Political Justice Scandal" are the individuals who stage-managed it and those who failed to discharge their political responsibilities by remaining silent or tolerating what went on in Canada, Germany, France, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Costa Rica, Austria, Liechtenstein and Switzerland damaging conservative politicians including suicides and changing the political situation in Europe.

The initiators: Hon. Allan Rock, Stevie Cameron, CBC The fifth estate, Giorgio Pelossi.

Responsible yet silent: The Right. Hon. Jean Chretien, The Right. Hon. Paul Martin, Hon. Anne McLellan, Hon. Martin Cauchon, Hon. Irwin Cottler.

Dereliction of duty:

Solicitors General: Hon. Herb Gray, Hon. Andy Scott, Hon. Lawrence MacAulay, Hon. Wayne Easter, Hon. Anne McLellan.

The abused: The RCMP with Commissioners J.P.R. Murray and Giuliano Zaccardelli, who rejected the initial allegations by Hon. Allan Rock Minister of Justice as unsubstantiated, but apparently yielded subsequently to political pressure or opportunism.

This strategy, which we can say, based on what I now know, is ongoing and the persecution and the cover-up of the "Political Justice Scandal" continue, both here in Canada and in the international arena. The Hon. Elmer MacKay was correct in his letter August 27, 1997 to Commissioner J. P. R. Murray when he named the matter to be a long term "ass-covering and face-saving" operation simultaneously.

On Jan 9, 1997 Allan Rock, Minister of Justice & Attorney General of Canada and Philip Murray, Commissioner of RCMP sent a letter of apology to me and informed me about the settlement agreement with the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney. My answer in a letter Jan 20, 1997 was: "I recognize your apology but this matter will only be properly clarified in a courtroom".

On October 24, 1997 my lawyer filed the Statement of Claim in the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta in Edmonton.

On March 1, 2001 RCMP Supt. Mathews learned from Jim Shaw, an Edmonton counsel representing the Federal Government of Canada, about the problems with a confidential RCMP Informant. Supt. Mathews tried to fix the problem and coded Stevie Cameron seven years backwards "code 2948" in order to protect the Crown and not to jeopardize the Alberta case with Karlheinz Schreiber.

My lawyer Edward L Greenspan Q. C. stated in an interview with the Globe & Mail 26/02/04: "We are at the front end of what will prove to be an incredible scandal."

Mr. Greenspan said it will eventually emerge that top figures in the Liberal government approved the investigation of Mr. Mulroney, knowing full well it was being launched on information from an anonymous journalist.

There are still unresolved matters in the Eurocopter case, as Ontario Superior Court judge Edward Then has yet to rule on whether he was misled by the RCMP or the Crown when he issued orders in 2001 sealing court documents.

The RCMP abandoned the Airbus investigation in 2003, but the baton was passed to the fraud case involving Eurocopter Canada (MBB Helicopters). Once again, the ultimate target of this case was Brian Mulroney. I then found myself, after a two-year RCMP sting operation, once more in the position of the victim of an unsuccessful attempt to designate me as a hostile witness.

In November 2005, Justice Bélanger dismissed the Eurocopter case for lack of evidence and thereby finally laid the "Airbus Affair" to rest.

On December 30, 2005 the Crown appealed this judgment, thereby resurrecting the "Airbus Affair" and with it, implicitly, the allegations against Brian Mulroney.

The situation leaves my claim for damages against the Attorney General as the only avenue that can lead to disclosure in a courtroom of the truly unbelievable extent of the vendetta waged by the former government against Brian Mulroney, Frank D. Moores, myself and ultimately the Conservative Party and a number of highly respected international companies, including Thyssen (now ThyssenKrupp), MBB (now Eurocopter) and Airbus Industries with EADS and DaimlerChrysler.

In order to avoid my demolishing this vendetta once and for all in a Canadian courtroom, through my lawsuit, the justice system has until now sought to have me extradited to Germany, based on an Extradition Treaty without Reciprocity, downgrading the value of my Canadian Citizenship or to neutralize me by having me put in jail in Canada with the help of undercover agents and misleading statements to the court regarding my bail conditions.

Since 1996, many Members of the House of Commons, including your self, Mr. Gilles Duceppe, Mr. Peter MacKay, Mrs. Pierrette Venne, Mr. Jack Ramsay, Mr. Michel Bellehumeur, Mr. Chuck Strahl, Mr. Kevin Sorenson, and members of the Senate have asked from time to time in vain for an official investigation. I submit time has finally come for Canadian taxpayers to be able to find out what the "Political Justice Scandal" has cost so far and what will be the estimated costs for the ongoing saga and the upcoming lawsuits for damages.

Brian Mulroney, the international Industrial Companies, many conservative politicians and I have borne the brunt of the case for the past twelve years and at this point there is still no closure in sight.

The result of the recent federal election changed the situation and all pending actions of the "Political Justice Scandal" in Canada and other countries are now under the jurisdiction of your government.

Will the Attorney General in your government continue with the delay tactics of the Liberal Attorneys General in my Alberta court action who hope that I lose my extradition case at the Supreme Court of Canada and be extradited to Germany?

This would prevent me from pushing forward the legal case and bury the "Airbus Affair" and the "Political Justice Scandal" at the same time. Would this be in the interest of Canada? I think not.

Will the Minister of Justice & Attorney General like his predecessor ignore the false German statements and political blackmail in my extradition case?

My lawyer Mr. Edward L. Greenspan Q. C. informed the Hon. Vic Toews Minister of Justice & Attorney General about the comments recently made publicly by the Chief Prosecutor and by the Judicial Spokesperson for the Court in Augsburg, Germany.

No cleanup in government can take place in Canada without an intensive parliamentary investigation of what is, in terms of its international implications, the largest scandal in Canadian history. This is entirely consistent with your announced intention to appoint an independent Director of Public Prosecutions, the Federal Accountability Act and Action Plan.

In 1985, I became the Chairman of Thyssen-Bearhead Industries and came to Ottawa on the request of the Canadian Government and the Right Hon. Prime Minister Brian Mulroney to create jobs in the Province of Nova Scotia. For eight years I worked on the project. I had to learn that the Liberal bureaucracy with Paul Tellier and Bob Fowler in Ottawa undermined the policies of the strong majority Government of Brian Mulroney at every opportunity. What I did find? Lies, fraud, attempt of manslaughter, conspiracy, greed, ignorance, arrogance, disappointment, breach of agreements and great sadness for Canada and Canadians. Thyssen, the Canadian soldiers, the people of Nova Scotia and I have been misused and betrayed after Thyssen spent more than \$ 60 million on the project for peacekeeping and environment-protection.

I am sure you will appreciate that under the circumstances I can only turn to you, since all the other government agencies responsible are still involved and as a result are not interested in clarification. I have taken the liberty of attaching a number of documents for your information.

Prime Minister this is your opportunity to bring this insanity to an end and the truth coming out in the greatest political cleanup in Canadian History.

The "Political Justice Scandal" began in the year 1994, is still moving ahead and will not disappear on its own.

Yours sincerely,



Karl Heinz Schreiber



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

62140194

57e351

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper, P. C., M. P.
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, July 31, 2006

Dear Prime Minister,


I am taking the liberty of sending you copies of my letters to

The Hon. Peter MacKay, P.C., M.P. July 25, 2006

Mr. Kevin Sorenson, M.P. July 25, 2006

for your personal information.

Yours sincerely,



MacKAY LAKE ESTATES
7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9
Tel: 613-748-7330 Fax: 613-748-9697

KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

Mr. Kevin Sorenson M.P.
4945 - 50 Street

Camrose, AB
T4V 1P9

Ottawa July 25, 2006

Dear Mr. Sorenson

I read with great interest the speech you gave in the House of Commons on October 22, 2001. I attach three pages of your speech to this letter to refresh your memory and I am sure that you still endorse the same principles as you did at that time. I have underlined relevant portions of your speech.


Your assumption that the "Airbus affair" could turn out to be a very big political scandal was correct, as it in my view combines the biggest "political justice scandal" in Canadian history with the most serious international implications.

The vendetta began in the early 1980s and has continued unabated. The main victims are the Canadian people, The Right Hon. Brian Mulroney und myself, Karlheinz Schreiber.

On June 16, 2006 I wrote to the Right Hon. Stephen Harper and sent a number of relevant documents, which I enclose for your information.

I wish you a pleasant stay in Alberta and remain,

Yours sincerely



MackAY LAKE ESTATES
7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9
Tel: 613-748-7330 Fax: 613-748-9697

KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

62140194

attachments

The Hon. Peter Gordon MacKay, P.C., M.P.
Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of the Atlantic Opportunities Agency

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, July 25, 2006

Dear Minister

I read with great interest the statements you gave in the House of Commons on May 27, 1998 and February 17, 1998. I attach six pages of your statements to this letter to refresh your memory and I am sure that you still endorse the same principles as you did at that time. I have underlined relevant portions of your statements.

You stated: "The government is faced with a very important issue, which relates directly to integrity and accountability.

Will the government do the right thing and call a public inquiry into the Airbus scandal? If the Prime Minister and the present Minister of Health had no roles in this affair, surely there is nothing to hide.

When this happens, Canadians will be allowed to finally see the truth".

Dear Minister unfortunately Canadians are still waiting for that moment to come. Nothing has changed. The biggest "Political Justice Scandal" in Canadian History with the most serious international implications is still moving ahead on several different places.

It looks like fate that both of your Ministries may have to deal with the "Political Justice Scandal".

Foreign Affairs:

The people who initiated the vendetta in Canada are the same in Germany and other countries. The German Conservatives lost two Federal Election and were forced into a great coalition with the Social Democrats after the last election. The Minister for Foreign Affairs and the one for Justice are Social Democrats. I am sure that Chancellor Angela Merkel will loose the next election, if the scandal continues the way it is now.

ACOA:

The people behind the "Political Justice Scandal" are the same, which are responsible for the tremendous fraud on the Thyssen Krupp Bear Head Project in Nova Scotia. You are very familiar with the company, the project, (an ACOA Project) and the victims, which are the Canadian people in Nova Scotia, the Canadian Peacekeeping soldiers, ThyssenKrupp and myself.


MACKAY LAKE ESTATES
7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9
Tel: 613-748-7330 Fax: 613-748-9697

On June 16,2006 I wrote to the Right Hon. Stephen Harper and sent a number of relevant documents, which I enclose for your information.

On May 17,2006 my Lawyer Edward L. Greenspan Q. C., LL. D., D. C. L. sent a letter to the Hon. Vic Toes Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, which I provide for your attention. (See tap 18 in the folder "Political Justice Scandal" International Case.)


I wish you good luck and success with your difficult and important job.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "S. Harper", written over the typed name "Yours sincerely". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Attachments:

Letter to The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper, Prime Minister June 16, 2006
Letter to The Hon. Allan Rock, Minister of Justice January 20, 1997
Letter from Department of Justice to Mr. Robert W. Hladun, Q. C. June 5, 2006
Letter to Department of Justice from Mr. Robert W. Hladun, Q. C., June 22, 2006
Letter to Department of Justice from Mr. Robert W. Hladun, Q. C., July 25, 2006
Letter from Augsburg City Tax Office to Office of the Public Prosecutor Augsburg State Court August 2, 1995 (regarding Canadian Embassy)
Letter from Edward L. Greenspan, Q. C., LL. D. ,C. L.



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

622 10185
575517

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper, P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, August 4, 2006

Dear Prime Minister,

I am taking the liberty of sending you copies of

The letter from the Department of Justice to Robert Hladun Q.C., July 31, 2006
regarding discovery of Mr. Allan Rock

The letter from Robert Hladun Q.C. to the Department of Justice, July 25, 2006

The letter from Robert Hladun Q.C. to the Department of Justice, July 22, 2006

The letter from the Department of Justice to Robert Hladun Q.C., June 5, 2006

The affidavit from Melissa Smith, sworn June 2, 2006

The letter from Robert Hladun Q.C. to the Department of Justice, March 1, 2006

for your personal information.

The documents confirm the content of my letter to you from June 16, 2006 and the reason
why I can only return to you.

Yours sincerely,



MackAY LAKE ESTATES
7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9
Tel: 613-748-7330 Fax: 613-748-9697



Department of Justice
Canada

Ministère de la Justice
Canada

Edmonton Regional Office
211 Bank of Montreal Bldg
10199 - 101 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 3Y4

Bureau régional d'Edmonton
Edifice de la Banque de Montréal
211 rue 101 - 10199
Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 3Y4

Telephone: (780) 495-6051
Facsimile: (780) 495-6300

Internet: christine.ashcroft@justice.gc.ca

Our File: 2-90141
Notre dossier:

Your File: 45890.1
Votre dossier:

July 31, 2006

BY FAX

Hladun & Company
Barristers and Solicitors
100, 10187 - 104 Street
EDMONTON, Alberta
T5J 0Z9

Attention: Robert W. Hladun
Fax # 424-0934

Dear Sir:

RE: Schreiber v. The Attorney General of Canada

Thank you for your letter requesting discovery of Mr. Allan Rock. We can advise that we object to any examination of Mr. Rock.

At common law, the Crown is not compellable at discovery. It is only through legislation that it may be compelled to discovery. Section 7 of the Regulations passed pursuant to the *Crown Liability and Proceedings Act* states that an officer or servant of the Crown may be designated for examination for discovery. The Court of Appeal has interpreted this section to mean that except for the right to examine a Crown designated officer, there is no machinery for examination for discovery as of right. See *CDIC v. Prisco*, (1997) 206 A.R. 283 (C.A.)


This decision was followed in *Milne and Milne v AG of Canada et al.*

Quite apart from the foregoing, there is case law regarding when a Minister may be examined. There must be special circumstances, and there must be no other person who is equally well-informed.

6 2140 194
attachments

In any event, we will object to the examination of any person other than the Crown officer.

Yours truly,



CHRISTINE A. ASHCROFT
Counsel
Civil Litigation and Advisory Services

CAA/jr

Tel.780.423.1888

100, 10199 - 101 Street

Fax.780.423.0934

Edmonton, AB T5J 3Y4

www.hladun.ca

(507)



Original 15737
Your file 2-77605

July 25, 2006

Department of Justice Canada
211, 10199 - 101 Street
Edmonton, AB T5J 3Y4

Via Fax: 495-6300
(Original retained)

Attn: Christine Ashcroft

Dear Madam:

Re: *Karlheinz Schreiber v. The Attorney General of Canada*
Q.B. Action #9703 20183

Please be advised that we have been instructed to examine for discovery Allan Rock, as a former employee of the Defendants, pursuant to Rule 200(1)(c) of the Alberta Rules of Court. Accordingly, please contact the writer's assistant to make the necessary arrangements for this examination.

Yours truly,

HLADUN & COMPANY

Signed in the writer's absence to avoid delay
ROBERT W. HLADUN, Q.C.
KFS/ms

cc: Karlheinz Schreiber - via fax



Tel. 780.423.1888 100 St. James Street, Suite 1000, Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0P9
Fax: 780.424.0974
www.hladun.com

15737

Sur file 2-77605


June 22, 2006

This is Exhibit "B" referred to in the Affidavit of

Joanne Romans

Sworn before me this 13th day of July A.D., 2006

Tania Norris
A Notary Public, A Commissioner for Oaths
in and for the Province of Alberta



Ms. Christine Ashcroft
Department of Justice Canada
#211, 10199 - 101 Street
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 3Y4

Dear Madam:

Re: **Karlheinz Schreiber v. The Attorney General of Canada**
Q.B. Action #9703 20183

TANIA NORRIS
Commissioner for Oaths
My Commission Expires
May 30, 2008

Further to your June 5, 2006 letter, this is to re-confirm that June 27, 2006 at 10:00 a.m., is the date upon which we will return to Court of Queen's Bench Chambers relative to our outstanding Notice of Motion.

By way of general response to your June 5, 2006 letter, it's quite clear to the writer, that "a fishing expedition" is being embarked upon in an effort to dissuade Mr. Schreiber from pursuing his legitimate claims as set out within the Amended Amended Statement of Claim, for example:

- a) Swiss banking records, records of contracts or undertakings in principle, are clearly irrelevant to the lawsuit.
- b) Banking records have been recognized by the Supreme Court of Canada as privileged and attract privacy protection section 8 Charter of Rights.
- c) Mr. Schreiber's business dealings are clearly irrelevant and not at issue.

On Examination for Discovery, there may well be some latitude, though confined to the allegations raised in the pleadings and not "fishing expeditions".

Yours truly,

HLADUN & COMPANY

Dictated, but not read and signed
in the writer's absence by:

Rosechuk
f ROBERT W. HLADUN, Q.C.
RWH/dr
Via fax 495-6300 and mail

18-Jul-06 10:08

From-Hladun & Company

+7804240934

T-246 P.008/012 F-212

Canada

Edmonton Office
Prairie Region
211 Bank of Montreal Bldg
10199 - 101 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 3Y4

Canada

Bureau d'Edmonton
Région des Prairies
Édifice de la Banque de Montréal
311 rue 101 - 10199
Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 3Y4

Telephone: (780) 495-6051
Facsimile: (780) 495-6300
Internet: cashcrof@justice.gc.ca
Our File: 2-77605
Notre dossier:
Your File:
Votre dossier:

June 5, 2006

BY FAX

Hladun & Company
Barristers and Solicitors
100, 10187 - 104 Street
EDMONTON, Alberta
T5J 0Z9

Attention: Robert W. Hladun
Fax # 424-0934

Dear Sir:

RE: Schreiber v. The Attorney General of Canada

I am assisting Jim Shaw with this file.

I understand that you have asked us to produce our documents.

We have reviewed Mr. Schreiber's Amended Amended Statement of Claim, and the Affidavit of Records. If this action is to proceed, our view is that Mr. Schreiber will need to file a further and better Affidavit of Records.

Below, we speak of the Statement of Claim, but in each case are referring to the Amended Amended Statement of Claim.

Referring to para. 12 of the Statement of Claim, we understand that Mr. Schreiber received some sort of notification of the Swiss authorities' request for banking records from the Swiss Union Bank. Mr. Schreiber should disclose the documents related to the notification in his Affidavit.

As you know, Mr. Schreiber is responsible to produce documents which are or were in his custody and control, which includes documents of companies which he owns or controls, or has owned or controlled. We understand that Mr. Schreiber conducted his business through several companies. Mr. Schreiber will need to produce any relevant and material documentation from these companies. Such documents would include, but not be limited to, records of contracts or understandings in principle between Mr. Schreiber's companies and such companies as MBB, Thyssen Industrie AG, Airbus Industrie, and Bear Head Manufacturing Industries BMI Inc.

This is Exhibit "A" referred to in the Affidavit of Joanne Romans

Sworn before me this 13th day of July A.D., 2006

Tania Norris
A Notary Public, A Commissioner for Oaths
in and for the Province of Alberta

TANIA NORRIS
Commissioner of Oaths
My Commission Expires
May 30, 2008

Canada

- 2 -

Documents held by Mr. Schreiber's lawyers or ex-lawyers remain within Mr. Schreiber's possession or control, and therefore Mr. Schreiber should produce non-privileged documents relevant to this matter which are in the possession of Mr. Schreiber's lawyers or ex-lawyers, including Peter Widmer.

Referring to para. 12 of the Statement of Claim, Mr. Schreiber should have banking records which relate to this matter. Such documents would include banking records from Verwaltungs-Und Private Bank in Vaduz, Liechtenstein. Banking records of companies controlled by Mr. Schreiber which relate to the allegations in the Statements of Claim and Defence are also relevant to this matter.

The documents would also include bank documents showing payments from MBB, Thyssen, Airbus Industrie, and Bear Head Manufacturing to IAL or other companies controlled by Mr. Schreiber, and payments from companies controlled by Mr. Schreiber to persons such as Mr. Moores and Mr. Schreiber, or companies such as Consultants International Incorporated.

You have said in discoveries that the ownership of IAL was by bearer certificate. Mr. Schreiber should be able to produce the bearer certificate or advise when it left his possession. There should be other relevant IAL documents. Even if some of them are no longer in Mr. Schreiber's possession or control, they should be listed in the Affidavit.

Referring to para. 14 and 15 of the Statement of Claim, Mr. Schreiber should have a copy of the letter of apology, and his own letter to the Deputy Attorney General and the Commissioner of the RCMP, and any letter he received in response. If he has other correspondence related to his alleged efforts to obtain apologies or revisions to Crown documents, that documentation should be produced.

Referring to para. 20 of the Statement of Claim, we understand that Mr. Schreiber says that he did pay some money to Brian Mulroney. He should produce documentation related to those payments.

Referring to para. 20 of the Statement of Claim Mr. Schreiber states there was no criminal activity as set out in the Letter of Request, or at all. He has denied criminal activity. He has put all of his business dealings into issue. He has also made many public statements, or responded in books and interviews. Mr. Schreiber must inform himself of all of that and disclose all documents relating to the matter which are relevant and material to this lawsuit.

At para. 30 of the Statement of Claim, the Plaintiff alleges that he has lost economic opportunity and income. He must have documentation in relation to that claim, and he will need to produce it.

At para. 19 of the Amended Statement of Defence, we allege that Mr. Schreiber provided Mr. Mulroney with a copy of the German version of the Letter of Request. If Mr. Schreiber has or had a copy of the German version, it should be set out in his Affidavit.

- 3 -

In *Germany v Schreiber*, before Mr. Justice Watt, there is reference to Mr. Schreiber's personal organizer. Documentation from the organizer which is material to this lawsuit must be produced.

Further, your client has been involved in many lawsuits related to this matter. All documentation which he or his counsel has received in these lawsuits is now within his possession or control, and must be produced in this matter. For example, Mr. Schreiber sued CBC, and should have documents produced during that lawsuit for disclosure, as well as documentation of his own related to that lawsuit which is also relevant and material to this lawsuit.


Some time has elapsed since 2003. Your client will likely have new relevant and material documentation in his possession, which should be added to his production.

Of course, we are unable to know exactly what relevant and material documents your client has in his possession or control. Clearly, however, his present Affidavit of Records is deficient.

We know you will review Mr. Schreiber's responsibilities respecting document production with him, to ensure compliance with his legal obligation to locate, gather, and produce all documents material and relevant to this matter. No doubt there are more material and relevant documents beyond what we have requested in this letter.

We look forward to receiving your filed further and better Affidavit of Records.

Yours truly,



Christine Ashcroft
Counsel

Jr

Action No. 9703 20183
Sworn this 2nd day of June, 2006
Deponent: Melissa Smith

**IN THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA
JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF EDMONTON**

BETWEEN:

KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

Plaintiff

- and -

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA
HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF CANADA**

Defendants

AFFIDAVIT

I, Melissa Smith, of the City of Edmonton, in the Province of Alberta, MAKE OATH AND SAY THAT:

1. I am a legal assistant with the law firm of Hladun & Company, which represents the Plaintiff in this action and as such have personal knowledge of the matters hereinafter deposed to, except where stated to be based upon information and belief.
2. I am advised by a review of the file that:
 - (a) the Statement of Claim in this action was filed on October 24, 1997;
 - (b) the Amended Statement of Claim was filed on May 25, 1998;
 - (c) an Amended Amended Statement of Claim was filed on May 4, 1999;
 - (d) the Statement of Defence of the Defendants was filed on May 25, 1998;
 - (e) on or about April 27, 2000, the Defendants provided an unfiled and unsworn Affidavit of Records, together with certain producible documents;
 - (f) Examinations for Discovery in this action proceeded on March 29, 2001, notwithstanding the absence of the Defendants' unfiled Affidavit of Records. In

particular, on March 29, 2001, Sergeant Fiegenwald, a former employee or agent of the Defendants, represented by his counsel, Gordon McKenzie of Bishop & McKenzie was examined and numerous undertakings were elicited.

- 3. I am still further advised by a review of the file that on March 1, 2006, Robert W. Hladun, counsel for the Plaintiff, wrote to counsel for the Defendants' counsel, Jim Shaw, reminding him of his continued obligation in this matter to produce relevant and producible records and requesting a sworn and filed Affidavit of Records. Attached hereto and marked as Exhibit "A" to this my Affidavit is a copy of this correspondence.
- 4. I am advised and do verily believe that to the present date, the Defendants have failed to provide a sworn and filed Affidavit of Records.
- 5. I make this Affidavit in support of an application compelling the Defendants to provide their sworn and filed Affidavit of Records and abridging the time for provision of service of same to 21 days, failing which, the Statement of Defence of the Defendants shall be struck.

SWORN before me at the City of Edmonton,)
in the Province of Alberta, this 2nd day)
of June, 2006.)

Susan M. Sauvé)
A Commissioner for Oaths in and for)
the Province of Alberta)


MELISSA SMITH

Susan M. Sauvé
My commission expires
December 8, 2007

15737

2-77605

March 1, 2006

Mr. James N. Shaw
Department of Justice Canada
#211, 10199 - 101 Street
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 3Y4

Dear Sir:

**Re: Karlheinz Schreiber v. The Attorney General of Canada and
Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada
Court of Queen's Bench Action #9703 20183**

This is to advise that the Examination for Discovery of Fraser Fiegenwald will be held at 10:00 a.m. on March 8, 2006, at the office of Hladun & Company.

In preparing for the continued Examination for Discovery of Mr. Fiegenwald, I have noticed that there are still several undertakings to be delivered and a number of questions still under advisement, for which I need the Crown's position. These matters must be attended to on an urgent basis, giving me an opportunity to properly prepare for the Examination for Discovery on March 8, 2006.

I look forward to your immediate attention to these matters.

Yours truly,

HLADUN & COMPANY

*Dictated, but not read and signed
in the writer's absence by:*

D. Kosychnuk
for **ROBERT W. HLADUN, Q.C.**
RWH/dr

THIS IS EXHIBIT "A" REFERRED TO IN THE
AFFIDAVIT OF Melissa Smith
SWORN (OR AFFIRMED) BEFORE ME THIS

7 DAY OF June, 2006

Susan M. Sauvé
A COMMISSIONER FOR OATHS IN AND
FOR THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA

Via fax 495-2964

cc: Gordon McKenzie
Bishop & McKenzie LLP, Via fax 426-1305

Susan M. Sauvé
My commission expires
December 8, 2008

Action No. 9703 20183

Sworn this 2nd day of June, 2006

Deponent: Melissa Smith

IN THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH
OF ALBERTA

JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF EDMONTON

BETWEEN:

KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

Plaintiff

- and -

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF
CANADA
HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT
OF CANADA**

Defendants

AFFIDAVIT

ROBERT W. HLADUN, QC

Barrister & Solicitor


Phone No. 423.1888


File No. 15,737.1

HLADUN & COMPANY

Barristers & Solicitors

100, 10187-104 Street
Edmonton, AB T5J 0Z9





579003

KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

624-19121

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHON: 613 748 7330
FACSIMILE: 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper
Prime Minister
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, August 23, 2006

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal"

Dear Prime Minister,


I am taking the liberty to send you a copy of the Case Report on the "Political Justice Scandal" International Case and the "Airbus" Affair, August 20, 2006 for your convenience.

The Case Books I sent to you on June 17, 2006 contain the evidence and substantiate the Case Report.

The document confirms the content of my letter to you from June 16, 2006 and the reason why I can only turn to you.

I wish you success in the interest of all Canadians.

Yours sincerely



“Political Justice Scandal” International Case And the “Airbus” Affair

Case Report

Ottawa, August 20, 2006

The case began as the “Airbus” affair. It turned quickly to become the biggest “Political Justice Scandal” in Canadian history with the most serious international implications.

The initiators of the scandal are: The Canadian Justice System (C. J. S.) including The Hon. Allan Rock, then the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, The Hon. Herb Gray, then the Solicitor General of Canada, Stevie Cameron a confidential RCMP informant and complainant, journalist and writer with the support of Kimberly Prost, Senior Counsel, then the Director, International Assistance Group for the Minister of Justice of Canada, the RCMP and a convicted Swiss criminal Giorgio Pelossi.

The vendetta against The Right Hon. Brian Mulroney and the Tories started after The Hon. Allan Rock was having dinner with the Globe and Mail reporter Susan Delacourt in the fall of 1993.

On June 14, 1996 The Right Hon. Stephen Harper, Prime Minister, then M.P (Calgary West, Ref) during Commons Debates:

Mr. Speaker, that kind of hair-splitting could only be done by a lawyer. I am citing an article in the Toronto Sun yesterday where it says that Globe and Mail managing editor Colin MacKenzie said that Rock approached parliamentary journalist Susan Delacourt for help in his behind the scenes probe of Mulroney one or two days after he first heard about allegations from an other journalist. My question is very simple. Going back to the beginning of this affair, why was the Minister of Justice conducting his own private investigation?

When Stevie Cameron’s book *On the Take* hit the best-seller lists in 1994, Liberals in Ottawa took to calling Cameron “Stevie Wonderful”. When Solicitor Herb Gray read it, he made sure that the RCMP were reviewing it carefully, to see if any investigation was warranted.

(An article from Saturday Night, October 1, 1996: *Vicious Circle – Media's Role in the Airbus Scandal Involving Brian Mulroney* is important to read.)

A letter from the Augsburg City Tax Office (Germany) to the office of the Public Prosecutor on August 02, 1995 confirmed that the C J S through the Canadian Embassy in Germany was, since May 24, 1995, in contact with the Senior Prosecutor Kolb and informed the authorities in Augsburg about their apparent investigation in Switzerland.

On July 24, 1995 the Augsburg tax investigators met with Giorgio Pelossi in Bregenz, Austria, to receive information on I. A. L. business. Because of the risk to be arrested Pelossi did not come to Augsburg.

On August 24, 1995 RCMP Inspector McLean, Liaison Officer Canadian Embassy Bern, Switzerland, writes to Kimberly Prost, Department of Justice, how to draft the Letter of Request to Switzerland to alleviate any problem *vis a vis* RCMP contact with a witness.

On September 6, 1995 G. Pelossi informed the tax investigators in Augsburg that Sergeant Fraser Fiegenwald and Inspector Yves Bouchard are the RCMP officers investigating in Switzerland. On September 11, 1995 the two officers met with the prosecutors in Augsburg and agreed to compare notes. (Read Cameron, *The Last Amigo*, page 260 about the illegal contact with a witness in Switzerland)

Kimberly Prost and the International Assistance Group (IAG) fabricated the Letter of Request to the Competent Legal Authority of Switzerland based on the stories from Giorgio Pelossi, without any real evidence but a lot of lies.

Giorgio Pelossi

On December 12, 1995 RCMP Inspector Gene McLean, acting as Liaison Officer at the Canadian Embassy in Bern, Switzerland informed the authorities in Ottawa that Giorgio Pelossi had a criminal record, being convicted on June 6, 1995 for a false accusation. Pelossi was sentenced on December 24, 1996 to three month detention, suspended for a two year period for embezzlement, specifically for wrongfully investing money for his own profit between 1984 and 1986.

On September 11, 1986 Pelossi was arrested by Swiss Police and detained for six month without charge. He was suspected of swindling money from a bank account belonging to someone laundering drug money for the Mafia. The prosecutor was Carla del Ponte, now Chief UN War Crimes Prosecutor. On January 22, 2000 Pelossi was arrested and detained by the police in Chicago in connection with Italian drug-trafficking charges.

The presiding Judge Maximilian Hofmeister together with 4 other judges and some prosecutors from the Augsburg Regional Court were traveling several times to Zuerich, Switzerland to examine Giorgio Pelossi. Pelossi cannot leave Switzerland because of the Italian arrest warrant against him. Switzerland will not extradite its Nationals.

M. B. B. AND THYSSEN

Based on the information from Giorgio Pelossi and the Canadian officials, the Augsburg prosecutors were granted warrants to search the offices of M.B.B., Messerschmitt – Boelkow – Blohm on August 2, 1995 and the offices of Thyssen – Industrie on August 14, 1995. The search of the offices of Thyssen - Industrie disclosed unrelated matters to the accusations, which finally led to the "C.D.U. Donation Scandal"

The Letter of Request to Switzerland

On September 29, 1995 Kimberly Prost, Senior Counsel Director International Assistance Group (IAG) Department of Justice Canada has sent the Letter of Request for Assistance from Canada to Switzerland in the Matter of Frank Moores and Martin Brian Mulroney to the Canadian Embassy in Bern, Switzerland. Kimberly Prost asked Insp. McLean, RCMP Liaison Officer at the Canadian Embassy, to present the letter to the appropriate authorities in Switzerland.

On October 26, 1995 Swiss officials seize the bank accounts and safety deposit boxes of Frank Moores and Karlheinz Schreiber.

Bayerische Bitumen Chemie

On October 5, 1995 German Police raid the Company and the home of Karlheinz Schreiber in Kaufering, Germany and seize documents. The raid is in connection with an investigation into suspected tax evasion.

International Cooperation

On April 30, 1996, Stevie Cameron, confidential RCMP informant, journalist and writer met with Senior Public Prosecutor Hillinger and Prosecutor Weigand in Augsburg, Germany. During the meeting Stevie Cameron provided documents regarding Canadian Companies of the suspect Mr. Karlheinz Schreiber, a copy of a newspaper article: "Arms and the Woman" and a copy of her book *On the Take*, which all has been placed on the file. Around the same time she met for some days with Giorgio Pelossi, the Swiss convicted criminal.

In the same month, Canadian tax officials were beginning to work together with their German counterparts. Stevie Cameron, the confidential RCMP informant reports in *The Last Amigos* at p. 285: On June 4, 1996 two Revenue Canada officers, Bruce Findlay and Guy Bigonnesse, met in Augsburg with the tax investigators Gumpendobler, Kindler and others to share intelligence. They swapped binders of confidential tax information.

The Legal Battle

On November 20, 1995 the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney filed a \$50 million lawsuit against the Canadian Government and the RCMP

On January 9, 1997 the Government of Canada, The Hon Allan Rock, then Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Philip Murray, then Commissioner, of the RCMP have sent a letter of apology to Karlheinz Schreiber and informed him about the settlement agreement of January 5, 1997 with the Right Hon Brian Mulroney.

Karlheinz Schreiber thought at that time- and thinks that he is proven right today- that it was a mistake to settle the lawsuit. He also believed at that time and feels the same way today that the statement by The Hon. Allan Rock and The Hon. Herb Gray, regarding the case of the *Right Hon. Brian Mulroney v. The Attorney General of Canada* on Monday, January 6, 1997 (see attached document) is a totally unacceptable insult and a historical lie in its dimension.

This political vendetta has cost the Canadian taxpayer millions of dollars so far and will cost much more because the case has not come to an end after 11 years and is still moving ahead, driven by the enormous fear of the individuals, responsible for the biggest "Political Justice Scandal" in Canadian history.

On January 20, 1997 Karlheinz Schreiber has sent a letter to Hon Allan Rock, then Minister of Justice and Attorney of Canada and to Phillip Murray, then Commissioner of the RCMP.

In his letter Karlheinz Schreiber explains, why the Minister's letter is pure nonsense and a pack of lies. The last paragraph No 9 of his letter: "I recognize your apology but this matter will only be properly clarified in a courtroom. This is my understanding .I have been a judge for commercial matters for nine years in Munich."

On January 30, 1997 Schreiber's lawyer Robert Hladun Q C., Edmonton, sent a letter to Hon.Allan Rock and Philip Murray, RCMP. Page 6 of the letter reads:

We have learned that the Swiss Government still labours under the impressions created by the original Request, together with all the accusations and indictment therein that now have been shown or proven to be erroneous, false and untrue.

In the event that the Government of Canada fails to recognize the above and officially withdraw / revoke the said Request, it is the intention of Mr. Karlheinz Schreiber to seek the appropriate legal remedy before the appropriate legal forum to resolve all of those issues that have arisen since the issuance of the said Request.

Therefore, we respectfully request an immediate reply not later than seven days from the date of this letter.

Neither Mr. Hladun, Q. C. nor Mr. Schreiber received an answer to their letters.

On October 24, 1997 Mr. Schreiber filed a \$35 million lawsuit against the Canadian Government.

Since the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney entered a settlement agreement with the Canadian Government, Mr. Schreiber's lawsuit is the only legal avenue, which would shed light to the unbelievable political vendetta and the biggest frightening "Political Justice Scandal" in Canadian history.

At the same time Mr. Schreiber's lawsuit is the greatest threat to all the responsible politicians and government officials, who were or are still involved in the case. Canadians from coast to coast will be shocked and scared when the truth of the case will come to light and when it will be known what all was done by the Department of Justice to avoid the truth to be seen.

The alternative to the Schreiber lawsuit would have been a publicly commissioned inquiry as unsuccessfully requested by several M.P.'s in the House of Commons.

On December 3, 1997 Mr. Jack Ramsay M. P. (Crowfoot, Ref.) made a motion to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

The questions he raised are still unanswered and very interesting to read. The document attached contains also very important statements regarding the Brian Mulroney and Karlheinz Schreiber cases from:

Messr. Gilles Duceppe M.P. (Laurier-Sainte-Marie, B.Q.)
 Mr. Peter MacKay M.P. (Pictou-Antigonish-Guysborough, P.C.)
 Mr. Garry Breitkreuz M.P. (Yorkton-Melville, Ref.)
 Messr. Michel Bellehumeur M.P. (Bertier-Montcalm, B.Q.).

Mr. Breitkreuz stated: "The confidence of Canadians in their institutions and the justice system is at stake."

Today, 8 years and 7 months later Canadians still do not know what happened and what is still ongoing with the case.

Attempt to stop the Lawsuit

To avoid the disclosure of the "Political Justice Scandal" through the Schreiber lawsuit, the Justice Department and the R.C.M.P. have chosen different defence measures for their face-saving action.

1. Delay actions since 1997 regarding the lawsuit proceedings in Edmonton.
2. The M.B.B. fraud case.
3. RCMP undercover operation.
4. The German Extradition Request for Karlheinz Schreiber

All of these activities raise one question: What have they done and try to hide under all circumstances? Why have these people acted at all costs to suppress the truth?

Mr. Schreiber is convinced that his lawyers will make sure that the secrets of the biggest "Political Justice Scandal" in Canadian history will come to light.

The lawyers dealing with this task are:

Mr. Edward L. Greenspan, Q.C., LL. D., D.C.L.
The Hon. Jack Major, Q.C., LL.D.
Mr. Robert W. Hladun, Q.C.

1 Delay actions regarding the lawsuit

Since 1997 the Department of Justice has tried to delay the proceedings of the lawsuit by requesting more and more documents from Mr. Schreiber regarding business matters clearly irrelevant and not at issue. The requests are part of permanent "fishing expeditions," related to the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney. It looks like the Department of Justice wants to start a new investigation in a file the RCMP closed in April 17, 2003.

The Department of Justice failed to provide better affidavits of documents and undertakings from discovery examinations and refused to send documents to their own lawyers in Edmonton. The aim is clearly to keep the lawsuit away from the court because there is no chance to win the case, since the R.C.M.P. closed the file on the fact that there was no evidence of wrongdoing.

The main reason to keep the case away from a public trial in the courts is the fear of disclosure and personal consequences.

The M.B.B. fraud case

The M.B.B. fraud case is the only thing that was left from the accusations in the foolish Letter of Request to Switzerland on September 29, 1995, starting the "Airbus" affair, which is the legal basis for the lawsuit.

The Attorney General of Canada, the International Assistance Group (IAG) of the Canadian Department of Justice and the R.C.M.P., who fabricated the Letter of Request need the insane M.B.B. fraud case to claim that there is an ongoing investigation to avoid any access to information.

For the same reason the Crown appealed the ruling of Mr. Justice Paul Belanger of the Ontario Court of Justice, who has thrown out fraud charges against Eurocopter Canada Ltd. M.B.B.'s subsidiary, Messerschmitt Canada Ltd. (MCL, now known as Eurocopter Canada), has since sold 12 helicopters to the Coast Guard.

On August 9, 2006 the Ontario Superior Court of Justice dismissed the Crowns application. The expectation is the Crown will appeal for the same reason as before.

On October 2002 two German executives – Kurt Pfleiderer and Heinz Pluckthun – were charged with fraud. Since Germany, like many other civilized countries- contrary to Canada- will never extradite their Nationals, the IAG and the Department of Justice could have requested the German legal authorities to prosecute the German executives with no costs for the Canadian taxpayer.

*TREATY BETWEEN CANADA AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY
CONCERNING EXTRADITION*

ARTICLE V

Extradition of Nationals

(3) *If a request for extradition is refused only on the ground that the person claimed is a national of the requested state, that state shall, if asked to do so by the requesting state, take all possible measures in accordance with its own law to prosecute the person claimed. For this purpose, the files, documents and exhibits relating to the offence shall be transmitted to that state. All expenses incurred in connection with such prosecution shall be born by the requested state. The requesting state shall be informed of the result of the prosecution.*

Why did the Canadian Department of Justice, the IAG, the Crown, and the RCMP not ask their friends in Augsburg to prosecute the M.B.B. executives since they worked on the M.B.B. case with them and jointly examined witnesses in Germany?

In the meantime the Crown should know that they have no case and that the Germans could never charge the M.B.B. executives.

This is what Karlheinz Schreiber (who was for 9 years a Judge at the Regional Court 1 for commercial cases in Munich, Germany) told the Crown as the Crown's witness in the Court in Ottawa during his testimony. Justice Paul Belanger ruled that Karlheinz Schreiber was not a hostile witness as requested by the Crown, Mr. Bernstein.

The Crown never asked the Germans to prosecute the M.B.B. executives, because they could not take the risk that a German Court would throw out their case immediately. This would badly ruin their case in Canada and constitute proof that since 1994 Canadian taxpayers' money was blown away and invested in a lot of nice international trips for Canadian officials, hunting the phantoms of Giorgio Pelossi's and Stevie Cameron's fairy tales.

What did the Crown do regarding the M.B.B. executives? They issued arrest warrants against the two men so that they cannot leave Germany (if they do not want to end up in a jail). Is this what people around the world expect to find with Canadian principles of fundamental justice? Is this just and fair treatment to a retired man, over 70 years old, who is highly respected on the international level of the world?

Mr. Edward Greenspan, Q.C., LL.D., D.C.L. recommended: "The Canadian Government should have only International Treaties with reciprocity guarantee. The Canadian citizenship should not have a lower value than the one from other countries."

*RECIPROCITY**ARTICLE V: EXTRADITION OF NATIONALS*

(1) Neither of the Contracting Parties shall be bound to extradite its own nationals.

This sentence reads like an agreement on reciprocity but it is misleading the Members in the House of Commons during the ratification. The truth would have been to write "(1): Germany will never extradite its nationals to Canada. Canada may extradite its nationals to Germany."

In reality: Canada will always extradite its nationals to Germany. Canada will never prosecute its nationals in Canada on the request of Germany. Germany will prosecute its nationals on the request of Canada.

What Government would enjoy the support of its own Nationals by signing such an agreement? What Opposition in the House of Commons would not provide the strongest protest supported by the national media? Nevertheless, the Treaty was signed by the Liberal Government on October 11, 1977.

The preliminary hearing of the M.B.B. fraud case was another fishing trip of the Crown hoping to find a crime involving Brian Mulroney and find help for their hopeless lawsuit with Karlheinz Schreiber in Edmonton.

The RCMP undercover operation

2001: During the secret court proceedings of the M.B.B. Eurocopter case, RCMP Inspector A. K. Matthews revealed the nature of the undercover operation in an affidavit he swore to support the continuation of a seal on information contained in a search warrant. The warrant was part of a court proceeding involving allegations of commissions paid to Schreiber in the sale of helicopters to the Canadian Coastguard in the mid-1980s.

The undercover sting operation began in November 2000 in cooperation with a foreign agency and ended in September 2002. The agent was introduced through Michel Cogger, a former lawyer of Karlheinz Schreiber. The agent was an elegant man, who tried unsuccessfully to involve Karlheinz Schreiber in several different criminal activities and also establish confidence with him by bringing nice gifts like French champagne, Russian caviar, Italian wine and invitations to luxurious restaurants.

2004: Mr. Justice Edward Then holds a special inquiry to determine if he was misled by the RCMP and the Crown when they had him issue the sealing orders in the Eurocopter case. Justice Then has not yet issued his findings.

The aim was clear: Vahe Minasian, the agent, tried to get information regarding Brian Mulroney and Schreiber's business and at the same time to involve Mr. Schreiber in criminal activities which would put him into prison. All this would help the Crown's sick lawsuit in Edmonton and hopefully stop Karlheinz Schreiber in proceeding with his own lawsuit.

All these expensive efforts must have a very important reason. Again what have the politicians and Government officials done with the "Airbus" affair and why are they so desperate and scared?

If one looks very critically at the facts he would have to agree that this case would be a good start for the Prime Minister to clean up the pile of political mire around Ottawa for a better and politically healthier environment for Canadian citizens.

The German Extradition Request for Karlheinz Schreiber

The Extradition Request comes from the same source like the "Airbus" affair: Giorgio Pelossi, Stevie Cameron, Allan Rock, other unknown political enemies. The request was prepared in Germany with the support of Canadian Government officials (IAG) International Assistance Group of the Department of Justice and the RCMP, in order to find allies and support for their vendetta against the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney and other Conservative supporters like Frank Moores, Gary Ouellet and Karlheinz Schreiber. The same group had send the Letter of Request to Switzerland.

On June 22, 1999 Professor Dr Erich Samson, Mr. Schreiber's lawyer reminded chief prosecutor Mr. Nemetz in Augsburg that the accusation for tax evasion is not an offence for extradition under the treaty between Germany and Canada. The response from Mr. Nemetz was: "We are going to get Mr. Schreiber. The Canadians have a new Extradition Act in place and behind the case is a Minister, who wants to Schreiber out of the country as soon as possible."

On August 31, 1999 Mr. Schreiber was arrested in Toronto based on an arrest warrant for tax evasion.

Since the arrest warrant did not satisfy the Canadian authorities, the prosecutor in Augsburg issued another arrest warrant on September 2, 1999 and added accusations of fraud, breach of trust and bribery.

From the 11th to the 15th of September 1999 and from the 4th to the 9th of October 1999 some Canadian lawyers from the IAG were in Augsburg and assisted the German prosecutor to prepare the record of the case for Mr. Schreiber's extradition from Canada. The document shows the date: October 11, 1999. The document was sent to the IAG and an authority to proceed was issued by IAG on behalf of the Minister of Justice of Canada.

The IAG is acting for the German prosecutors and at the same time for the Canadian Minister of Justice on Mr. Schreiber's Extradition case and until today on the pending lawsuit of Mr. Schreiber's against the Attorney General of Canada and the IAG.

Under the new Extradition Act, the IAG represents the greatest example of conflict of interest and abuse of power that one could ever imagine. They believe that they are a law unto themselves.

The circumstances amount to a violation of the principles of fundamental justice.


The German allies of the IAG misused the case immediately for their own political purposes and brought down the Conservative Government of Chancellor Helmut Kohl in the 1998 German election. The Social Democrats with Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder set up an Investigative Committee to shed light on the CDU affair and used this vehicle until the next German Election in 2002. They defeated the Conservative CDU/CSU again and forced the German Conservatives with Chancellor Angela Merkel after the 2005 election into a great coalition with the Social Democrats, who hope to win the next election again with the use of the Schreiber extradition case and the support from the Canadian Government.

On June 30, 2005, the last day of the legislative period of the German Bundestag, the Government of Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder (SPD) extended the statute of limitations on extradition. The new law, known in the German Parliament as the Lex Schreiber (Magazine *Spiegel* on line July 31, 2005) stipulates that the statute of limitations ceases to apply when the accused has fled abroad and extradition proceedings are under way. The prosecutors in Augsburg were afraid that the charges against Mr. Schreiber could soon be dropped because of the statute of limitations and were hoping that President Koehler will sign an amendment to the statute into law.

The law came into force on August 4, 2005 after the Deutsche Bundesrat confirmed the law on July 8, 2005.

It is the first time in German history that a new law was used after only a few days since it was proclaimed in force, to secure the extradition of a single person accused for tax evasion.

The name of the person who received his own law: Karlheinz Schreiber.



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

579845

62490161

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

THELEPHON: 613 748 7330
FACSIMILE: 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa August 30, 2006

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal"

Dear Prime Minister,

As an oversight I forgot to include the attachment to my letter August 23, 2006.
I include it herewith.

Document 1: Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights December 3, 1997

The motion before the Committee: That the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights conduct hearings with witnesses into what was commonly called the "Airbus Scandal," to determine whether a Publicly Commissioned Inquiry should be convened.

Recorded vote: Motion negatived : Nays 8; yeas 7

Today, 8 years and 9 months later, most of the important questions remain unanswered and Canadians still do not know what happened and what terrible vendetta took place on their tax account.

The case proves again how right you were when you announced on November 30, 2005 the creation of a Director of Public Prosecutions and made reference to the Mulroney-Airbus affair as a bad example.

Document 2: Statement by the Hon. Allan Rock and the Hon. Herb Gray Regarding the Case of Brian Mulroney v. The Attorney General of Canada et al – Monday, January 6, 1997.


Document 3: Edited Hansard * 1420 * Number 031

Document 4: Oral Question Period Airbus Aircraft 3817, 3818 96-06-1

(Some of the documents are also in the "Political Justice Scandal" Case Books)

I apologize for any inconvenience.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "M. Mulroney", written in a cursive style.

Français Close

STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

COMITÉ PERMANENT DE LA JUSTICE ET DES DROITS DE LA PERSONNE

EVIDENCE

[Recorded by Electronic Apparatus]

Wednesday, December 3, 1997

• 1533

[English]

The Chair (Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.)): The committee is now called to order.

We have a letter from Mr. Ramsay, which will be the subject of the first part of this meeting.

Let me say for the record, just so I know whether we have agreement on this, that I know all members are aware that the customs union is to appear before the committee at 4.30 p.m. to deal with a bill that is very important to them. I understand we have all-party agreement on it. I intend to stop this, to show courtesy to our witnesses, at 4.28 p.m. or so, hear those witnesses, and get through clause-by-clause later today.

So I put you on notice of that. If there's going to be a vote on this thing, I'd like to do it at about 4.20 p.m.

Is that okay, then? Does everybody agree that at 4.20 p.m. we'll have the vote on this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: Or before.

The Chair: Well, yes, if we run out of steam, but I mean, Jack is here, and five Ramsay minutes are worth about twenty of regular time.

I'm going to have the clerk read the letter, which is the procedure recommended by those who recommend procedure. I'll be asking for a motion at the conclusion of that.

Go ahead, Mr. Clerk.

• 1535

The Clerk of the Committee: The letter was addressed to the clerk and dated November 18, 1997:

Pursuant to Standing Order 106(3), a meeting of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal

Affairs shall be convened within ten sitting days for the purpose of examining with witnesses and not in camera what has become known as the "Airbus Affair".

The Chair: Thank you.

I understand, then, that arising out of this there is a motion by Mr. Ramsay.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Yes.

The Chair: Would you like to make that motion now?

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. I move that the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights conduct hearings with witnesses into what has commonly been called the Airbus scandal to determine whether a publicly commissioned inquiry should be convened.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Ramsay.

That motion being on the floor, is there discussion? Mr. Ramsay, would you like to lead?

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Yes, if I may.

Madam Chair and committee members, there are two areas I would like to address, and I would begin with the first. The purpose of convening today's meeting and the motion I have tabled is to deal with the unanswered questions on the Airbus scandal, questions the Canadian public have the right to have resolved.

The request letter sent to the Swiss authorities, signed by Kimberly Prost on behalf of former Justice Minister Allan Rock, contained false accusations of criminal activity. I quote from that letter:

This investigation is of serious concern to the Government of Canada as it involves criminal activity on the part of a former Prime Minister.

This false accusation laid the basis for Brian Mulroney's \$50 million lawsuit. Former Justice Minister Allan Rock had the opportunity to withdraw the letter and replace it with one minus the false accusations. Mr. Rock failed to do so despite receiving a letter dated November 8, 1995 from Mr. Tassé, Mr. Mulroney's lawyer, in which he stated:

In light of the most improper, unjustified and highly damaging statements contained in the Request made to the Swiss authorities, we urge you to personally review the matter and to direct your Department to withdraw the Request already made and to present, if that is the wish of the RCMP, a new Request that is more respectful of basic rules of fairness and decency.

Mr. Rock refused to withdraw the letter and this resulted in the \$50 million lawsuit by Mr. Brian Mulroney. According to RCMP Commissioner Murray, this lawsuit jeopardized the criminal investigation. This is what Commissioner Murray said:

I have been concerned about the potential impact on the criminal investigation of a long and very public civil process.

This concern was insufficient to have the letter withdrawn. The civil suit was proceeded with and at the

last moment former Justice Minister Allan Rock made an out-of-court settlement, with apology. This cost taxpayers \$3.4 million. Letters of apology went to Karlheinz Schreiber and Frank Moores. However, the letter containing the false accusations of criminal activity was not withdrawn.

A court decision indicated the request letter was invalid, or at least the process was, since it had followed an improper process. Rather than withdraw the letter, the former justice minister appealed the decision, and to date no court decision has been made on the legality of the process followed in issuing the letter of request.

The original court decision invalidated the process and meant the letter would have to be withdrawn. If the original decision is upheld by the courts, I believe the letter will be invalidated and will have to be withdrawn.

The false accusations contained within the letter of request, signed by Kimberly Prost on behalf of the justice minister, formed the basis of the \$50 million lawsuit, which cost taxpayers \$3.4 million. Because it has not been withdrawn, it now forms the basis for the \$35 million lawsuit initiated by Mr. Karlheinz Schreiber.

Madam Chair, it is essential the following questions be clarified for all members of the House and the Canadian people.

One, why did former Justice Minister Allan Rock not withdraw the letter when requested in writing on November 8, 1995, to prevent the lawsuit and to save taxpayers the money that was expended on that lawsuit?

1540

Two, who knew about the RCMP investigation and the request letter other than Kimberly Prost and Staff Sergeant Fiegenwald?

Three, who drafted the six draft letters?

Four, who rejected those draft letters?

Five, who approved the letter that finally went forward to the Swiss authorities?

Six, who embellished the wording of the draft letters each time, going further and further beyond the evidence supplied by the RCMP in their original request for the request letter? Why did the Justice officials not simply tell the RCMP that they didn't have enough evidence to support a request letter and to come back when they did?

Those are some of the questions.

In addition to those questions, how many Canadians have been falsely accused by a secret process employed by the Justice department? What assurance do Canadians have that letters containing false accusations against citizens of this country are not continuing to be sent out by the justice department?

Of course I refer to former Justice Minister Allan Rock's comments on January 6, 1997. He said this:

There was a presumption that the written Requests would never become public and that in keeping

with the international practice, statements of wrongdoing could be made about people under investigation so that foreign authorities could quickly grasp the essence of the police theory.

So the question is, has this system victimized other Canadians, and if so, how many?

Eight, are Canadians to believe this investigation of the former Prime Minister was initiated by a staff sergeant of the RCMP and a mid-level lawyer in the justice department without the knowledge of the justice minister, the Solicitor General, the Prime Minister, or the Commissioner of the RCMP, all of whom have claimed to have played no direct role in the investigation?

Nine, if the investigation and letter were instigated by a staff sergeant and a mid-level lawyer, under whose authority was it initiated?

Ten, why was the letter containing the false accusations not withdrawn, and why is it still not withdrawn? The RCMP do not need letters of request containing false accusations in order to do their job. Why has it not been withdrawn? This letter provides the base for the Schreiber lawsuit of \$35 million against Canadian taxpayers and may be the target of another lawsuit from the former Prime Minister.

I'd like to move to the second area.

The Chair: Can you just slow down a little bit.

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Okay.

A voice: Do you have a copy of the report?

Mr. Jack Ramsay: I don't; I'm sorry. But for the record I'll present what I have here.

The perception has been left with Canadians that former staff sergeant Fraser Fiegenwald is responsible for the entire Airbus scandal, including the \$3.4 million the fiasco cost Canadians. The facts do not support this perception. However, the government has done nothing to dispel it.

I refer to comments made by RCMP Commissioner Murray regarding the announcement of the code of conduct investigation of Staff Sergeant Fiegenwald. On January 6, 1997, he said this:

On the allegation of a disclosure by a member of the RCMP investigative team to an unauthorized third party, I am deeply disturbed by this development. Although we are talking here about allegations of oral communication made to an unauthorized third party outside government, this is potentially a serious breach of the RCMP's Code of Conduct, but it is NOT expected to harm the criminal investigation. On the contrary, the investigative team continues to work full-time to gather information and evidence.

Two independent senior investigators from outside the Ottawa area with no links whatsoever to the Airbus case have been assigned to conduct a thorough investigation under the RCMP Code of Conduct. They have been directed to start work immediately. In the meantime, the member in question has been reassigned to administrative duties. If the evidence gathered by the Code of Conduct investigation suggests the allegations are true, the member could face a variety of sanctions ranging from counselling to dismissal from the Force.

In closing, it's obvious that this is not a normal practise for the RCMP to publicly announce a Code of Conduct investigation involving one of our members. But this is all part of an effort to be as up front with the Canadian public as we possibly can. We are committed to being as transparent as possible throughout this process.

• 1545

The code of conduct hearing was convened despite a recommendation to the contrary from an internal investigation. The Staff Sergeant Fiegenwald hearing was to be closed to the public. The closed hearing was challenged and the court ruled the hearing was to be open. However, just a few days before the judge's decision Staff Sergeant Fiegenwald was allowed to retire from the force without a hearing or any determination of guilt or innocence.

The question is this. Why was Staff Sergeant Fiegenwald allowed to retire from the force before the accusations against him had been dealt with? The RCMP Act grants the commissioner authority to refuse a discharge of a member until any disciplinary actions have been dealt with. Why was this authority not exercised and this matter clarified? Why was this not done to determine the full extent of the involvement of Staff Sergeant Fiegenwald in the Airbus scandal?

The Solicitor General has the authority under subsection 24.1(1) of the RCMP Act to appoint a board of inquiry to investigate and report on any matter connected with the organization, training, conduct, performance of duties, discipline, efficiency, administration, or government of the force, or affecting any member or other person appointed or employed under the authority of the act. The question is why has the Solicitor General failed to exercise his authority to clarify this matter for Canadians? Why was this not done to determine the involvement of Staff Sergeant Fiegenwald in the Airbus scandal? Madam Chair, even the former justice minister, on learning of the discharge of Staff Sergeant Fiegenwald, expressed regret that all the facts were not on the table.

I conclude by saying this. The committee has the power and the authority to put those facts on the table, and I implore the committee members to do so. A cloud hangs over the RCMP, negatively affecting their reputation. As well, a cloud hangs over the Prime Minister, the former Minister of Justice, and the former Solicitor General, as their involvement in this matter remains suspect. I would encourage all members, particularly those on the other side of this table, to help lift this cloud and allow the truth to be known. If there is nothing to hide, they should be willing to do so.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Ramsay.

About procedure, there are four signatories to this letter. I know Mr. MacKay wants to make some submissions.

Mr. Forseth, do you have any submissions to make at this time?

Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby, Ref.): I would just say there is precedent. I'm looking at the minutes of a previous committee, where I recall currently Minister Marchi was on this side of the table and was making the same kind of request. So we're not asking for something that's out of bounds or unusual.

I think we have to look specifically at the motion that is before us. We're not looking to conduct

everything here. We're looking to the merits of getting, as you called it, a commission of inquiry. That's the issue: only getting into the substance of the matter an amount sufficient to consider voting for our specific motion, not making this committee the process of the inquiry. That's the distinction.

Those are the two points I had. There is precedent for what we're doing. Secondly, it's to clarify what we're really asking for.

The Chair: Mr. Breitkreuz.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): I would just like to add my support to what we've been looking at here.

We as committees are masters of our own destiny. We can make our decisions. If we see there's a need within Parliament for something to be done we can initiate that. That's what we're bringing forward here.

To maintain the credibility of Parliament and the MPs who represent the people of Canada I think we need to uphold a very high standard. To me that's really important. Therefore we really should be sure that all the information is open and available for the Canadian people to see. That's why I'm supporting this motion.

The confidence of Canadians in their institutions and the justice system is at stake. As a committee I think we realize more than most that this is very important. That's why I would call upon all the members of the committee to be sure they support this motion.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Breitkreuz.

Mr. MacKay. Take the time you need.

• 1550

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Thank you, Madam Chair. Many of my remarks, I think, will in essence be along the same lines as those put forward by members of Reform, in particular Mr. Ramsay.

As a starting point, I think what we have to keep in mind is that the letter that was signed by Mr. Mulroney contains some significant passages when one considers the recent refusal by the government to withdraw the initial letter that was sent to the Swiss authorities. I just want to quote from a passage of the letter that was sent:

The Chair: I was just going to ask you something. You're referring to a letter signed by...?

Mr. Peter MacKay: I'm referring to the settlement letter that was waved in the House of Commons several times by the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister. It was tabled in the House, I believe, and I have copies.

The Chair: The minutes of settlement.

Mr. Peter MacKay: Yes, the minutes of settlement. It's actually entitled "Settlement Agreement".

The Chair: I think everybody here has a copy, but go ahead.

Mr. Peter MacKay: Paragraph 4 states:

Based on the evidence received to date, the RCMP acknowledges that any conclusions of wrongdoing by the former Prime Minister were—and are—unjustified.

The second paragraph says:

The Government of Canada and the RCMP regret any damage suffered by Mr. Mulroney and his family and fully apologize to them.

We know this letter was accompanied by a financial compensation package for Mr. Mulroney's legal defence.

The Chair: Would you like to table that letter so that it's before the committee?

Mr. Peter MacKay: Certainly.

The Chair: Do I have unanimous consent for that?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Thank you.

An hon. member: For clarity, it's not the letter, it's the settlement agreement.

The Chair: He's calling it a letter.

Mr. Peter MacKay: It's the settlement agreement. I have the letter that went to the Swiss authorities as well, if you would like that to be tabled.

The Chair: Sure.

Mr. Peter MacKay: The settlement letter that Mr. Mulroney signed was signed with the understanding that this would essentially clear him of wrongdoing. I think this was the intent of this letter. Regardless of that fact, we know that an investigation continues. That's been repeated by the commissioner and by the Minister of Justice. My understanding is that there may be up to seven RCMP investigators now working on this file. That's like the rule of diminishing returns—the less evidence you have, the more police investigators you put on the file. Be that as it may, Mr. Mulroney has been declared innocent by virtue of that letter. He has been cleared of wrongdoing, and I would suggest that there would certainly be an issue of double jeopardy if ever there were to be charges laid in any event.

The fact remains that the letter is still in existence. It is still, I would suggest, damaging to the reputation of the former Prime Minister.

I want to put on the record that I appreciate that it's the Reform Party that has taken the initiative in this regard. I would suggest that is indicative of the fact that this transcends partisan politics. We're talking about the guilt or innocence of a former Prime Minister, but also a citizen of this country who is bound by the same protections of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms of this country. He is bound by the same protection that proclaims a person's innocence until proven guilty, although the Prime Minister, on the floor of the House of Commons, spoke of "guilty until proven guilty". That is in fact an accurate

assessment of what I think has been perpetrated here.

Based on the evidence, or the lack thereof, in this country it would appear that members of the RCMP—specifically Staff Sergeant Fiegenwald, who was heading up the investigation at the time—I assume under the direction of members of the justice department, particularly Kimberly Prost, went ahead and sent this very accusatory letter containing all sorts of false, unsubstantiated allegations to another country.

Madam Chair, with your involvement in the legal system, you would know that in order for the police to get a warrant, they have to appear before a justice of the peace to make a case in order to get a warrant at that point. On the face of it, it would appear there was insufficient evidence in this country, so the politically motivated witch-hunt took them across the ocean to Switzerland in order to go into bank accounts.

I will table this letter, because for those who haven't read it, I think it's important to take a look at just how damaging these allegations were. I think there was an analogy made in an article in the *Financial Post* that graphically sums up what is occurring here. Suppose a billboard was erected on Parliament Hill and it said that Brian Mulroney is a crook. Suppose also that subsequent to that there was a settlement in which the government retracted that allegation, made financial compensation, and apologized publicly, but left the billboard erected for months afterwards. This is essentially what is going on here.

• 1555 ▶

This letter is floating around out there. Whether it's accepted or not in this country, it looks as if it is finally starting to trickle down in people's minds that this was completely unsubstantiated. This letter is still in the hands of the Swiss authorities. This, I would suggest, is much of the reasoning behind the lawsuit that has been launched now by Mr. Schreiber. Mr. Mulroney, for his reasons, is perhaps rattling his sabre that he as well may launch a lawsuit if this letter is not retracted.

Madam Chair, it is trite to say that in this particular case I've often heard the expression that a dead fish stinks from the head. Obviously, what's going on here is not the full picture—

The Chair: It must be a Nova Scotian expression.

Mr. Peter MacKay: Yes, it is. A fish rots from the head.

I'm afraid that we're getting only part of the fish here; we've got only the body.

The comments made by Mr. Ramsay to suggest to this committee or to anyone in Canada that a middle-management lawyer in the justice department and a staff sergeant were the only ones behind this entire investigation, driving it forward, is, I think, ludicrous.

I would suggest that this is the forum for us to have a full look at what has taken place, to remove this cloud of incompetence, I would suggest, if nothing else, from the justice department.

It's consistent, I would suggest, with the stance that was taken by the Liberal government of openness and transparency to restore public confidence. It's very consistent with the stance of the Prime Minister before the election that this is what he intended to do, but it's simply not the case; it's not what we're seeing take place here.

Mr. Mulroney deserves, as I said, all of the rights and privileges of any other Canadian.

It goes beyond politics at this point. If this can happen to a former Prime Minister in this country, think of the jeopardy that each and every one of us is in. Brian Mulroney was and is fortunate in that he was able to defend himself in a public forum, the civil courts. A Canadian wrongfully accused, I would suggest, would not, under normal circumstances, have the financial means to defend himself in such a way.

Now that we have this compensation package, we know that it's costing the taxpayers a lot of money. There are still lawsuits outstanding, and potentially more coming. We haven't heard from former premier Frank Moores. I would suggest that there is a potential lawsuit in the works there as well.

So, Madam Chair, I would support this motion that has been put forward by the Reform Party. I would suggest that it is within your purview to initiate a public forum where we can have witnesses called. I would be most interested in hearing from Staff Sergeant Fiegenwald, under oath, as to what his instructions were, who knew, who helped in the drafting of the letter. These are questions that we all need to flush out.

The process has broken down here, and I think it's incumbent upon all of us to try to rectify what has occurred. It is not to rehabilitate the reputation of Brian Mulroney, nor to place a priority on this ahead of victims or ahead of any other important justice issue that may come before us. However, I would suggest that this is something that has become very prevalent in people's minds when it comes to the credibility not only of the government but also of the entire justice system. I fully support this initiative, and I hope that all members of this committee will take this matter very seriously and not delve into partisan politics.

Let's get some answers. Let's be truth seekers. That's what this system is supposed to be all about.

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): On a point of order, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Derek Lee: Mr. MacKay referred to the offending letter, if there was an offending letter, that is floating around Parliament Hill.

The Chair: He was going to table it.

Mr. Derek Lee: It's not floating around over here.

If that's tabled, thank you.

[Translation]

The Chair: Mr. Bellehumeur.

• 1600 ▶

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): I will also be supporting this motion moved by the Reform Party, not so much to restore someone's image or to re-establish the value of public figures who played a significant role in the history of Canada in the past years, but to get to the bottom of this

matter which I find extremely important because the Airbus Scandal is not limited to Canada. Some foreign countries are also involved in this matter and some Canadian institutions have lost a bit of credibility because of the work done by the RCMP. The Department of Justice has also been discredited in the matter.

Let's simply take a cold hard look at the facts. A letter goes around and Mr. Mulroney's lawsuit is settled out of court. I was joking before, but it is mostly Switzerland that is involved. There's a world of difference between the two.

Someone or some group somewhere has not done its job properly. Some people have made reckless accusations. Was there any political intervention to abort the whole thing? What lies at the very bottom of this matter? We know it has cost millions to settle and close the file.

But nothing is said about the time the Department of Justice and the RCMP spent preparing the file and trying to save face. How long did they work on it? Nobody knows. Everybody is going back to square one as though nothing had happened. Everyone is going back to their duties as though nothing had happened. They carry on with their day-to-day existence and that's it.

I think that the Standing Committee on Justice of the 36th Parliament is the appropriate forum to consider the matter as coolly as possible and to put the spotlight on the people who didn't do their job and the blame on those in authority. We can also make recommendations. We are in a good position to do it. However, I also know that we have limited powers and that we cannot exceed our powers. This committee has indeed very limited powers but we can nevertheless start investigating in order to check whether the matter is serious enough to warrant requesting the House to establish a public inquiry commission in due form.

It's happened in an earlier Parliament. However, the Liberal Party as well as the Reform Party, the NDP, the Bloc Québécois and the PC Party, which is directly interested because of the former Prime Minister of Canada, would all be well advised to get to the bottom of this matter. I think that we should all step back to consider this issue from a distance, so that it is not reviewed—without any partisanship, it's hard—in the same light as in the 34th and 35th Parliaments.

I think that time is on our side in this case. We could make an in-depth assessment of the situation and draw our own conclusions to make sure that this thing never happens again. If nobody gets blamed, we cannot be certain that there will not be a second time. The Minister of Justice says he's sorry, remains in the same portfolio and life goes on as though nothing had happened. The Solicitor General apologizes at the same time, also gets to keep his position and life goes on for him too. The same thing happens with the bureaucrats who worked on the case and who wrote the letter. Who has seen this letter? How wide was it circulated? We don't know.

If we want to fulfil our mandate and do a good job as members of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, I think that our only option is to vote in favour of the motion.

• 1605

Would it be possible to rework the policy aspect? We do have limited powers as I said earlier. It is our duty to consider the Airbus Scandal, given all the implications and the fact that this matter affects Canada's credibility on an international basis.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Bellehumeur.

Mr. Mancini, do you have any comments?

Mr. Peter Mancini (Sydney—Victoria, NDP): Yes, thank you.

I have a procedural question first. Madam Chair, can you answer this question for me? If this motion passes, as I read the request from the members we would convene within 10 sitting days. How much time would be devoted to this? Do we know how many days?

The Chair: We've convened well within 10 sitting days of receiving the letter. You may not have the actual motion, but the motion as I understand it is that we now embark upon a study of the subject matter of this meeting, with a view, I think, in Mr. Ramsay's eyes, to maybe making a recommendation that there be a commission of inquiry.

Mr. Peter Mancini: And we can set the parameters of how long this would take, how many days we would devote to it.

The Chair: If that motion passes then we would have to sit down and work out what procedure we would follow and how we would deal with it.

Mr. Peter Mancini: I ask those questions because initially when I received notice of this, I was not disposed to support the motion, for a couple of reasons, primarily because I think we have already spent a huge amount of the taxpayers' money on this whole affair and there are other pressing justice issues that the people of Canada want us to address.

That said—and I kind of had in my mind what it is it going to cost us to continue to look to the past instead of struggling with the justice issues of the future—having listened to Mr. Ramsay today, he took me down a different path, and I think he makes a compelling argument about the questions that have not been answered.

I am swayed by his words more so, Peter, than I am by yours to some extent, because I heard in some of your comments a great deal of defence, I suppose. But I am convinced—and I'll be very brief—to support the motion more so by the arguments that were put forward by Mr. Ramsay, and by Mr. Bellehumeur as well. We need to look at this as coldly as possible. I was also convinced by the answers I received from the chair about how we can set the parameters and how much time we spend on this.

Because I do come back to the point that the Canadian taxpayers have spent a huge amount of their money on this whole issue, which may have been mishandled, and I don't know if they want us to spend a whole lot more. I do think we need to get to the bottom of what we can.

The Chair: Thanks.

We have about 12 minutes left and I have four government members who want to speak. I want to give at least Mr. Ramsay and Mr. MacKay a brief opportunity to respond. I think that's the best model in terms of dealing with this.

Ms. Bakopanos.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Ahuntsic, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

I would like to address some of the concerns Mr. Ramsay and Mr. MacKay raised. First of all, I believe Mr. MacKay tabled only the settlement agreement, without the actual annex. I'd like to put it on the record and I'd like to table the annex that also goes with the agreement. I'd like to read it for the Canadian public because I think it clarifies a couple of things:

I, the undersigned, THE RIGHT HONOURABLE BRIAN MULRONEY, in consideration of the Settlement Agreement entered into this fifth day of January...and in consideration of costs to be paid in accordance with the Settlement Agreement, hereby release and discharge the Defendants

—and that includes the procureur général of Canada, Kimberly Prost, J.P.R. Murray, and Fraser Fiegenwald—

from all claims, which I have or may have arising out of or related directly or indirectly to the matters set forth in the various proceedings in the present case.

I recognize that this Settlement constitutes a transaction within the meaning....

I won't read the rest. It's signed by Brian Mulroney. I'd like that to also be on the record. I have it in both official languages.

The other thing I'd like to read, which wasn't read into the—

The Chair: Is there any objection to that? We need unanimous consent for tabling this.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos: That's fine.

The Chair: No objections. Thank you.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos: Here's what I'd like to read. Under the agreement:

The parties acknowledge that the procedure used in sending the Request for Assistance to Switzerland in this case was the same as that followed in numerous previous requests for mutual assistance under both the current and previous administrations where such requests have always remained confidential. Because of this the Government of Canada did not foresee that the Request for Assistance would become public. Since it did, the Government of Canada has reviewed its procedure to ensure that the risk of this happening again is minimized.

The parties accept that the RCMP, on its own, initiated the Airbus investigation;

—and let's not forget that Mr. Mulroney signed this—

that the Minister of Justice was not involved in the decision to initiate the investigation; and that before November 4, 1995, the Minister of Justice was not aware of the Request for Assistance and the RCMP investigation.

The parties accept that the RCMP and the Department of Justice in sending the Request for Assistance to Switzerland acted within their legitimate responsibilities in this matter.

I believe, Madam Chair, that the settlement agreement sets out the parameters of what was agreed upon between the government and Mr. Mulroney, and I believe it does state that Mr. Mulroney accepted the fact that there is an ongoing RCMP investigation. I fail to see how we, as a committee—if there is precedent, I'd like to know about it—could interfere in an ongoing investigation. We would bring to the public perhaps confidential aspects of this investigation, which may damage the RCMP's investigation in the long run.

Also, there are some issues that are currently before the courts, as was stated by both Mr. Ramsay and Mr. MacKay, and the Supreme Court will be considering constitutionality. We would also be damaging that process.

Mr. Schreiber is suing the government for libel, and that also is an ongoing case before the courts. We would also perhaps be damaging the process in that case.

I fail to see how any precedent has been created in the past when there is an ongoing investigation...that we as a committee should be interfering with an ongoing investigation and also with a process that is within the justice system.

I would like to say again that I think the out-of-court settlement is very clear in terms of Mr. Mulroney exonerating the government and allowing the RCMP to continue its investigation.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thanks, Ms. Bakopanos.

Mr. Lee.

Mr. Derek Lee: Thank you.

There are a whole lot of different perspectives we could take on this here today, but on the issue of whether or not the justice committee could pursue this, I certainly stand with those who say it could. It has the authority to do it under the standing orders. It has the full authority of the House of Commons to call for persons and papers. We have resources, all the resources of the House of Commons, so we could certainly do this. The question is, would we want to? Do we want to at this time, if at all?

I have some concerns. That won't surprise any of you. One of them—and I'm surprised no one else has mentioned it—is what I would call Mr. Mulroney's personal vulnerability to a process that would take place here in the House of Commons or at this committee.

You will realize that in this committee and in the House of Commons there is complete immunity for the work we do here, and in the process of pursuing an inquiry along these lines we will inevitably, and quite publicly, unless we decide to do it in camera, end up saying things, articulating things, that Mr. Mulroney and others might prefer that we do not publicly. He is, for all practical purposes, an innocent person in all respects until the state manages to prove otherwise.

By embarking on an inquiry that probes very specific allegations—and there's no question at all that officials who were pursuing the investigation at the RCMP were in fact making allegations. In fact, officials had never reached a conclusion. Regrettably, the letter of request to Swiss authorities implies that a conclusion had been reached by the RCMP, and that was the basis of the lawsuit. But no one has reached a conclusion that anyone is guilty of an offence here. There are only allegations and some

evidence.

1615

I hold that out as reason why we might not want to, at this point in time, before the investigation is completed, begin probing an issue where someone's guilt or innocence will come into play, and there are at least three individuals allegedly, possibly, involved here. Even as I speak I am touching on matters that are best not dealt with publicly at this point in time and are best left with those who would pursue any investigation, so I don't want to spend more time on that.

If we were to undertake an inquiry now, we would do it with the full knowledge that there is in existence an investigation. This is something Parliament generally doesn't do by convention. Just because there's a convention there that we wouldn't embark on an inquiry when another branch of government is carrying on the same kind of inquiry doesn't mean we can't do it. We have full authority in this Parliament to carry out any kind of an investigation we want to. But the question is, should we? I'm suggesting we should respect the convention that causes Parliament to avoid or delay carrying on investigations when the police are doing it in tandem.

Thirdly, you can't look at one small aspect of this case. This began with a decision by Air Canada to spend \$1.8 billion on some new aircraft, and I don't think you can look at any one piece of this puzzle unless you look at the whole thing. By the time we would complete reconnoitring every little nook and cranny of this issue we would have gone global; we would have brought up dozens of names of people, procedures; how the heck these contracts are negotiated; who the middle men are; why people open up bank accounts in Switzerland; how the money moves around; percentages, favours, quid pro quos, travel arrangements, suitcases, and telephone calls.

I could spend a couple of months myself, and there are probably a few investigative journalists out there spending half a year putting stuff together on this. My Pandora's box argument is that if we were to ever get into it, we would only do it with very specific focus, time, location and place, and we certainly haven't done that.

Having said all of that, this is why even though there are real questions out there—and I have questions as a member of Parliament about certain things—I'm not prepared to embark on an inquiry of this intensity, of this profile, at this time, if ever. I wouldn't say never.

But there is in existence.... The members are all aware that the estimates procedure or other inquiries that we undertake at this committee are fully capable of providing an avenue to ask questions and get them answered. The Commissioner of the RCMP will be here for estimates. I suspect he would be cautious about answering questions about a matter that is under investigation, but if members of this committee are determined to get an answer then the commissioner is bound to answer. The question is whether we want a public answer about something that's under investigation.

There are other questions that can be asked of the Minister of Justice, of the Solicitor General, whatever, and the opposition is fully at liberty to ask those questions today, in the House, or at committee in estimates.

I was in opposition once, too, Madam Chair, and I'm fully supportive of those types of inquiries. But I can't support the motion at this time.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lee.

Colleagues, just keep in mind that it's 20 after and we have witnesses coming, so—

Mr. Derek Lee: I apologize for taking so much time.

The Chair: That's all right. I want to give the opposition, Mr. Ramsay and Mr. MacKay, a chance to respond, so I know you're going to be brief, Mr. Discepola.

Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Lib.): As usual.

Madam Chair, I think if the members opposite had taken the time, and I know they have, to read the settlement of agreement...a lot of the questions they raise have been answered in that settlement of agreement, as Ms. Bakopanos pointed out.

• 1620

On the question of the letter, what we have to understand here is that the criminal investigation is still ongoing and was ongoing. What precipitated the civil suit is the issuance of that letter, which was issued under normally followed, traditional procedures that were followed by previous administrations.

On the question of the content of the letter, the settlement also acknowledges that it only contained allegations. That was made clear. This is something Mr. Mulroney signed and accepted. If he wanted that letter withdrawn, I'm sure he is intelligent and had recourse to an awful lot of good counsel, so why didn't he make that part of his settlement, the request to withdraw that letter?

When we take a look at the content here, we have to assure Canadians that no one should be subjected to that in the future.

Again, if we take a look at item 8 of the settlement, it says that even though they've used the regularly followed procedure, we have now put new procedures in place to review any such requests of foreign countries, and those letters will be scrutinized and reviewed by the proper echelons in the hierarchy. So the risk of that happening again is minimized and no one else will undergo such a thing.

I don't understand what we're going to achieve by having... I'd like this clarified on behalf of Mr. Ramsay in his rebuttal. Are we asking for a commission of inquiry on the Somalia commission? That's how his motion reads, I think.

The Chair: The motion is that the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights conduct hearings with witnesses into what is commonly called the Airbus scandal in order to determine whether a publicly commissioned inquiry should be convened.

Mr. Nick Discepola: Okay, so we're not at that step yet. All right, thank you.

The Chair: Thanks.

Mr. DeVillers and then Mr. Telegdi, and I know you're both going to be so brief.

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.): Yes, I'll be very brief, Madam Chair.

I hear the members of the opposition saying they are not trying to be political or partisan, and I don't question that lightly, but I am brought to wonder when I notice the wording in the letter refer to "the

Airbus affair", whereas in the motion it's referred to as "the Airbus scandal". That, to me, smacks of politicizing the issue.

The Chair: I'll let them have a little lapse.

Mr. Paul DeVillers: The only other point I want to make is on what Mr. Ramsay referred to as other possible victims we might not know about. Well, we're here and we're discussing this because this letter became public, and that's what created the victim, if there is one in this thing. If there were other victims, we would know about it. They would be in the public domain. So I don't think that should be a legitimate concern.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thanks.

Mr. Telegdi, ever so briefly:

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Kitchener—Waterloo, Lib.): Madam Chair, I'm very touched by the non-partisan nature of the issue before us and I'm further touched by Mr. Ramsay's interest in rehabilitation.

I've been kind of bothered by this issue. We're talking about a motion that we don't have a copy of. We're talking about wanting to do things such as withdrawing letters, which to my understanding would effectively abrogate the ongoing investigation, which the former Prime Minister thought the RCMP had every right to carry out. There are all sorts of questions as to who leaked this letter, and on and on.

My concern, Madam Chair, is if this is really a serious attempt to get at something specific, then I would like to see the documentation before me and I would like to have an opportunity to review it, none of which has been the case.

The other issue I'm concerned about is that we as a committee have quite a workload in front of us, not the least of which is the Victims' Bill of Rights, which we really have to start moving on, plus all the other work. I would hate to get into committing ourselves to major time expenditures that would put many of those pressing issues on the back burner, for something that I don't have the documentation on and didn't have the opportunity to review. I don't know the implications of the ongoing investigation. Now I understand there are seven RCMP officers undertaking it.

• 1625

So, Madam Chair, I cannot support the motion at this time for those reasons.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Telegdi.

Mr. Ramsay and then Mr. MacKay, keeping in mind the time.

Mr. Jack Ramsay: The motion has nothing whatever to do with interfering with the RCMP investigation.

To respond to the comments that have been made by the other side, Brian Mulroney's agreement cannot release Kimberly Prost or any other official from any act of impropriety they may have committed. To attempt to cover that possibility by reading from the agreement is irrelevant, redundant, and wrong.

The agreement signed by Brian Mulroney and the Department of Justice cannot alleviate responsibility if there have been improprieties committed. We've been asking, and certainly I've been asking, to be able to look at the process that occurred here that resulted in a letter being forwarded to a foreign authority containing false accusations against a Canadian citizen.

As far as the agreement is concerned, it was made between the parties involved and has no other impact in terms of impropriety committed by Staff Sergeant Fiegenwald or Kimberly Prost or whomever. We would like to ask questions as far as their conduct is concerned.

On the interference with an ongoing police investigation, I covered that and there is no interference. Let the police do their work.

But we have a responsibility to the citizens of this country to ensure that our institutions of government are working properly and the rights of individuals are not being violated. If we have a process that allows false accusations about Canadians to be placed in letters going to foreign authorities, then you had better believe we should be examining that process. We have a right and a duty to examine that process.

It happened in this case and became public only because of extraordinary circumstances, I suppose. I don't know what brought it to the attention of the public. But it does identify a process that we ought to be very concerned about. There doesn't seem to be any concern about a process that can label a person falsely in this country. We have evidence that this has been going on for a number of years. Although there is an indication that process has been changed, we don't know what has changed in that process. We do know court has ruled it to be illegal and improper. That ruling has been appealed and we're still waiting for the final decision.

If the appeal is thrown out, it means we have a very clear process and it's a legal process. It's very clear we would have to appear before a competent jurisdiction in order to get the authority to make the request letter to a foreign authority. We go far beyond that.

As far as Mr. Lee's concern about poor Mr. Mulroney and the others being exposed, well, for goodness' sake, Mr. Mulroney himself is asking for a public inquiry into this. Mr. Schreiber is initiating his own public inquiry in a forum into this. I'm sorry, but I simply don't buy your comments, sir,

I respectfully submit that an effort to get answers to the questions I have raised can be done and ought to be done without interfering at all in the RCMP investigation. What bothers me more than anything else is that it seems the Minister of Justice, the Department of Justice, and the government of this country are saying that in order for the RCMP to continue with its investigation, it must rely upon a letter containing a false statement and a false accusation, and I don't agree with that.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos: That isn't what you said.

The Chair: Order.

• 1630

Mr. Jack Ramsay: I do not understand why the letter cannot be withdrawn and a new letter issued, minus the false accusations, and let the police carry on with their job. As it is now, we the taxpayer are vulnerable to the lawsuits. We're vulnerable to Mr. Schreiber's lawsuit. Who is going to pay for the cost of his lawsuit? Is there going to be an out-of-court settlement? The lawsuit is based upon the false

accusation contained in a letter the government refuses to withdraw.

For the benefit of time and my colleague down the way, who obviously has some comments, I'll end my comments there.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Ramsay.

Mr. MacKay.

Mr. Peter MacKay: I have to pick up on the last comment by Mr. Ramsay. Let's face it, that letter is flawed evidence. It's not going to be used in an investigation. It's impossible for them to rely on that as part of their investigation. The investigation is continuing full force, there's no question about that.

Mr. Lee, I have to respond to your remarks about process and the public perception of this. How much more public can this affair be? I ask that rhetorically. This has gone on for over a year now. This trial took place in the papers and on the news. It didn't take place in a courtroom. At least a person accused of a crime has a forum to go before a court and be proven guilty or innocent. That hasn't taken place here.

There is a suggestion by Ms. Bakopanos that this letter and the fact that Mr. Mulroney has signed this letter is an exoneration of the government. I would suggest that when a breach of contract occurs.... This would have to be disputed, but if the government is still relying on this letter and not withdrawing it and it was false to begin with, then all bets are off. Mr. Mulroney does not have to comply with what he's agreed with if the government isn't living up to their end of the bargain.

Mr. Lee also suggested that we should ask questions in Question Period, that we have other forums, and yet he has contradicted himself in his very remarks by saying that we don't want to have pieces of the puzzle. So let's delve into this in a complete way. Let's have a subcommittee or a forum where we can look at all the facts. If the investigation is going to go on ad infinitum, we're never going to get to the bottom of it, if that cloud is going to continue out there.

There's a principle in law, as you know, Madam Chair, called habeas corpus. Where's the body? Where's the evidence here? Where's the proof? There's none. There's an investigation that's been ongoing for years. There's not one shred, one scintilla, of evidence that the Prime Minister did anything wrong, and if there were, I guarantee you we'd know about it.

The Chair: First of all, I just want to thank everybody for keeping on the right side of the edge of tone here and also for co-operating in terms of time. I know you know we've limited the time by agreement. I appreciate that because it allows us to get on with the work we have to do. I think we've had a pretty full discussion within that limited time, so I thank you all for that.

The motion is now before the committee and I'm going to call the question. Do you want the motion read?

An hon. member: Yes.

The Chair: Do you want a voice vote?

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Yes.

The Chair: All right. Please read the motion, Mr. Clerk.

The Clerk:

That the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights conduct hearings with witnesses into what has commonly been called the "Airbus Scandal," to determine whether a Publicly Commissioned Inquiry should be convened.

The Chair: Thank you. We'll have a recorded vote, please, Mr. Clerk.

(Motion negatived: nays 8; yeas 7)

• 1635

The Chair: Thank you. We'll rise for a few minutes while we get ready to hear our witnesses.

E-mail th

FOOTNOTES
1. ...
2. ...

...
...
...

...
...
...

...
...
...

...
...
...



1420

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have more respect for Parliament and the institution of prime minister than to use the language suggested by the hon. member.

I do want to say that the minutes of settlement signed on behalf of Brian Mulroney say that the parties accept that the RCMP, on its own, initiated the Airbus investigation. The parties have always acknowledged that the RCMP must continue investigating any allegations of illegality or wrongdoing brought to its attention.

This is what Brian Mulroney's lawyers signed for him. These words—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Crowfoot.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, everyone from the prime minister to the former justice minister to the commissioner of the RCMP has told Canadians that Staff Sergeant Fiegenwald is the only individual responsible for the Airbus scandal.

Yet they allowed him to walk away without a hearing and without the determination of guilt. I ask the prime minister is this because it forms part of a high level government cover-up?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no cover-up here. The arrangement between Mr. Fiegenwald and the RCMP was, as far as I am aware, entered into voluntarily by Mr. Fiegenwald with the RCMP.

That is something involving the internal disciplinary process of the RCMP under the RCMP Act. As far as I am aware, ministers have no role in that process.

* * *

[Translation]

IRAQ

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, over the past few days, a potential conflict has been growing in the Persian Gulf between Iraq and the international community.

The Prime Minister said in Hanoi last week on this matter that he was not ruling out support for the American option, that is, armed intervention.

Could the Deputy Prime Minister clarify the remarks of the Prime Minister and tell us clearly the government's position on the growing conflict between Iraq and the United States?



- [Press Releases](#)
- [Fact Sheets](#)
- [Media Contacts](#)
- [Speeches](#)
- [Relevant Links](#)
- [Search](#)
- [Archives](#)
- [Home Page](#)

Brian Mulroney v. The Attorney General of Canada et al-

Monday, January 6, 1997

Department of Justice

(Statement by The Honourable Allan Rock and The Honourable Herb Gray Regarding the Case of *Brian Mulroney v. The Attorney General of Canada et al* - Monday, January 6, 1997)

MINISTER ROCK

This morning in Montreal, Counsel for the parties in the Airbus Litigation appeared before the presiding trial judge to announce that the action had been settled.

We have now released a full text of the agreement in separate documents.

Today's agreement is, I believe, in the best interests of the Canadian Government, the Canadian Justice System and the Canadian taxpayer.

Starting last night with leaks and 'spin' about this agreement there has been a lot of comment and speculation about what is in it.

Let me start by telling Canadians what is **not** in the agreement:

-There is no \$50 million damages payment to Mr. Mulroney - as he has been demanding for more than a year in his law suit. In fact, Mr. Mulroney has now dropped any claim to compensation for damages.

-This agreement does not stop the RCMP's ongoing criminal investigation, into Airbus, or give anyone - including Mr. Mulroney - effective immunity from such an investigation.

-In fact, under the Agreement, it is clear that the RCMP will continue its investigation in its entirety and it is now free to carry it through to whatever conclusion is appropriate.

It is important to note that Mr. Mulroney has accepted what the Government has said all along, that the Airbus investigation was begun by the RCMP on its own, that there was no political interference, and that the Department of Justice and the RCMP, in transmitting the Letter of Request, acted within their legitimate responsibilities. Mr. Mulroney has also acknowledged that the procedure used in sending the Letter of Request in this case was the same as that followed in numerous previous Requests for Assistance under the current government and his own administration.

For our part, this settlement agreement does acknowledge that the letter of request sent to Switzerland contains some words that, taken on their own, indicated incorrectly that the RCMP had already concluded that illegal activity had occurred. The reality is that no such conclusion had been reached and, based on the evidence received to date, has still not been reached in the ongoing investigation.

The publication of language in a Letter of Request was completely unprecedented. To this day, it is not known how the newspaper that first reported the matter obtained a copy of a non-governmental summary of the document.

It should be noted that the Government and the RCMP have decided that costs are to be paid to achieve this settlement. No damages will be paid, because under the Settlement Agreement, the issue of liability was not admitted, nor pursued. The amount of the costs will be determined through arbitration. There will be no payment for items such as media management advice. The only costs that will be paid are those that were reasonably incurred in the prosecution of this action.

There is no doubt that the cost of this settlement to Canadian taxpayers will be far less than we would have spent by going on with a lengthy and complex trial.

I know a lot of people will be surprised that this case has been settled. Some will ask why Mr. Mulroney's legal costs are being paid. Let me explain.

First, my own experience as a trial lawyer tells me that there is no such thing as a sure case. There are always risks in going to trial. I have already referred to elements of risk in this case, including some of the language in the letter, and the enormous cost of a lengthy trial.

When public money is involved, we have an obligation to minimize risks. Obviously, we would have preferred not even to pay legal costs. But two events late last week convinced us that it was in the public interest to settle this case even if it meant paying legal costs to the plaintiff.

My colleague, Mr. Gray, will speak to those events and other issues.

MINISTER GRAY

There were three reasons that led the RCMP to recommend a settlement.

The first and paramount reason was to ensure the integrity of the ongoing police investigation.

Throughout the past year, consistent efforts have been made to protect the overall investigation, the identity of police sources, and the evidence itself.

The risk that these objectives might not be achieved and that, directly or indirectly, a serious precedent might be set that would damage well established police investigation policies, led to the conclusion that Mr. Mulroney's legitimate costs should be paid as a means of achieving settlement and eliminating this risk.

Secondly, the ruling of the Federal Court last Friday reinforced the very real possibility that the RCMP could be forced to disclose information obtained

during the course of its police investigation - despite its objections raised under the Canada Evidence Act.

This ruling, and other proceedings, have brought home to the RCMP the very great risk that testimony might be required that would have the effect of jeopardizing the entire investigation.

Finally, we learned three days ago that, during the investigation, there may have been a disclosure by a member of the RCMP investigative team to an unauthorized third party outside government, about who was named in the Letter of Request.

There is no indication that this alleged communication can be linked to the actual publication in the Financial Post of a non-governmental summary of the Letter of Request. I should also stress that this new element is not the cause of Mr. Mulroney's complaint against the government.

While the Privacy Act prevents disclosure of the names of either individual involved, I can tell you that the Commissioner has already initiated a Code of Conduct investigation and he will be available to you following this press conference to discuss the details of this process.

Therefore, these three reasons, the overall need to protect the investigation, the decision last Friday and the apparent disclosure, led to the RCMP decision to support settlement of this case in a manner that includes payment of Mr. Mulroney's costs.

MINISTER ROCK

One final note. For more than a decade, under this and former governments, requests for assistance have been sent by the Department of Justice on behalf of police in Canada to governments around the world. There was a presumption that the written Requests would never become public and that in keeping with the international practice, statements of wrongdoing could be made about people under investigation so that foreign authorities could quickly grasp the essence of the police theory.

We now know that the process must change and have taken steps to minimize the risk of something going wrong.

Within a month of the publication of the Request for Assistance in this case, we began to change the practice. Over the past year, the Deputy Minister has put procedures in place to minimize the risk of repetition to the greatest extent possible. In addition, we have implemented a new procedure to review the system periodically in the future to determine whether any additional changes are required.

Finally, I should point out that the efforts made by the parties to settle this case were greatly assisted by the efforts of the Honourable Alan B. Gold, who served as a facilitator through the process. I know that I speak on behalf of all parties in expressing to the Honourable Mr. Gold our thanks for his help.

And now, we would be pleased to receive any questions you might have.

Last Updated: 2005-10-20

Important Notices

3817

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

AIRBUS AIRCRAFT

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier-Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice has revealed that, a few days after his appointment as Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, he approached RCMP authorities concerning the Airbus affair.

Let us not forget that the minister has admitted that the information he communicated to the RCMP originated with an unidentified journalist.

I am asking the minister whether he advised the Prime Minister of the approaches he was planning to make to the RCMP, before he was appointed Minister of Justice and Solicitor General of Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): No, Mr. Speaker, but there is an assumption in the question that is wrong.

The hon. member asserted in his preamble that there has been an omission that I involved myself in the Airbus investigation. That is plain wrong. The choice of language and precision of expression is important in this matter.

The House will know from what has been said that I have made it a matter of public record that after consulting with my deputy minister and the Solicitor General of Canada, I communicated to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in November 1993, or thereabouts, information which I had received with respect to the previous government.

The RCMP then communicated with me after they had looked into those matters and said that there was no basis for investigation.

Subsequently, separately, the RCMP commenced an investigation into what is now called the Airbus affair. I had no knowledge of or involvement in that investigation. My first knowledge of it was derived on November 4, 1995 when one of the lawyers for Mr. Mulroney telephoned me at home.

Those are the facts. In communicating information to the RCMP that I had learned early in November 1993, I was not only acting after consulting with the deputy minister and the solicitor general, but as it appears from reports in the media in recent days, I was doing exactly the same as at least one former minister of justice, John Turner, said he did when he was fixed with information of that kind.

3818

Therefore, I invite the hon. member to be careful in how he expresses himself. I had no involvement in the Airbus investigation, as that is known. That is a matter for the police.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier-Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister tells us that he communicated information to the RCMP. I am not making any assumptions on the role he played in the affair.

Having this information, however, and intending to communicate it to the RCMP-I am not saying he interfered in the investigation-I am asking him, knowing all this, when the Prime Minister invited him to be Minister of Justice and Solicitor General of Canada, did he not find it appropriate to inform the Prime Minister of his intention to communicate that information to the RCMP because, after becoming Solicitor General and Minister of Justice, he would be the one responsible for the case.

Is this not a lack of judgment? Let us keep in mind, all ministers speak on behalf of the government, commit the Cabinet, commit the Prime Minister. Why then did he not inform the Prime Minister?

(1420)

[English]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): No, Mr. Speaker, it is not.

In the first place, at the time when I was sworn in I had not yet consulted either with the deputy or the solicitor general with respect to the information in my proper role. Second, a police investigation is not the responsibility of the attorney general and the Minister of Justice.

If the hon. member will look at the roles and responsibilities of officers of the government, he will see the RCMP conducts investigations on its own. It is the solicitor general, not the attorney general, who reports to Parliament for the police.

These are not simply matters of detail. They are fundamental issues, as I said in response to a question last week from the hon. member's colleague. Police investigations are run by the police, not by politicians.

It is only those who choose not to see it who say there is no distinction between an attorney general acting responsibly in communicating to the RCMP information so it can pursue it and exercise its own judgment about its importance and an attorney general saying to the police: "I will have no role in a police investigation. That is up to you to decide". Those are the principles.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier-Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister tells us that he did not speak to the deputy ministers or the people in the department before becoming minister and Solicitor General. I can understand that, as he was not yet in the position. The opposite situation would have surprised me greatly.



Previous & Next

1420

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have more respect for Parliament and the institution of prime minister than to use the language suggested by the hon. member.

I do want to say that the minutes of settlement signed on behalf of Brian Mulroney say that the parties accept that the RCMP, on its own, initiated the Airbus investigation. The parties have always acknowledged that the RCMP must continue investigating any allegations of illegality or wrongdoing brought to its attention.

This is what Brian Mulroney's lawyers signed for him. These words—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Crowfoot.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, everyone from the prime minister to the former justice minister to the commissioner of the RCMP has told Canadians that Staff Sergeant Fiegenwald is the only individual responsible for the Airbus scandal.

Yet they allowed him to walk away without a hearing and without the determination of guilt. I ask the prime minister is this because it forms part of a high level government cover-up?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no cover-up here. The arrangement between Mr. Fiegenwald and the RCMP was, as far as I am aware, entered into voluntarily by Mr. Fiegenwald with the RCMP.

That is something involving the internal disciplinary process of the RCMP under the RCMP Act. As far as I am aware, ministers have no role in that process.

* * *



[Translation]

IRAQ

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, over the past few days, a potential conflict has been growing in the Persian Gulf between Iraq and the international community.

The Prime Minister said in Hanoi last week on this matter that he was not ruling out support for the American option, that is, armed intervention.

Could the Deputy Prime Minister clarify the remarks of the Prime Minister and tell us clearly the government's position on the growing conflict between Iraq and the United States?



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

584 702

627 20228

627 20228

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHON: 613 748 7330
FACSIMILE: 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6


Ottawa, September 26, 2006

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal"

Dear Prime Minister,

I am taking the liberty to sending you copies of my letters September 26, 2006
to the Hon. Stockwell B. Day, P.C., M. P. Minister of Public Safety
and to Mr. Gilles Duceppe M.P., Chef du Bloc Quebecois
for your personal information.

Yours sincerely



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE: 613 748 7330
FACSIMILE: 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbek@aol.com

Mr. Gilles Duceppe M. P.
Chef du Bloc Quebecois
Chambre des communes
Ottawa, On
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, September 24, 2006

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal"

Dear Mr. Duceppe,

On June 13, 1996 during Question Period regarding Airbus Aircraft you asked Allan Rock, then minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada whether he advised the Prime Minister of the approaches he was planning to make to the RCMP, before he was appointed Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

It might be of interest to you to read the transcript attached after more than 10 years later, keeping in mind that the "Airbus" affair came to an end on September 11, 2006 when the Crown announced that there was going to be no appeal after two judgments have been unsuccessful.

As a matter of fact Allan Rock started a private investigation into Brian Mulroney's affairs before he became the Minister of Justice and Attorney General. He was interested about the source of the mortgage payments on Mulroney's Westmount home (William Kaplan, "Presumed Guilty").

Nobody could ever imagine that Allan Rock initiated the biggest "Political Justice Scandal" in Canadian history.

I take the liberty to provide you with the Case Report concerning the "Political Justice Scandal"- International Case- and the "Airbus" Affair - Allan Rock & William Corbett and two Case Books which contain evidence and substantiate the Case Report.

It is hard to believe that the RCMP, with the cooperation of the Department of Justice and Canadian politicians, cooperated in this vendetta and witch hunt.

One could think SUN TZU was the godfather of this international conspiracy.

I am convinced that Canadians from coast to coast will be shocked and scared when the truth about the "Political Justice Scandal" comes to light and Canadians begin to understand that nearly everybody could face a similar situation.

On August 23, 2006 my lawyer Robert Hladun Q.C. in Edmonton obtained an Appointment for Examination for Discovery on October 12, 2006 concerning Mr. Allan Rock in my law suite against the Attorney General of Canada.

The "Political Justice Scandal" might be of special interest to you since quite a few politicians involved come from the Province of Quebec. If you have any further questions don't hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely



Copy to The Right Hon. Stephen J. Harper
Prime Minister

KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHON: 613 748 7330
FACSIMILE: 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

The Hon. Stockwell Burt Day
Minister of Public Safety

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, September 25, 2006

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal" and the RCMP

Dear Minister,

After 12 years of political intrigue and an investigative bill that run into many millions of dollars, the final curtain has gone down on the "Airbus and Eurocopter affair".

Brian Mulroney, the international industrial companies, many conservative politicians abroad and my family and I have born the brunt of the case for the past twelve years and at this point there is still no closure in sight.

Dear Minister, I am taking the liberty of sending you a copy of the Case Report on the "Political Justice Scandal" for your information.

On August 23, 2006 my lawyer in Edmonton obtained an Appointment for Examination for Discovery on October 12, 2006 concerning Allan Rock in my law suite against the Attorney General of Canada.


I intend to make a formal complaint to the Commission for Public Complaints Against the RCMP.

RCMP Commissioner Giuliano Zaccardelli met with the convicted Swiss criminal Giorgio Pelossi in Calgary who is an informant like Stevie Cameron to the RCMP and a key figure in the political vendetta against Brian Mulroney and me.

RCMP Commissioner Giuliano Zaccardelli increased the number of RCMP officers working on the file when he took office. The Case Report will tell you what they did to us.

If you have any further questions don't hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'G. Zaccardelli', written over a horizontal line.

Copy to The Right Hon. Stephen J. Harper
Prime Minister



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

63 11 162

630 40262

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE 613 748 7330
TELEFAX 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, October 27, 2006

**Subject: "Political Justice Scandal" and the "Airbus" affair
From Allan Rock to Irwin Cotler**

Dear Prime Minister,


I am taking the liberty to send you a copy of my letter October 25, 2006 to the Hon. Vic Toews, P.C., M.P. Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada for your personal information.

Could one of your officials be so kind and check with the Minister whether he received my letter, because I believe that he is shielded by the political enemy.

Dear Prime Minister, I am sorry to bother you. You know the reason why I can only turn to you.

I thank you and wish you success in the interest of all Canadians.

Yours sincerely



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE 613 748 7330
TELEFAX 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

The Honourable Vic Toews, P.C., M.P.
Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, October 25, 2006

**Subject: "Political Justice Scandal" and the "Airbus" Affair
From Allan Rock to Irwin Cotler**

Dear Mr. Minister,

I am taking the liberty to sending you copies of the

"Political Justice Scandal" Canadian Case (Binder),
"Political Justice Scandal" International Case (Binder),
"Political Justice Scandal" International Case and the "Airbus" Affair, Case Report
(attachment tab18),
"Political Justice Scandal" International Case the "Airbus" Affair – Allan Rock &
William Corbett (attachment tab19)
for your personal political information.

On May 17, 2006 and on August 10, 2006 my lawyer Edward Greenspan Q.C.,
LL. D. sent letters and submissions to you concerning the political aspects of my
extradition case, including his submissions to the then Minister of Justice and Attorney
General of Canada, Irwin Cotler together with the Minister's decision for surrender.

Since your decision in my case is of highly important political nature in Canada
and Germany, I feel strongly that I have an obligation and a right to give to you my views
of the story and the scandal. Let me tell you why:

All my life I was and I am a Conservative on an international level.
The conservative Governments of the Province of Bavaria, Germany with Premier Franz Josef Strauss (Chairman of the CSU) and the conservative Government of the Province of Alberta, Canada with Premier Peter Lougheed made me come to Canada in 1974.

On September 2, 1978 I became a Canadian landed immigrant.
On February 23, 1982 I became a Canadian Citizen.

As requested I brought jobs and substantial amounts of money to Canada.
I felt very comfortable with my new Canadian conservative friends and was happy to provide support and financial help to them when required and became a member of the Conservative 500.

I don't want to drop names to impress you, but it might be that we share some friends or there are also people you may want to speak to.

The Hon. Dr. Hugh Horner's son, The Hon. Doug Horner, M.L.A.
The Hon. Ken Kowalski, M.L.A.
Rowland McFarlaness's widow Jan
William (Bill) Skoreyko M.P.'s widow Helen and his son Alan Skoreyko
The Hon. Dr. Horst A. Schmid
Norman Wagner professor and University president's widow Cathy
Rod Sykes (Major of Calgary)
Dr. Eric Waldmann professor
Robert Hladun, Q.C.
The Hon. Jack Major, Q.C., LL.D.
Lee Richardson, M.P.

The Right Hon. Brian Mulroney
The Hon. Don Mazankowski
The Hon. Elmer MacKay
The Hon. Frank Oberle
The Hon. Charles Mayer
The Hon. Robert Coates
The Hon. Frank D. Moore's widow Beth
The Hon. Bill McKnight
The Hon. Paul Dick
The Hon. Sinclair Stevens
The Hon. John M. Buchanan
The Hon. Don W. Cameron
The Hon. Peter MacKay, M. P.

The Hon. Jean Charest
 The Hon. Benoit Bouchard
 The Hon. Marcell Masse
 The Hon. Monique Vezina
 The Hon. Jean Corbeil
 The Hon. Michel Cogger
 Mr. Fred Doucet
 Mr. Gerry Doucet
 Mr. Garry Ouelett's widow Renee

Lieutenant – General J.E. Vance CMM, CD. RT and Army Major Ian Read
 Major – General G.M. Reay, Commander MBE, CD's widow Lesley
 Lieutenant- General J. A. Fox, Commander RT

The older we become the more friends we loose.

1997 LEGAL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA

Allan Rock, then the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada initiated the "Airbus" affair based on talks with journalists (for all the details see the reports and the Binder Canadian Case).

On August 24, 2006 my Lawyer, Robert Hladun, Q.C. filed an appointment for Examination for Discovery concerning Allan Rock in the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta in Edmonton.

On October 2, 2006 John H. Sims, Deputy Attorney General of Canada filed a Notice of Motion with the Court in Edmonton that he will bring an application for an order setting aside the Appointment for Examination of Allan Rock, which will start another battle all the way up to the Supreme Court of Canada. This is another chapter of the 9 year-delay tactics of the Liberal Underground Government of Canada – the Liberal bureaucracy (attachment tab 1).

The aim is still the same: make sure that Canadians will never find out about the secrets of the "Airbus" Mulroney Vendetta and the biggest "Political Justice Scandal" in Canadian history with international political implications.

When the legal battle begun the Attorney General was with a Liberal Government, responsible for the scandal and trying everything to stop the lawsuit.

Since February 6, 2006 the situation has changed and the Attorney General of Canada is a member of the Conservative Government, but the bureaucrats are still the same.

I will send all this material and information to you in order to bring the situation to your attention. I will ask The Right Honourable Stephen Harper M.P., Prime Minister of Canada for help to make sure that it gets to you because you are shielded by those who are the target of my legal proceedings.

CANADIAN GREAT LIARS: ALLAN ROCK, HERB GRAY, STEVIE CAMERON!

CBC Watch, Thursday, June 3, 2004

RCMP launched fraud investigation after hearing journalist Stevie Cameron on CBC Radio. The Cameron interview spurred police on.

Supt. Mathews said that two senior officers contacted her after the 1995 broadcast. They persuaded her to supply potential evidence in return for anonymity and insider information, an arrangement that recently erupted into a major legal and journalistic controversy (attachment tab 2).

The arrangement paid well for Steve Cameron, not for the RCMP, not for the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, not for the Solicitor General of Canada, not for the Government of Canada, not for several governments abroad, not for Canadian international reputation, not for important international industrial companies and not for Brian Mulroney, Frank Moores, Garry Ouelett and Karlheinz Schreiber.

Stevie Cameron provided stories with the support of Giorgio Pelossi (a convicted Swiss criminal) and helped the Mounties and other Canadian officials to find reasons to travel the world for 11 years on Canadian taxpayer's money. This started the longest RCMP criminal investigation in Canadian history. It cost millions of dollars without any result.

With the insider information from the RCMP Stevie Cameron (a.k.a. "Stevie Wonderful") published her second book *On the Take: Crime, Corruption and Greed in the Mulroney Years* in October 1995 DRAMATIC NEW MATERIAL ADDED and her book *The Last Amigo: Karlheinz Schreiber and the Anatomy of a Scandal* in 2001. (See the Case Report September 27, 2006 page 3.)

The books created public support for the RCMP and the Liberal Government concerning the political vendetta against Brian Mulroney and Karlheinz Schreiber.

On January 6, 1997 in a Statement by Allan Rock and Herb Gray regarding the case with Brian Mulroney and the Settlement Agreement, Herb Gray, the then-Solicitor General of Canada pointed out:

Finally, we learned three days ago that, during the investigation, there may have been a disclosure by a member of the RCMP investigative team to an unauthorized third party outside government, about who was named in the Letter of Request.

While the Privacy Act prevents disclosure of the names of either individual involved, I can tell you that the Commissioner has already initiated a Code of Conduct investigation and he will be available to you following this press conference to discuss the details of this process (attachment tab 3).

Stevie Cameron writes in her book *The Last Amigo* on page 289:

The Privacy Act notwithstanding, within hours of the press conference's conclusion, Rock's senior staff and counsel, as well as public relations specialists hired to give him advice on how to handle the affair, were telling reporters openly that the Mountie in question was Staff Sergeant Fraser Fiegenwald and the "third party" was Stevie Cameron (attachment tab 4).

Mike Niebudek, President, Mounted Police Association of Ontario, reported: *Southam wanted to cover the disciplinary hearing of S/SGT. Fraser Fiegenwald, who was charged with two offenses under the Code of Conduct following the Airbus Affair. Judge Rutherford ruled that the section of the RCMP Act which allowed hearing in private was unconstitutional. Following this ruling, the RCMP decided to negotiate a deal with good old Fraser instead of carrying on with the disciplinary hearing. And I could go on....*

Considering all these legal battles, which cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to Canadian taxpayers, maybe we should send a copy of the Constitutional Act of 1982 to the Commissioner and to the Attorney General of Canada.

*You have to agree that it is inconceivable that the leaders of our country and of a national police force ignore this Act which takes precedence over any other legislation in our land. After all, our main mandate is to maintain the law, as says our motto. **Before insuring that the Canadian people respect the laws of our country, maybe the RCMP should set the example in its own back yard** (attachment tab 5).*

Dear Mr. Minister, do you understand what is going on with this case?

Why was Fraser Fiegenwald fired because he spoke to Stevie Cameron (the confidential RCMP informant Code A 2948) when she was entitled to insider information?

Why did Fraser Fiegenwald get a nice deal after Judge Rutherford's ruling?

Why did Herb Gray, then the Solicitor General of Canada, lie about Fraser Fiegenwald unethically speaking to Stevie Cameron when he ought to know that she was entitled to receive RCMP insider information?

Why did Allan Rock, then the Minister of Justice and Attorney General, who initiated the whole affair send people out to broadcast the untrue story on Fraser Fiegenwald and Stevie Cameron?

Why did all the individuals - from the Department of Justice, the International Assistance Group (IAG) and the RCMP - who are involved in the case, try to stop me with my lawsuit through delay, detention or extradition?

There is an explanation as long as it concerns individuals of the previous Liberal Governments, or the Canadian Underground Government - of the Liberal bureaucracy:

PLAIN FEAR!

Imagine the truth about the biggest "Political Justice Scandal" in Canadian History with all the international implications comes to light in a Canadian court.

Imagine Canadians will learn that the "Airbus" affair was nothing more than a political vendetta against Brian Mulroney and Karlheinz Schreiber is the innocent victim.

The case of **Maheer Arar** shows what can happen to an innocent victim of the RCMP and the Canadian Department of Justice.

What would happen if a Judge, like Mr. Justice Dennis O'Connor, conducted an inquiry into the "Airbus" affair and the "Political Justice Scandal"? Both affairs tortured for 11 years the families of Brian Mulroney and Karlheinz Schreiber. They damaged their reputation with confidential RCMP informant Stevie Cameron's books and their skillful manipulation of the media.

On June 5, 2006 Christine Ashcroft, a lawyer of the Department of Justice, acting for the Attorney General of Canada in the lawsuit with Karlheinz Schreiber is asking in her letter for a better Affidavit of records, regarding the business of Mr. Schreiber and payments to Brian Mulroney (attachment tab 6).

On July 31, 2006 Christine Ashcroft writes in her letter: We can advise that we object to any examination of Mr. Rock (attachment tab 7).

Since this situation is not in accordance with the announcement of the Prime Minister to clean up the Government in Ottawa, it seems to be obvious that you have no knowledge about the legal proceedings in Edmonton. I hope this information is of some help to you.

THE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE EXTRADITION
OF
KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

In 1985, I became the Chairman of Thyssen – Bearhead Industries and came to Ottawa on the request of the Canadian Government and The Right Hon. Prime Minister Brian Mulroney to create jobs in the Province of Nova Scotia and to bring success to the USA–Canadian Defense Production Sharing Agreement.

For eight years I worked on the project. I learned, through bitter experience, that the Liberal bureaucracy in Ottawa with Paul Tellier, Bob Fowler and the support of Joe Clark undermined the policies of the Government of Brian Mulroney everywhere. What I did find were lies, frauds, conspiracy, greed, ignorance, arrogance, disappointment and great sadness for Canada and Canadians. The failure to use the superior military products developed by Thyssen – Bearhead (especially their armoured personnel carriers) cost the lives of Canadian soldiers and for what. The only gain was to achieve the Liberal Underground Government's goal to frustrate the policies of the legitimately-elected Conservative government of Canada.

Thyssen, the Canadian soldiers, the people of Nova Scotia, Quebec and I have been misused and betrayed after Thyssen spent more than \$60 Million on the project for peacekeeping and environment – protection.

In other words, it was easy for me to make enemies with the second Canadian Government (the Liberal bureaucracy).

If Canadians will ever get to know what really happened they will be shocked from coast to coast. I am still in contact with the witnesses including four Generals of the Canadian Armed Forces and several Ministers of previous Canadian Governments.

Having this situation in mind it is easy to understand why my enemies in the spring of 1995 teamed up with the German prosecutors, Stevie Cameron the RCMP informant and Giorgio Pelossi, the Swiss convicted criminal (see the Case Report).

On April 1, 1998 R. Brettschneider, RCMP Liaison Officer at the Canadian Embassy in Bonn, Germany send a letter to the German authorities and wrote: "Canadian investigators are equally interested in having Schreiber arrested. You will be contacted immediately in the event of any information which would assist you."

Why and on what legal basis did the RCMP want Schreiber arrested? There was never a charge or an arrest warrant issued against Mr. Schreiber (the document is in the International Case binder tab 5).

From the 11th to the 15th of September 1999 and from the 4th to the 9th of October 1999 some lawyers of the Canadian Department of Justice (IAG) were in Augsburg, Germany and assisted the German prosecutors to prepare the record of the case for Mr. Schreiber's extradition from Canada (read the whole story in the Case Report). The cooperation is still working.

My lawsuit against the Liberal Attorney General of Canada is the only legal route besides a public inquiry to bring the "Political Justice Scandal" in a Canadian court to light. This is why my enemies try everything to stop my actions. Their greatest wish is to have me extradited to Germany, hoping that I will disclose matters of interest to them during a trial in court and at the same time bring the lawsuit to an end in Edmonton. (Read all the details in the Case Report, in the report on Allan Rock & William Corbett and in the binder of the Canadian Case and the International Case of the "Political Justice Scandal".)

IRWIN COTLER'S LIBERAL RESCUE ACTION

When The Hon. Irwin Cotler, then the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, signed the warrants ordering Mr. Schreiber's surrender to the Federal Republic of Germany on October 31, 2004 he wrote to my Lawyer Edward Greenspan Q.C., LL.D

VI. Conclusion

It is my opinion that none of the circumstances which you raise, either individually or cumulatively, lead to a finding that Mr. Schreiber's surrender to Germany would be "shocking or fundamentally unacceptable to our society", or that his circumstances are such that they "constitutionally vitiate an order of surrender". I have also determined that there are no other considerations that would justify ignoring Canada's obligations under the Treaty between Canada and Germany Concerning Extradition.

On page 13 of the same letter Mr. Cotler wrote: My decision on surrender is a political one which involves balancing the interests of the person sought with Canada's international obligation.

With his conclusion and decision he presents the evidence that he is either fully integrated in the cover up of the "Political Justice Scandal" initiated by Allan Rock, Stevie Cameron RCMP informant, Herb Gray and other Liberal companions or he was totally under the control of the IAG and ignorant.

It looks to me that Mr. Cotler ascribed to the same credo, as do all the other people who are involved in the "Airbus" vendetta and the "Political Justice Scandal": maintain at all costs the principle of the "Constant Lie"

There is no Canadian obligation to extradite its Nationals to Germany.

Mr. Cotler knows that Germany will never extradite one of its Nationals to Canada. The German Constitution, Article 16 (2) will not allow the extradition of its Nationals.

ARTICLE V OF THE TREATY : EXTRADITION OF NATIONALS

(1) NEITHER OF THE CONTRACTING PARTIES SHALL BE BOUND TO EXTRADITE ITS OWN NATIONALS.

The truth is: The TREATY BETWEEN CANADA AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY CONCERNING EXTRADITION applies only to individuals, who are not German Nationals.

Canada has 49 not 50 Bilateral Extradition Treaties (attachment tab 8).
15 of the Treaties entered into force during the last Centuries.
22 countries, with the highest standards of civilization and culture do not extradite their Nationals.
21 countries have reserved the rights to decide on the extradition of their Nationals. Only 7 countries extradite their Nationals. See the Treaties and the publication of the RCMP, Interpol, the Canadian Central Authority and the IAG (attachment tab 9).

I reviewed every single Extradition Treaty which is on the list and found another huge lie: imagine the government of Canada signed 42 out of 49 Extradition Treaties without reciprocity, which is the most elementary common basis of each Treaty, and the misled members of the Canadian House of Commons ratified the Treaties (Treaty attachments tabs 15 – Germany, 16 – Finland, 17 – Korea as examples).

RCMP Interpol Ottawa published an Interpol History Report (attachment tab10).
 On page 3 you will read: Assistance to the Canadian Law Community and Interpol Member Countries - point 5:

CANADA EXTRADITES ITS NATIONALS

Dear Minister, people from around the world followed the invitation of the Canadian government and came to Canada like myself and helped to grow the country. I saw quite a few of them with tears in their eyes at the day, when they became Canadian Citizens. Don't you think that all of them expected to receive a Canadian Citizenship with quality standards other civilized countries provide for their Nationals?

**I have never seen a Government advertising the extradition of its Nationals.
 I wonder what you may think when you read this.**

On May 5, 1995 the Department of Justice announced:
 EXTRADITION REFORMS TABLED. The signature of Kimberly Prost (IAG) was on the document.

On June 17, 1999 the Department of Justice announced:
 NEW EXTRADITION ACT COMES INTO FORCE. The signature of William Corbett (IAG) was on the document. (See the report attached "Political Justice Scandal" International Case).

The new Extradition Act reduced the jurisdiction of the Extradition Judge and increased substantially the Jurisdiction of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

In my case the Extradition Judge had to believe in the statements made by a German prosecutor and ignore the rulings of Liechtenstein Courts, the decisions of Liechtenstein Investigative Judges and prosecutors, the sworn affidavit of a lawyer (a previous Swiss prosecutor), the decision of the Minister of Justice in Switzerland who refused to grant legal assistance related to my case and the only statement from the so called Crown witness Giorgio Pelossi even given under oath in the Court of Augsburg: ***"None of the Liechtenstein companies mentioned in the accusations was incorporated for the purpose of tax evasion."***

Irwin Cotler then the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada had the duty to examine my case and to make a personal decision.

RCMP Interpol I - The Canadian Central Authority publication page 14:

“While the Minister relies upon advice from the IAG, he or she decides each case personally.”

The Minister relies upon advice from the IAG, the officials who drafted and sent the Letter of Request to Switzerland, who are responsible for the “Political Justice Scandal,” the “Airbus” affair and my lawsuit against the Attorney General of Canada.

The RCMP and the IAG officials conspire with the German prosecutors to cover up the huge problems they have with the threat of disclosure and exposure through my legal proceedings in Edmonton, knowing that they lost the lawsuit at the moment when the RCMP finally closed the files on the Brian Mulroney “Airbus” vendetta.

Let me show to you a perfect example: On May 17, 2006 and on August 10, 2006 my Lawyer Edward Greenspan, Q.C. sent letters to you concerning the political prejudice of the German authorities in my case. There is no law or extradition request or charges for the introduction of political corruption in Germany. The statements of Judge Haeusler brought the truth about the political reasons of my case to light.

On March 9, 2006 the following article was available on the Deutsche Presse – Agentur website (DPA is one of the world’s leading international news agencies supplying news on a global basis):

Schreiber Requests that Supreme Court of Canada Refuse Extradition.

In that article the following comments were made:

....Judge Karl Heinz Haeusler, spokesman for the Regional Court of Augsburg, told dpa that after his extradition, Schreiber would have to reckon with the “full force of the law”. **“He is the trigger of the entire affair and has caused damage to Germany.”**

...Until the Schreiber case, Germany had been considered a country immune to bribery [he stated] – the arms dealer’s “unconcealed exertion of influence” on politicians and managers made the “unspeakable” reality. Schreiber had done Germany a “disservice”, said the Court spokesman...

(Mr. Greenspan’s letters, attachments tabs 11 and 13).

The IAG officials know that the German authorities ruined my extradition case by themselves and therefore it is in their own interest to try to rescue it.

On July 28, 2006 Barbara Kothe, Senior Counsel, International Assistance Group sent a memorandum to you regarding the case, which speaks for itself (attachment 12).

On October 14, 2004 Jacqueline Palumbo, Counsel, International Assistance Group, Barbara Kothe, A/Director, International Assistance Group and William Corbett, Senior General Counsel, Criminal Law Section sent a memorandum to Irwin Cotler, then the Minister of Justice and Attorney General for Canada.

The memorandum was the basic document for the Minister's decision to surrender Mr. Schreiber. The memorandum speaks for itself (see the report "Political Justice Scandal" International Case, The "Airbus" Affair – Allan Rock & William Corbett).

The IAG, the Department of Justice and the office of the Attorney General of Canada seek to delay the legal proceedings for many more years. Their aim is to help the Liberals to cover the Brian Mulroney "Airbus" affair and the biggest "Political Justice Scandal" in Canadian history with great international political implications (see the Case Report and the "Political Justice Scandal" binders attached).

The continuation of the already lost lawsuit will just increase the amount of the already wasted Canadian taxpayer's money under your responsibility, you inherited from Allan Rock and Irwin Cotler.

How will you ever get to know what is going on if you have to rely on the advice of the IAG who are the enemies of the Canadian Conservatives in this case since 1995?

How is the continuation of this case in accord with the Conservative's federal election promise to Canadian voters to clean up government in Ottawa?

I am an expert on the tactics of the Liberal Underground Government and the often-used arguments to prevent the ministers responsible to do the right thing:

Mr. Minister, don't do this, the matter is before the court (and there it will be dragged along for the next five to ten years). Who cares about the citizens involved and the tax payer's money?

Mr. Minister, don't do this, the matter is a RCMP investigation, which we cannot jeopardize. They know what they are doing. They are our friends. Who cares when they travel for ten years to Germany, Liechtenstein, Switzerland, Italy, France, United Kingdom, United States and Mexico enjoying life in nice hotels on the account of Canadian taxpayers' money as long as they hunt Brian Mulroney and Karlheinz Schreiber and keep the Conservatives busy?

Mr. Minister, don't do this, we had already calls from the Ottawa Citizen, the CBC Fifth Estate Harvey Cashore and Stevie Cameron, you better get prepared for question hour today and tomorrow.

Dear Minister, I am certain that you have heard similar stories many times since you began your career in politics.
None of the stories applies to my case, because you have nothing to hide, you can only be interested in the clean up in the "Airbus" affair and the "Political Justice Scandal".
You are the central authority; you have the jurisdiction for the final political decision concerning my extradition.
You are the responsible Attorney General of Canada, representing the government in my legal proceedings against the previous Attorney General of Canada.

Dear Minister, all the decisions on the cases have to be made by you and nobody else. The Canadian Courts play no role concerning the political decisions. Only you have the jurisdictions and the responsibilities related to these cases.

On January 20, 1997 I sent a letter to Allan Rock, then the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and responded to his Letter of Apology to me.

I wrote:

I recognize your apology but this matter will only be properly clarified in a court room
(attachment tab 14).

Today, nine years and nine months later, I take the liberty to ask you respectfully for your support and help by reviewing my case and let me bring to light to Canadians the biggest "Political Justice Scandal" in Canadian history and to bring to an end the nightmare of this case for my family and me.

The new Extradition Act grants you the jurisdiction and the political mandate to inform the Supreme Court of Canada about your review of my case and ask the Supreme Court of Canada to put the extradition request on hold.

I believe that my request is in accordance with the Prime Minister Stephen Harper's announcement to clean up the Government in Ottawa and the need for a Director of Public Prosecutions when he referred to the Mulroney – Airbus affair.

The history of Canada proves that the Conservative governments were always interim solutions. The Liberals governed Canada most of the time. This is the success of the Liberal bureaucracy, the underground Government of Canada, which brought down the Conservative government of The Right Honourable Brian Mulroney from 211 seats in 1984 to two seats in 1993.

Dear Minister, please stop the support from the Department of Justice and the IAG in favor of the Liberal Underground Government concerning the "Airbus" Vendetta.


There is no Conservative future in Canada without a real clean up!

Yours sincerely



Karlheinz Schreiber

Copy to The Right Honourable Stephen J. Harper, P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

63 17 13 19

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE 613 748 7330
TELEFAX 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

Personal / For His Eyes Only

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa November 30, 2006

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal"


Dear Prime Minister,

I am taking the liberty to send you the copies of two facsimile November 14th and 16th from the IAG for your personal information.

The documents speak for themselves and may give you some evidence concerning the IAG and the "Political Justice Scandal". I am referring to my letter October 27, 2006 I have sent to you.

The attached copy of my letter to the Hon. Stockwell Day is also for your personal information.

Yours sincerely



Karlheinz Schreiber



Department of Justice / Ministère de la Justice
Canada / Canada

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

SEND TO		FROM	
Name:	Karlheinz Schreiber	Name:	Julie Fitton for Jacqueline Palumbo Counsel
Address:	7 Bittern Court Rockliffe Park Ottawa, Ontario K1L 8K9		International Assistance Group Federal Prosecution Service East Memorial Building, Room 2291 284 Wellington Street Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H8
Fax #:	Tel. #:	Fax #:	Tel. #:
613-748-9697		613-957-8412	613-957-3489

Comments:

RE: FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY V. KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

Please refer to attached correspondence.

Thank you.

SECURITY INSTRUCTIONS

Unclassified documents only VIA clear transmission.
Protected information permitted within Justice secure FAX network.

Protected documents?

Yes

No

Transmission

Pages (+1):

5

Date:

November 16, 2006

Time

3:18 PM



Department of Justice
Canada

Ministère de la Justice
Canada

International Assistance Group
Federal Prosecution Service
284 Wellington Street, EMIJ-2291
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H8

Telephone: 613-957-3489
Facsimile: 613-957-8412

November 16, 2006

BY FACSIMILE: 613-748-9697

Karlheinz Schreiber
7 Bittern Court
Rockliffe Park
Ottawa, ON K1L 8K9


Dear Mr. Schreiber:

Re: Karlheinz SCHREIBER
- Extradition request from the Federal Republic of Germany
- Second Supplemental Summary of Case and Submissions on Reconsideration

I am attaching a copy of the second supplemental summary prepared for the Minister in relation to your request for reconsideration of the previous Justice Minister's decision on the issue of surrender. This summary contains an outline of your submissions contained in your letter dated October 25, 2006 and your three binders of attachments.

Please note that your submissions and attachments, in their entirety, will be put before the Minister of Justice for his consideration, together with the attached summary.

Yours sincerely,



Jacqueline Palumbo, Counsel
International Assistance Group
Federal Prosecution Service

c.c. Edward Greenspan, Q.C., Greenspan, White (fax: 416-366-7994)



Department of Justice
Canada

Ministère de la Justice
Canada

Room 2287, 284 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario

MEMORANDUM / NOTE DE SERVICE

Security classification - Cote de sécurité
File number - Numéro de dossier
Date November 16, 2006
Telephone / FAX - Téléphone / Télécopieur 613-957-3489 / 613-957-8412

TO / DEST: Minister

FROM / ORIG: Jacqueline Palumbo, Counsel, International Assistance Group
(via Janet Henchey, General Counsel and Associate Director,
International Assistance Group)

SUBJECT / OBJET: **GERMANY v. Karlheinz SCHREIBER**
- Extradition from Canada to Germany
- Second Supplemental Summary of Case and Submissions on
Reconsideration

Comments/Remarques

I. PURPOSE OF THIS MEMORANDUM

This memorandum provides you with a summary of additional submissions sent directly to you by Mr. Karlheinz Schreiber in support of his petition that you reconsider your predecessor's decision to surrender him to Germany. His further submissions are contained in a letter dated October 25, 2006, together with three binders of attachments. All of these materials are appended in their entirety to this memorandum.¹

Please note that by letter dated November 15, 2006, counsel for Mr. Schreiber advised the International Assistance Group that Mr. Schreiber's additional submissions do not form part of the request for reconsideration submitted on Mr. Schreiber's behalf by his counsel on May 17 and August 10, 2006.²

II. SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

In his letter to you dated October 25, 2006, Mr. Schreiber writes:

¹ Appendix A: Submissions from Mr. K. Schreiber dated October 25, 2006, including three binders of attachments.

² Appendix B: Letter dated November 15, 2006 from Mr. Edward Greenspan to Jacqueline Palumbo, International Assistance Group.

Do not write in this space / Ne pas écrire dans cet espace

- 2 -

Since your decision in my case is of a highly important political nature in Canada and Germany, I feel strongly that I have an obligation and a right to give to you my views of the story and the scandal.

He submits that he has been the victim of "the biggest 'Political Justice Scandal' in Canadian history with international political implications". He blames the former Liberal governments and the so-called "Liberal bureaucracy" (which he also describes as "the Liberal Underground Government of Canada") for this "scandal" and, further, he submits that one of the ways in which they have perpetuated this scandal is by delaying and thwarting Mr. Schreiber's outstanding lawsuit against the former Attorney General of Canada, Mr. Allan Rock, in the Alberta Queen's Bench. In this regard, he writes:

My lawsuit against the Liberal Attorney General of Canada is the only legal route besides a public inquiry to bring the "Political Justice Scandal" in a Canadian court to light. This is why my enemies try everything to stop my actions. Their greatest wish is to have me extradited to Germany, hoping that I will disclose matters of interest to them during a trial in court and at the same time bring the lawsuit to an end in Edmonton.

Mr. Schreiber underscores the following actions, amongst others, as supporting his allegation of a "political vendetta" carried out against himself and Brian Mulroney by the former Liberal governments and the so-called "Liberal Underground Government of Canada":

1. During the "Airbus affair", two "senior officers" persuaded author Stevie Cameron to give evidence of alleged fraud against Mr. Schreiber in return for "anonymity and insider information" which she then used in her books attacking Mr. Schreiber. He states that these books "created public support for the RCMP and the Liberal government concerning the political vendetta...";
2. Millions of taxpayer dollars have been spent in support of an RCMP investigation against Mr. Schreiber that has resulted in no charges;
3. Persons named in the confidential Letter of Request to Switzerland were allegedly disclosed by an RCMP officer to Stevie Cameron who published this insider information in her books. The RCMP officer was later the subject of an RCMP disciplinary hearing;
4. The RCMP struck a deal with the RCMP officer who allegedly disclosed the confidential information to Ms. Cameron and this transaction occurred after the Superior Court of Justice ruled that the RCMP's disciplinary hearings

- 3 -

were unconstitutional insofar as they were held in private. In this regard, Mr. Schreiber is suggesting that the RCMP entered into the said arrangement in order to avoid a public hearing of the matter;

5. Then Solicitor General Herb Gray and then Minister of Justice Allan Rock made alleged misrepresentations to the public regarding the unauthorized disclosure of the names of persons who were the subjects of Canada's Letter of Request to Switzerland;
6. In April 1998, the RCMP advised the German authorities that Canada was also interested in arresting Mr. Schreiber but they had no legal grounds on which to charge him;
7. In September and October of 1999, officials with the International Assistance Group attended in Germany to assist the German prosecutors in preparing their Record of the Case in support of their extradition request.

In particular, Mr. Schreiber targets the Department of Justice as a whole, the International Assistance Group and the RCMP as allegedly taking steps to thwart his lawsuit "through delay, detention or extradition", ultimately to conceal from the public the harm that has been caused to Mr. Mulroney, Mr. Schreiber and their respective families. He also states that he has witnessed first-hand the "Liberal Underground Government's" attempts to "frustrate the policies of the legitimately-elected Conservative [Mulroney] government of Canada" when he was the Chairman of Thyssen-Bearhead Industries in 1985. In relation to this submission, he states the following:

Thyssen, the Canadian soldiers, the people of Nova Scotia, Quebec and I have been misused and betrayed after Thyssen spent more than \$60 Million on the project for peacekeeping and environment protection.

Mr. Schreiber goes on to describe himself as "a Conservative on an international level" who has made a significant contribution to this country by bringing jobs and considerable funds into Canada. He takes the position that a Conservative Minister of Justice is more likely to review his case from an impartial point of view, but he is concerned that, you will be "shielded" from the information he is attempting to put before you in this matter by those persons who are the subjects of his lawsuit.

He also believes that the current Conservative government is unaware of his civil action in Alberta since officials of the Department of Justice have recently sought the production of records concerning his business and any payments he may have made to Mr. Mulroney. Moreover, they are seeking an order to set aside the examination of Allan Rock in this matter. Mr. Schreiber views these


- 4 -

actions as inconsistent with Prime Minister Harper's position that he would "clean up the Government in Ottawa". He also wonders "*how you will ever get to know what is going on if you have to rely on the advice of the IAG who are the enemies of the Canadian Conservatives in this case since 1995.*"

Mr. Schreiber goes on to criticize your predecessor's decision to surrender him to Germany and suggests that your predecessor was either implicated in concealing the so-called "Political Justice Scandal" or "was totally under the control of the IAG and ignorant" when he ordered Mr. Schreiber's surrender. Moreover, he condemns Canada's practice regarding the extradition of its nationals, particularly in cases where there is no reciprocity. In this regard, he argues that your predecessor was aware that Germany would "never extradite one of its Nationals to Canada" but, nevertheless, proceeded to order his surrender. Regarding the negotiation of extradition treaties which do not involve reciprocity, Mr. Schreiber takes the view that the Canadian government misled the Canadian House of Commons when these treaties were ratified since, based on his review of Canada's treaties, reciprocity is "the most elementary common basis of each Treaty".


Finally, Mr. Schreiber appeals to you to "clean up...the 'Airbus' affair and the 'Political Justice Scandal'" by personally exercising your jurisdiction on the issue of his surrender to Germany. He asks that you reconsider his case with a view to exposing "*the biggest 'Political Justice Scandal' in Canadian history and to bring to an end the nightmare of this case for my family and me.*"

Prepared by:



Jacqueline Palumbo, Counsel
International Assistance Group

Reviewed by:



Janet Hedehey, General Counsel and Associate Director
International Assistance Group



Department of Justice / Ministère de la Justice
Canada / Canada

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION TRANSMISSION PAR TÉLÉCOPIEUR

SEND TO / ENVOYER À		FROM / DE	
Name / Nom: Karlheinz Schreiber		Name / Nom: Jean-Michael Gabrario, Legal Assistant for Jacqueline Palumbo	
Address / Adresse: 7 Bittern Court Rockliffe Park Ottawa, Ontario K1L 8K9		Address / Adresse: Justice Canada International Assistance Group 284 Wellington Street Suite 2288 Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H8	
Fax # / No du télécopieur: 613-748-9697	Tel. No. / No du Tél:	Fax # / No du télécopieur: 613-957-8412	Tel. No. / No du Tél: 613-946-0314
Comments / Commentaires: Re: Karlheinz Schreiber <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extradition request from the Federal Republic of Germany - Request for Reconsideration of Minister's Surrender Decision 			
SECURITY INSTRUCTIONS / INSTRUCTIONS SÉCURITÉ			
Unclassified documents only VIA clear transmission. Protected information permitted within Justice secure FAX network.		Documents non cotés à transmettre sans protection. Renseignements protégés par le réseau des télécopieurs protégés de la Justice.	
Protected documents? Documents protégés?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Oui	<input type="checkbox"/> No Non
Transmission			
Pages (Including cover sheet) 2	Date: 14/11/2006	Time: 1:45 PM	



Department of Justice
Canada

Ministère de la Justice
Canada

International Assistance Group
Federal Prosecution Service
284 Wellington Street, EMB-2291
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H8

Telephone: 613-957-3489
Facsimile: 613-957-8412

November 14, 2006

BY FACSIMILE: 613-748-9697


Karlheinz Schreiber
7 Bittern Court
Rockliffe Park
Ottawa, ON K1L 8K9

Dear Mr. Schreiber:

Re: Karlheinz SCHREIBER
- Extradition request from the Federal Republic of Germany
- Request for Reconsideration of Minister's Surrender Decision

I am writing to acknowledge receipt of your further submissions to the Minister of Justice in the above matter. Your letter dated October 25, 2006 was received by the Minister's Office on November 1, 2006 and your attachments were received by the Minister's Office on October 30, 2006.

Yours sincerely,



Jacqueline Palumbo, Counsel
International Assistance Group
Federal Prosecution Service

c.c. Edward Greenspan, Q.C., Greenspan, White (fax: 416-366-7994)

KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K 1 L 8 K 9

TELEPHON 613 748 7330
TELEFAX 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

The Hon. Stockwell Burt Day P.C., M.P.
Minister of Public Safety

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, November 30, 2006

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal" and the RCMP

Dear Minister,

I am referring to my letter September 25, 2006 I have sent to you.

The attached letter from the Commission for Public Complaints Against the RCMP,
November 15, 2006 is for your personal information.

Yours sincerely



Karlheinz Schreiber

Copy to The Right Hon. Stephen Harper
Prime Minister

Commission for Public Complaints Against the
Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Commission des plaintes du public contre la
Gendarmerie royale du Canada

7337 137 Street, Suite 102
Surrey, British Columbia V3W 1A4
Tel.: (604) 501-4080 / Fax: (604) 501-4095
Toll-Free: 1-800-665-6878

7337 rue 137, pièce 102
Surrey, Colombie-Britannique V3W 1A4
Tél.: (604) 501-4080 / Télécopieur : (604) 501-4095
Sans Frais : 1-800-665-6878

November 15, 2006

File No. PC-2006-1847

Mr. Karlheinz Schreiber
7 Bittern Court, Rockcliffe Park
Ottawa, ON K1L 8K9

Dear Mr. Schreiber:

In accordance with the *RCMP Act*, your complaint was forwarded today to the Commissioner of the RCMP for appropriate action. A copy of the complaint is enclosed for your information.


The Commissioner is required to provide written acknowledgment of your complaint within 45 days of receiving it. He is also required to provide you with a status report every 30 days thereafter. When the Commissioner has dealt with the complaint, you will be informed of the outcome.

Should you be dissatisfied with the RCMP's response to your complaint, you may contact this office to request a review by this Commission.

The Commission for Public Complaints Against the RCMP is an agency independent of the RCMP whose role is to receive and review complaints from the public about the conduct of members of the RCMP while on duty.

I am sending you a pamphlet on the Commission that you may find useful. Please read it and the attached copy of your complaint, and contact me at (604) 501-4080 or at our toll free number, 1-800-665-6878, if you have any questions.

Yours truly,


Lorraine Blommaert
Enquiries and Complaints Analyst

LB:GS
Enclosures

Canada



Royal Canadian
Mounted Police

Gendarmerie royale
du Canada

Security Classification/Designation
Classification/désignation sécuritaire

Protected A

Professional Standards Unit
Coventry Square Bldg, Room 5-D14
295, Coventry Rd.
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0R2

Mr. Karlheinz Schreiber
7 Bittern Ct, Rockliffe Park
Ottawa, Ontario
K1L 8K9

Your File - Votre référence

Our File - Notre référence

HQVII061401293

Date

November 28, 2006

Object **Public Complaint Against Commissioner Murray, Commissioner Zaccardelli,**
Sujet **Supt. Mathews, Insp. McLean, Insp. Brettschneider and S/Sgt. Feigenwald.**

Mr. Schreiber,

The present is to acknowledge receipt of your complaint dated November 14, 2006, lodged against the above-mentioned RCMP officers. Please noted that Commissioner Murray, Insp. McLean and S/Sgt Feigenwald have retired from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and are not subject to an investigation pursuant to the RCMP Act.

A member of the RCMP will be appointed to investigate this matter and will be in touch with you shortly. You will be notified of the status of the investigation into your complaint within forty-five days from the date we received it and on a monthly basis thereafter, until we are in a position to advise you of the results of our findings.

Yours truly,


S/Sgt Michael Robineau
NCO i/c Professional Standards Unit

cc Commissioner Zaccardelli
Supt. Allan Mathews
Insp. Rainer Brettschneider

Canada

RCMP GRC 2823 (2002-11) WPT

Page 1 of/de 1



635 20216
635 20216
596395-EM
FILE

KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE 613 748 7330
TELEFAX 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

PERSONAL / FOR HIS EYES ONLY

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa December 13, 2006

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal"
Karlheinz Schreiber v. The Attorney General of Canada et al
Q.B. Action # 9703 20183

Dear Prime Minister,

I am taking the liberty to send you a copy of the letter my lawyer Robert Hladun Q.C. Edmonton, Alberta has sent to The Hon. Vic Toews P.C. M.P. on November 15, 2006, concerning my legal action.


I am attaching a copy of the December 7, 2006 letter my lawyer Robert Hladun Q.C. received from Jacqueline Palumbo, Counsel International Assistance Group Prosecution Service of the Department of Justice of Canada.

The letters speak for themselves and may give you some more evidence concerning the IAG and the "Political Justice Scandal" demonstrating at the same time how the Minister is shielded.

I am referring to my letters October 27 and November 23, 2006 I have sent to you.

Dear Prime Minister, I strongly believe that only an independent inquiry can achieve a proper clean up and return fundamental Justice to the RCMP and the Department of Justice.

Yours sincerely



Karlheinz Schreiber



Tel.780.423.1888
Fax.780.424.0934
www.hladun.com

100, 10187 - 104 Street, inquiries@hladun.com
Edmonton Alberta
T5J 0Z9

15,737.1


Our File

Your File

November 15, 2006

The Honourable Mr. Vic Toews
Minister of Justice and
Attorney General of Canada
Suite 306, Justice Building
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

Via fax: (613) 995-1049
(Original sent registered mail)



Dear Sir:

Re: Karlheinz Schreiber v. The Attorney General of Canada et al
Q.B. Action #9703 20183

I act on behalf of Karlheinz Schreiber in relation to a lawsuit he commenced against the Attorney General of Canada on October 24, 1997. I am writing to you in connection with this lawsuit. This letter is not intended nor should it be construed to be further submissions in relation to your responsibility under the *Extradition Act*. The lawsuit arose as a result of a Letter of Request ("Request") of September 29, 1995 prepared by counsel from your International Assistance Group ("IAG") and sent to the Swiss authorities. The Request became a cause celebre because of its allegations of wrongdoing by politicians and by Mr. Schreiber.

Mr. Schreiber's lawsuit is serious and has been pursued as assiduously as possible, bearing in mind the extradition proceedings commenced against Mr. Schreiber in August, 1999. Examinations for Discovery of some Crown witnesses have been held and will be concluded in the next few months. The Crown's Affidavit of Records was provided on October 20, 2006 and is being reviewed for the purposes of the lawsuit. It is anticipated that Mr. Schreiber will be examined once the examinations of the Crown witnesses are concluded.

On April 22, 2003, the RCMP announced their "investigation" relating to the Request for Assistance and allegations of wrongdoings could not be substantiated, save for a charge of fraud against MBB Helicopters Canada (Eurocopter Canada). The Court found insufficient evidence to commit Eurocopter to stand trial and discharged Eurocopter at the preliminary Inquiry. Over the years, Mr. Schreiber, a Canadian citizen and successful businessman, has been subject to egregious treatment and the subject of a RCMP investigation conducted in bad faith, designed to entrap Mr. Schreiber, and bring him into disrepute. The culmination of the RCMP actions have led Mr. Schreiber to make a complaint to the Commission for Public Complaints against the RCMP, a copy of the complaint is enclosed for your review.

I am writing to you to retract the Ministerial Order to extradite Mr. Schreiber to Germany and I do this on the basis that Mr. Schreiber, a citizen of Canada has the right and legitimate expectation to remain in Canada in order to prosecute his case. It is highly unlikely that he will be able to do so

*The Honourable Mr. Vic Toews
Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
November 16, 2006
Page 2*

were he to be surrendered to Germany in light of the comments made by Karl-heinz Haeusler, Judge of the Augsburg Regional Court and by Reinhard Nemetz, the Chief Senior Prosecutor of the Augsburg Prosecution Office. Mr. Schreiber's inability to prosecute his case would be a travesty of justice when regard is had to the overall political background of the Airbus investigation.

The Minister must also retract the Ministerial Order on the basis that there is a reasonable apprehension of bias in relation to the conduct of the IAG and its ongoing involvement in the Schreiber case since 1995 and, in the result, the actions of the IAG and the Minister in not having retained independent counsel to defend Mr. Schreiber's lawsuit, such as to bring the administration of justice into disrepute. Any reasonable person, understanding all of the facts of the case, could come to no other conclusion but that the actions of the IAG and the Department created an apprehension of bias.

Please review this matter in the context of the actions of the IAG, the fact that Mr. Schreiber commenced his lawsuit in October, 1997, the fact that the RCMP investigation was tainted and scurrilous, and the fact that Mr. Schreiber is entitled to have his day in Court. Please advise whether you will retract or withdraw the Ministerial Order for Mr. Schreiber's extradition, pending completion of his lawsuit in the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta.

Yours truly,

HLADUN & COMPANY

*Dictated but not read and
Signed in the writer's absence to avoid delay*
ROBERT W. HLADUN, Q.C.
RWH/ms

Enclosure



Department of Justice
Canada

Ministère de la Justice
Canada

International Assistance Group
Federal Prosecution Service
284 Wellington Street, EMB-2291
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H8

Telephone: 613-957-3409
Facsimile: 613-957-8412

December 7, 2006

BY FACSIMILE: 780-424-0934

Robert W. Hladun, Q.C.
Hladun & Company
Barristers and Solicitors
100, 10187 - 104 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 0Z9


Dear Mr. Hladun:

Re: *Karlheinz SCHREIBER* - German Request for Extradition
- Petition to Minister of Justice to Refuse to Execute Surrender Order


We are in receipt of your correspondence, dated November 15, 2006, addressed to the Minister of Justice concerning the above matter. Although you state that your letter "is not intended nor should it be construed to be further submissions" with respect to the Minister's duties under the *Extradition Act*, you proceed to ask the Minister to "retract the Ministerial Order to extradite Mr. Schreiber to Germany" on various grounds. Therefore, it would appear that you are, indeed, making submissions to the Minister concerning his discretionary authority to surrender a person sought under the extradition process.

As you may know, Mr. Schreiber has been, and continues to be, represented by Mr. Edward Greenspan in relation to the Canadian extradition proceedings, including with respect to the issue of Mr. Schreiber's surrender to Germany. Therefore, we would advise you to consult directly with Mr. Greenspan regarding the concerns raised in your letter.

Yours sincerely,



Jacqueline Palumbo, Counsel
International Assistance Group
Federal Prosecution Service



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

70190126
70190126

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHON: 613 748 7330
FACSIMILE: 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

Ottawa, January 16, 2007

Personal, for his eyes only

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal"

Dear Prime Minister,

On October 27, 2006 I took the liberty to send you a copy of my letter October 25, 2006 to the Hon. Vic Toews, then the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada for your personal information.

On November 30, 2006 I took the liberty to send you the copies of two facsimiles dated November 14th and 15th from the IAG of the Department of Justice for your personal information.

Today I take the liberty to send you the copy of the facsimile of December 14, 2006 from the IAG of the Department of Justice together with a letter, December 1, 2006 from The Hon. Vic Toews which was sent to my lawyer, Edward Greenspan Q.C., LL.D., D.C.L.

The letter of The Hon. Vic Toews, then the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada opens the door to the next dimension of the biggest "Political Justice Scandal" in Canadian history!

Dear Prime Minister, assume you would hear this story:

A Liberal Minister of Justice and Attorney General teamed up with a journalist, a confidential police-informant and complainant, the Solicitor General, the Police Commissioner, officials of the Department of Justice, officers of the police force and a police informant with a criminal record from an other country, to start a conspiracy and political vendetta including allegations of bribe and fraud against a former Conservative Prime Minister and his friends.

The conspiracy and vendetta started 12 years ago and is still moving ahead.

It cost millions of taxpayers' money and continues to do so.

No charges were ever laid

The lawsuit of the former Conservative Prime Minister was settled, but the vendetta continued for ten years.

One other victim of the vendetta filed ten years ago an ongoing lawsuit against the Liberal Minister of Justice and the Attorney General.

The Department of Justice tries to thwart the lawsuit through delay, extradition without treaty obligations and detention with the involvement of the police and an undercover agent hired from a foreign country, ultimately conceal from the public the truth about the vendetta, the abuse of power and the "Political Justice Scandal"

The Liberal Minister of Justice and Attorney General who initiated the vendetta refuses to appear for examinations for discovery because he is not the responsible Minister today.

The Liberal Minister and Attorney General responsible for the lawsuit and the extradition case lies about his obligations under an extradition treaty and writes in a letter October 31, 2004: "I was not the Minister of Justice at the time the impugned actions were taken and therefore, I have no bias against Mr....."

After 12 years in opposition, the Conservative Party formed a new government. The Conservative Minister of Justice and Attorney General is supporting his Liberal predecessors' scandal-hiding activities, denies the existence of the "Political Justice Scandal" and backs his lies!

Dear Prime Minister, would you have ever believed that this story is a real Canadian story and the Conservative Minister of Justice and Attorney General was a member of your government?

It seems to be a matter of fact that there is no need for a government clean-up in Ottawa because the Liberal Government did the necessary clean-up when they put in place the Gomery inquiry and the Maher Arar inquiry.

It looks like the situation has changed since 30 November 2005 when you announced that a Conservative Government would appoint an Independent Director of Public Prosecutions and you referred especially to the Mulroney - Airbus affair (documents attached).

I believe when you read my letter to The Hon. Vic Toews and his reply to my lawyer Edward Greenspan, Q.C. you will come to the same conclusions I came:


The Hon. Vic Toews Did not read my letter and the attachments
 just signed the letter, written by the IAG
 did not see my letter and his signature is a rubber stamp
 had a reason to ignore or deny my allegations and facts
 had a reason to support the Liberals
 was not interested to clean up his department
 was not interested to inform Canadians about the scandal
 was told that the Conservative Government is not interested to
 call an inquiry for their one reasons.
 writes in his letter on page 5 paragraph 6:

"In addition, Mr. Schreiber is at liberty to use any other public venue available to convey any information which he deems to be of interest to the public."

Is he recommending the CBC's Fifth Estate or the political opposition?

Dear Prime Minister, I ask you in the interest of the Canadian taxpayer to grant me the courtesy to read my letter to The Hon. Vic Toews and his reply to Mr. Edward Greenspan and the attachments. Please let me know whether you share the Minister's views. I told you since June 2006 that I strongly believe that this case will not disappear by itself. Only an independent inquiry can achieve a proper clean up and return fundamental Justice to the Department of Justice and the RCMP to make sure that the same will not happen again in the future.

Yours sincerely



Karlheinz Schreiber

Copy to The Right. Hon. Brian Mulroney



FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION TRANSMISSION PAR TÉLÉCOPIEUR

Name / Nom:		Edward L. Greenspan Q.C. Counsel		Name / Nom:		Lisa Anderson Paralegal	
Address / Adresse:		Greenspan, White Barristers 144 King Street East Toronto, Ontario M5C 1G8		Address / Adresse:		International Assistance Group Federal Prosecution Service 284 Wellington Street, EMB-2281 Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H8	
Tel. No. / No du Tél:		416-366-3981		Fax # / No du télécopieur:		613-957-8412	
Tel. No. / No du Tél:				Tel. No. / No du Tél:		613-941-4157	
Comments / Commentaires:							
<p><u>F.R.G. v. Karlheinz SCHREIBER – Request for reconsideration</u></p> <p>Please find herewith the Minister's reasons on reconsideration dated December 14, 2006. Please confirm receipt by calling me at the above noted number or, preferably, by e-mail at landerso@justice.gc.ca. Please note that the original will follow via priority post.</p>							
<p style="text-align: center;">SÉCURITÉ DE L'INFORMATION / INFORMATION SECURITY</p>							
<p>Unclassified documents only VIA clear transmission. Protected information permitted within Justice secure FAX network.</p>				<p>Documents non cotés à transmettre sans protection. Renseignements protégés par le réseau des télécopieurs protégés de la Justice.</p>			
Protected documents? Documents protégés?		<input type="checkbox"/>		Yes Oui		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
						No Non	
Transmission							
Pages:		6		Date:		December 14, 2008	
				Time:		5:51 PM	

Minister of Justice
and Attorney General of Canada



Ministre de la Justice
et procureur général du Canada

The Honourable / L'honorable Vic Toews, P.C., O.C., M.P./c.p., c.r., député
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0H8

DEC 1 + 2006

Mr. Edward Greenspan, Q.C.
Greenspan, White
Barristers
144 King Street East
Toronto ON M5C 1G8

Dear Mr. Greenspan:

I am writing in response to the submissions you addressed to me on May 17, 2006, and August 10, 2006, on behalf of your client, Mr. Karlheinz Schreiber. I am also responding to submissions made directly to me by Mr. Schreiber in a personal letter dated October 25, 2006, including three binders of appendices.

You have asked me to reconsider the surrender decision of my predecessor, the Honourable Irwin Cotler, and rescind the order surrendering Mr. Schreiber to Germany. Mr. Schreiber is also directly petitioning me to reconsider the decision to surrender him to Germany, although I note your correspondence dated November 15, 2006, in which you indicate that Mr. Schreiber's independent submissions do not form part of the reconsideration request that you have presented on his behalf.

You have brought to my attention media reports that quote statements made by Mr. Nemetz, the Chief Prosecutor of the Augsburg Prosecution Office, and Judge Karl-Heinz Haeusler, the judicial spokesperson for the Augsburg Regional Court. You submit that their comments amount to conduct by German authorities that interferes or attempts to interfere with the extradition process in Canada, as was the case in *United States of America v. Cobb* (2001), 152 C.C.C. (3d) 270 (S.C.C.), and that demonstrates that the case against Mr. Schreiber has been prejudged in Germany. Indeed, you submit that the comments made by Judge Haeusler are far more disconcerting, as they relate directly to a prejudgment of the case by a judge and spokesperson for the very Court which will try Mr. Schreiber.

In Mr. Schreiber's additional submissions, he states his belief that my officials, together with members of the former Liberal governments, are engaged in ongoing attempts to ensure his removal in order to halt his ongoing lawsuit in the Alberta Queen's Bench against the former Attorney General of Canada, the Honourable Allan Rock. He claims that the authorities in question are anxious to see him gone in order to prevent him from

Canada

revealing, through his civil action, scandalous information about the former Liberal governments in their treatment of him, of former Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, and of the Canadian public as a whole in the "Airbus" matter.

Mr. Schreiber further accuses my officials of misconduct in allegedly suppressing relevant information about his extradition case from my predecessor and me. He believes that there are certain bureaucratic officials who have Liberal affiliations and, thus, it is in their interest to shield me and, ultimately, the public from information that would expose alleged wrongdoing by members of the former Liberal governments. He asserts that a "Political Justice Scandal" without precedence in Canadian history has been propagated against him, and he urges me not to rely on the advice of counsel in my Department, which he believes to be politically motivated.

He further takes the position, based on his commitment to the Conservative ideology and his Conservative ties, that a Conservative Justice Minister is more likely to be sympathetic to his case.

I have considered your submissions, the additional submissions made to me independently by Mr. Schreiber, as well as my predecessor's surrender decision. For the reasons set out below, I am satisfied that the surrender order of my predecessor, the Honourable Irwin Cotler, should be maintained.

The submissions before me raise claims of abuse of process allegedly committed by both the German and Canadian officials. I have the authority to consider claims of breach of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (the Charter) and, thus, allegations of abuse of process are relevant to my reconsideration of this case. However, to find an abuse of process, there must be evidence of bad faith or improper motive on the part of the Canadian and/or foreign authorities. As stated by the Supreme Court of Canada [*Cobb, supra*], such a finding will be "extremely rare" and must only be made in the "clearest of cases."

With these principles in mind, I will first address your submissions regarding the actions of the German authorities.

The first article you have provided is from the online version of *Der Spiegel* of March 8, 2006. It contains an interview with Mr. Nemetz, in which he comments on the Ontario Court of Appeal's decision dated March 1, 2006, which upheld the surrender of Mr. Schreiber to Germany. Mr. Nemetz's comments indicate that he was aware that an application for leave to appeal had been filed with the Supreme Court of Canada. He spoke about the length of time the extradition proceedings had taken in Canada and what Mr. Schreiber faced upon return to Germany. In particular, you point out that Mr. Nemetz stated that Mr. Schreiber

would definitely be imprisoned on remand, due to the severity of the charges, and the public prosecutor would "vehemently" protest against releasing him on bail.

You submit that this clearly reflects a prejudgment of the availability of bail pending trial for Mr. Schreiber.

The second article you have submitted appeared on the Deutsche Presse-Agentur Web site on March 9, 2006. It included statements made about Mr. Schreiber by Judge Haeusler, the judicial spokesperson for the Court. You submit that the statement by Judge Haeusler that Mr. Schreiber is "the trigger of the entire affair" (the Christian Democratic Union, or CDU; contributions scandal), demonstrates that the Court has prejudged Mr. Schreiber's guilt and that he will not have a fair trial in Germany. Furthermore, you submit that it would appear that Mr. Schreiber is being held responsible for the entire CDU contributions scandal, the largest political scandal in German history.

In light of your submissions, my officials contacted German authorities. They advised that:

- Judge Karl-Heinz Haeusler is the judicial spokesperson for the Augsburg Regional Court's Criminal Division;
- Neither Judge Haeusler nor Mr. Nemetz will have any involvement in Mr. Schreiber's case;
- Mr. Nemetz's comments reflect the position that the prosecution is expected to take on bail, rather than being a predetermination of the outcome of issue of bail pending trial; and
- If surrendered to the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Schreiber must be taken into custody. He will be taken before the court without delay for a bail hearing and the court will decide the issue of bail pending his trial.

In *Cobb*, the assigned trial judge in the United States stated, while sentencing a co-accused, that if the fugitives, who were Canadian citizens fighting extradition from Canada, did not cooperate and come to the United States voluntarily, he would impose the absolute maximum jail sentence that the law permitted. Furthermore, the prosecutor assigned to the case appeared on "The Fifth Estate," a Canadian television program, and threatened that those fugitives who contested their extradition would serve longer sentences under much more stringent conditions, and would "be the boyfriend of a very bad man," an apparent reference to the possibility of homosexual rape in prison.

4

In my view, the circumstances of Mr. Schreiber's case are not comparable. It is difficult to construe what was said by Mr. Nemetz and Judge Haeusler as threats directed towards intimidating Mr. Schreiber into giving up his right to lawfully resist extradition. The extradition proceedings against Mr. Schreiber have been ongoing for over seven years. In my view, there is nothing in either man's comments to suggest that Mr. Schreiber would find himself in a more favourable position if he returned voluntarily to Germany, or be treated more harshly for not doing so.

Moreover, unlike *Cobb*, where the impugned comments were made by the prosecutor and judge assigned to the defendant's case, Mr. Nemetz is not the prosecutor assigned to Mr. Schreiber's matter, and Judge Haeusler is not the assigned trial judge.

In so far as the decision in *Cobb* dealt with the fairness of the extradition hearing, rather than the fairness of the trial in the foreign jurisdiction, it provides little guidance in determining whether there is any merit to the concerns raised on Mr. Schreiber's behalf.

I must be satisfied that the surrender of Mr. Schreiber would not be unjust or oppressive, having regard to all the relevant circumstances. I take for granted that an impartial tribunal is essential for a fair trial, and that surrender to a tribunal which is not impartial would violate the principles of fundamental justice and be contrary to section 7 of the Charter.

In my view, there is no basis to believe that Mr. Schreiber will not receive a fair trial before an impartial tribunal in Germany. As stated above, neither Mr. Nemetz nor Judge Haeusler will participate in Mr. Schreiber's case. The indictment against Mr. Schreiber is pending before the 10th Criminal Division of the Augsburg Regional Court, over which Judge Klaus Scheizig presides, along with two professional judges (Mr. Stephan Knoepfle and Mr. Martin Barnickel) and, according to German law, Mr. Schreiber is presumed innocent until proven guilty and has the right to a fair trial. If surrendered, he must be taken into custody. However, he will be brought before the Court, which will determine the issue of bail pending his trial.

In the Canadian criminal justice system, the scope for public comment by participants in ongoing cases is limited for fear of prejudicing an accused's right to full answer and defence, and it is therefore unlikely that a Canadian judge would speak publicly about a case before the court.

Canada's approach to minimizing pretrial publicity and commentary by participants in the process in ongoing criminal matters has not, however, impeded extradition to other countries, such as the United States, where there is a much greater tolerance for public

statements by participants during the course of criminal proceedings. The right to a fair trial before an impartial tribunal is no less of a concern in the United States. Indeed, it is a fundamental right under the U.S. constitution. It is simply differently achieved in the U.S. system (*The Queen v. Bain*, [1992] 1 S.C.R. 91). It follows that the fact that other countries' criminal justice systems do not operate on the same model as our own does not mean that they are fundamentally unfair (*Republic of Philippines v. Pacificador*, [1993] 14 O.R. (3d) 321 (Ont. C.A.); *Canada v. Schmidt*, [1987] 1 S.C.R. 500).

While there is no exact equivalent in Canada to the post of judicial spokesperson, it is obvious that it is a feature of the German system of justice. Accordingly, in the German system, it must be that there is no necessary conflict between a judicial spokesperson commenting on a prosecution and the state's ability to guarantee a fair trial.

In my view, even if it could be concluded that Judge Haeusler's comments could potentially give rise to prejudice for Mr. Schreiber, this is a matter where the German courts should be trusted to deal with the issue and fashion a remedy, if necessary.

I now turn to Mr. Schreiber's separate submissions alleging misconduct on the part of the Canadian authorities, particularly members of the former Liberal governments and the officials who advised them. Having reviewed Mr. Schreiber's claims of bad faith on this front, I find them to be unfounded and based on speculation.

First, there is no basis to his assertion that the extradition case against him is part of a broader scheme by Department of Justice Canada and other Canadian government officials to guarantee the failure of his lawsuit. His surrender to Germany would not, of necessity, lead to a termination of his civil action against the former Attorney General of Canada. Mr. Schreiber has legal representation in that matter and his presence in Canada is not a prerequisite to its continuation.

Similarly, there is no merit to his contention that members of the former Liberal governments and the government officials who advised them are using the extradition process to silence him from disclosing, through his lawsuit, important information about the so-called "Airbus affair." As I already indicated, the outstanding civil case in Alberta may proceed with or without his presence in Canada. In addition, Mr. Schreiber is at liberty to use any other public venue available to convey any information which he deems to be of interest to the public.

Finally, Mr. Schreiber has provided absolutely no evidence to support his serious charge that my officials, including members of the International Assistance Group, may have concealed information about his extradition case from my predecessor and/or me in order to advance politically-motivated interests. It is the practice of my Department to put before the presiding Justice Minister all of the original submissions

made by a person sought for extradition in his or her petition against surrender. It is clear from former Minister Cotler's letter to you dated October 31, 2004, in which he orders Mr. Schreiber's surrender, that he had personally received all of the numerous submissions which you made on Mr. Schreiber's behalf. Likewise, I have before me your submissions on Mr. Schreiber's petition for reconsideration and his independent submissions to assist me in personally considering whether there is a legitimate basis on which to interfere with my predecessor's decision.

Therefore, Mr. Schreiber's denunciation of the officials advising me or my predecessor on the question of surrender is entirely unsubstantiated.

For the above reasons, I do not find that the extradition matter against Mr. Schreiber has been pursued for any improper objective. The extradition request was based on evidence in support of the German charges, and a Canadian court has determined that a committal order was warranted on the force of that evidence. The committal order was reviewed by the Ontario Court of Appeal and upheld.


It is also of note, in reviewing Mr. Schreiber's claims of bad faith, that during the course of the extradition proceedings in this case, which commenced with his provisional arrest in August of 1999, he has had every opportunity to pursue his legal rights as a person sought for extradition in Canada. His efforts to oppose his extradition to Germany have been given full consideration at both the judicial and ministerial phases of the extradition process. Indeed, he continues to pursue these avenues, and he is free to do so, through this petition for reconsideration, as well as his outstanding application in the Supreme Court of Canada to appeal his committal for extradition and my predecessor's decision to surrender him to Germany.

In summary, I do not find that the integrity of the extradition process has in any way been eroded in this case. As such, this is not one of those "extremely rare" cases in which a refusal to surrender would be justified.

In all the circumstances, I am satisfied that Mr. Schreiber's surrender would not be unjust or oppressive or contrary to section 7 of the Charter. Accordingly, I am not prepared to alter the decision on surrender.

I thank you for providing me with your submissions.

Yours sincerely,



Vic Toews



Director of Public Prosecutions

[Click here for PDF version](#)

THE ISSUE

The Liberal Party's 12 years in power have been 12 years of consecutive scandal. Despite Paul Martin's promises to clean up Ottawa, nothing has changed. Worse, the Liberals have made no attempt to ensure that those responsible for these scandals pay the price -- and they still pretend they are victims in the sponsorship scandal!¹

Judge Gomery concluded that the Liberal Party "as an institution cannot escape responsibility for the misconduct of its officers and representatives."² Unfortunately, the current system of lap-dog oversight means Liberals get to hold themselves accountable. They negotiated with themselves to calculate how much taxpayers' money the Liberal Party would repay.³ They cut a deal letting Paul Coffin repay only \$1 million even though he stole \$1.6 million by fraud.⁴

Additional examples of the need for prosecutorial independence:

- **François Beaudoin, former president of the Business Development Bank of Canada, was subjected to a vendetta after refusing the prime minister's request to give a loan to a personal friend. The vendetta included complaints to the RCMP that Justice André Denis of the Québec Superior Court later called "completely vexatious and without foundation."** After the Crown Attorney concluded that there was no reason to charge Beaudoin, the government-owned Bank, headed by a political appointee, refused to accept the outcome and hired a lawyer to try (unsuccessfully) to influence the prosecutor to change the decision.⁵
- **The Mulroney-Albus affair: Officials in the federal Department of Justice advised the RCMP during its investigation and it was the Justice Department that signed and sent the letter asking the Swiss authorities to cooperate. The Department's letter wrongly indicated that the RCMP had reached conclusions about criminal activity and then-Attorney General Allan Rock subsequently apologized in writing. To avoid any possibility of interference, this is precisely the sort of issue that should have been handled by an Independent Director of Public Prosecutions.**



Stand Up for Accountability

Let's clean up government

Canadians have been let down by 12 years of Liberal scandal. We need a change in government to restore accountability and end the culture of entitlement. Canadians must be able to trust our government and know that our tax dollars are well spent.

A Conservative government will provide the leadership to stand up for honesty and integrity in government. Our first piece of legislation will be a *Federal Accountability Act*, a sweeping reform plan to clean up government.

The Conservative Party will stand up for:

- Ending the influence of big money in politics by banning corporate and union political donations, and limiting individual donations to \$1000.
- Tough new lobbying rules and an end to the revolving door that allows former ministers, political aides, and top bureaucrats to turn around and lobby the government.
- Giving more power and teeth to independent watchdogs such as the Auditor General and Ethics Commissioner, protecting whistleblowers from reprisal, and strengthening access to information laws to give citizens the right to know.
- Appointing an Independent Director of Public Prosecutions to protect criminal prosecution from political interference.

THE LOWEST RATE. GUARANTEED. On our hotels ONLY AT BestWestern.com

AOL news AOL Search

Home

LATEST HEADLINES: Coretta Scott King's Will Filed in Court Injured Hiker Found After 3 Days in

- News
- Did You See That
- Letters to the Editor
- News Alerts
- Odds & Ends
- Quips & Quotes
- Autos
- Careers
- Computing
- Entertainment
- Finance
- Health
- Life & Style
- Red
- Shopping
- Sports
- Travel

TOP 11

Top 11 Political Leaks and Scandals

Scandals and leaks are all part of what makes a government or a politician sink or swim. Well-timed, intentional leaks can help sway an election, while unexpected revelations can ruin a career. Take a look at some of the best-known affairs on record.

Member's
Should emp
workers tim
sporting ev
Read more

- Yes
- No

Vote

Get Organized



Eight Risk Free issues of Time



(1 of 11)



1972- Watergate: 'Deep Throat' may well be the most famous political leaker of all time. Last year he revealed himself to be Mark Felt, the associate director of the FBI at the time of the Watergate scandal. Until then, Felt's identity had been the best kept secret in the United States, protected by the Washington Post journalists who were informed by Deep Throat and who broke the story of President Richard Nixon's illicit actions. The journalists, Bob Woodward and Leonard Bernstein, as well as Deep Throat were immortalized in the film 'All the President's Men.' (Getty Image)

05-03-06 18:31 EDT

Best Western THE LOWEST RATE. GUARANTEED. On our hotels ONLY AT BestWestern.com

AOL news AOL Search

Home

LATEST HEADLINES:sh. Injured Hiker Found After 3 Days in Wash. Pa. Primary to Test Vote

- News
- Did You See That
- Letters to the Editor
- News Alerts
- Odds & Ends
- Gulps & Quotes
- Autos
- Careers
- Computing
- Entertainment
- Finance
- Health
- Life & Style
- Red
- Shopping
- Sports
- Travel

TOP 11

Top 11 Political Leaks and Scandals

Scandals and leaks are all part of what makes a government or a politician sink or swim. Well-timed, intentional leaks can help sway an election, while unexpected revelations can ruin a career. Take a look at some of the best-known affairs on record.


Member's
Should emp
workers tim
sporting eve
Read more

- Yes
- No

Get Organized




Eight Risk Free issues of Time



◀ (8 of 11) ▶

1995- Sponsorship scandal: Though the federal sponsorship scandal only really came into the public awareness in the early years of the new millenium, sponsorship leaker, Allan Cutler blew his whistle way back in 1995. The former bureaucrat is credited with bringing the shady advertising deals made under Jean Chretien out of the back rooms and into the limelight, he even lost his job in the process. We've since seen several names dragged through the mud for during the Gomery Inquiry and the scandal arguably played a significant role in putting a Liberal government out of power. (CP Image)

05-03-06 18:31 EDT



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

601147

70277350

7090250

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE 613 748 7330
TELEFAX 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

PERSONAL / FOR HIS EYES ONLY

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, January 24, 2007

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal" and the RCMP

Dear Prime Minister,

Today I take the liberty to send you copies of my letter January 23, 2007 to The Hon. Robert D. Nicholson, Minister of Justice and Attorney General and my letter January 24, 2006 to The Hon. Stockwell B. Day, Minister of Public Safety for your information.

The news from today proves again who controls the department of Justice and confirms my concerns. **The inescapable conclusion is that your political enemies are undermining your government's intention to clean up how the nation is governed.**

I don't think that you are interested in my advice but I can tell you that I have spent at least 45 years of my life with international Conservative Politics and tried to support Conservative causes where-ever support was needed. This is the main reason of my troubles, since no good deed goes unpunished.

I was a close witness to the painful decline of the Conservative Government of Brian Mulroney and I am a pretty good observer with an impressive memory.


I learnt that the formula: "Wash me but don't make me wet" will not work!

Dear Prime Minister, in my opinion you need the strong and permanent support from Canadian voters to ensure your success through their confidence.

Only an independent public inquiry, concerning the "Political Justice Scandal" and the "Airbus" affair, can achieve the clean up in Ottawa which you have promised to your voters.

I wish you health and fortune:

Yours sincerely



Karlheinz Schreiber

KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHON 613 748 7330
TELEFAX 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

Personal / For his eyes only

The Honourable Robert Douglas Nicholson P.C. Q.C.
Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
2895 St. Paul Avenue, Unit 11
Niagara Falls, Ontario
L2J 2L3

Ottawa, January 23, 2007

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal" and the "Airbus" Affair

Dear Mr. Minister,

Please accept my congratulations on your appointment as the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada. I wish you success and fortune with your new, important duties.

Since you were in the House of Commons from 1984 – 1993 you witnessed the dramatic situation of the Conservative Party's seats going down from 216 seats in 1984 to two seats in 1993 and you became aware of the reasons responsible for this development. I experienced the tragedy from the outside, but very close, as you may know.

Maybe it is fate that you became the present Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada. The future will tell whether you will write a chapter in Canadian history.

Today I am taking the liberty to sending you copies of my letter of October 25, 2006 with attachments to The Hon. Vic Toews, then the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, the letter dated December 1, 2006 of The Hon. Vic Toews, then the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, to my Lawyer Edward Greenspan Q.C., LL. D., D.C.L. as well as the facsimile dated November 14, 2006 and November 16, 2006 from the IAG of the Department of Justice for your personal information.

The documents are self explanatory. I truly believe that you can share my concerns that the IAG of the Department of Justice is shielding the Minister.

For this reason I am sending the letter to your office at Niagara Falls. I do very much believe that it is of political importance for you to know about the case.

In my opinion the letter December 1, 2006 of The Hon. Vic Toews, then the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada to my lawyer Edward Greenspan Q.C., LL.D., D.C.L. opens the door to the next dimension of the biggest "Political Justice Scandal" in Canadian history.

Dear Minister, I am convinced that you will agree with me if you read this story on the front page of a national newspaper:

A Liberal Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada teamed up with a journalist, a confidential RCMP – informant and complainant, the Solicitor General of Canada, the RCMP Commissioner, officials of the Department of Justice of Canada, officers of the RCMP and a police informant with a criminal record from Switzerland, to start a conspiracy and political vendetta including allegations of bribery and fraud against a former Conservative Prime Minister of Canada and his friends.

The conspiracy and vendetta started 12 years ago and is still moving ahead.

It costs millions of taxpayers' money and continues to do so.

No charges were ever laid.

The lawsuit of the former Conservative Prime Minister of Canada was settled, but the vendetta continues.

Ten years ago, one other victim of the vendetta filed a lawsuit against the Liberal Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of Canada, and that lawsuit is still ongoing.

The Department of Justice of Canada tries to thwart the lawsuit through delay, extradition and detention without treaty obligations (with the involvement of the RCMP and an undercover agent hired from a foreign country), ultimately attempting to conceal from the public the truth about the vendetta, the abuse of power and the "Political Justice Scandal".

The Liberal Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada who initiated the vendetta refuses to appear for examinations for discovery because he is not the responsible Minister today.

The Liberal Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, responsible for the lawsuit and the extradition case, lies about his obligations under an extradition treaty and writes in a letter October 31, 2004: "I was not the Minister of Justice at the time the impugned actions were taken and therefore, I have no bias against Mr.....".


After 12 years in opposition, the Conservative Party formed a new government. The Conservative Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada is supporting his Liberal predecessors' scandal-hiding activities, denies the existence of the "Political Justice Scandal" and backs his lies!

Dear Minister, this case will not disappear by itself. You have the responsibility and the authority now to deal with a difficult situation. Your officials, dealing with the case so far, have been the political enemies, who initiated the vendetta and are still pursuing The Hon. Brian Mulroney and me [see the attachments of the letter to The Hon. Vic Toews October 25, 2006 taps 18 and 19].

In my opinion only an independent inquiry can achieve a proper clean-up and return fundamental Justice to the Department of Justice and the RCMP to make sure that the same will not happen again in the future.

I am looking forward to hear from you.

Yours sincerely



Karlheinz Schreiber

Copy to The Right Hon. Stephen J. Harper, P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister

KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE 613 748 7330
TELEFAX 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

Personal / for his eyes only

The Hon. Stockwell Burt Day P.C. M. P.
Minister of Public Safety

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, January 24, 2007

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal" and the RCMP

Dear Minister,


I am taking the liberty to send you copies of letters November 28, 2006, January 10, 2007 and January 16, 2007 which I received from the RCMP concerning my Public Complaints against some RCMP officers for your information.

I am also attaching complaint – Scheduling A, B, C, D, E of November 14, 2006 File No PC- 2006-1847 and of December 27, 2006 File No PC- 2006 – 1973..

Five officers have retired from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and are not subject to an investigation pursuant to the RCMP Act.


In order to arrange for a proper clean up of the "Political Justice Scandal" with the involvement of the RCMP, I strongly recommend an "Inquiry" to bring the truth to light to the Canadian public.

Yours sincerely



Karlheinz Schreiber

Copy to The Right Hon. Stephen Harper P.C. M.P. Prime Minister



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

70920207

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE 613 748 7330
TELEFAX 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

Personal / For His Eyes Only

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, March 29, 2007

**Subject: "Political Justice Scandal" & "The Airbus Affair"
RCMP & IAG Conspiracy and Coverup
Public Inquiry**

Dear Prime Minister,

Today I take the liberty to send you a copy of my letter January 29, 2007 to The Right Hon. Brian Mulroney, P.C., L. L. D. for your personal and private information.

Concerning a Public Inquiry I am referring to all the letters I have sent to you since June 16, 2006 especially to my letters January 16, 2007 and January 24, 2007. I also attaché a copy of an article of the Toronto Sun November 17, 1997: "Former Prime Minister Brian Mulroney is calling for a Royal Commission into a possible coverup of the Airbus scandal."

**AIRBUS INQUIRY URGED; MULRONEY SUSPECTS HIGH-LEVEL
COVERUP IN SCANDAL**

Since the 6th of February 2006 Canada has a Conservative Government and Brian Mulroney's request for a Public Inquiry disappeared.

Concerning Extradition I attaché 3 pages of a RCMP publication.
 Interpol 1- The Canadian Central Authority
 2.2 Court Proceedings
 2.4 The Decision to Surrender

The document explains the duties of the officials involved and shows the political power of the Minister of Justice.

The situation appears like your Conservative Government is using previous Liberal Government tactics.

Delay the Schreiber lawsuit against the Attorney General of Canada, try to involve him in criminal activities and put him in a jail or extradite him to Germany. Shut him up.

Conceal the biggest "Political Justice Scandal" in the history of Canada.


Assure that the Canadian Public will never get to know what really happened concerning the "Airbus" affair, when a Liberal Minister of Justice and the IAG of the Department of Justice teamed up with the RCMP in an illegal international conspiracy to hunt a previous Conservative Prime Minister and his friends.

How would this work with the Accountability of the Conservative Government and the election promise: Let's clean up government. Canadians have been let down by 12 years of Liberal scandal?

Dear Prime Minister, I always thought that events like this belong to the political behavior in countries with totalitarian Governments and have been the reason for many people to escape to Canada.

Could it be that there is serious concern within the Conservative Government regarding the possible findings of a Public Inquiry which caused you to become part of the conspiracy and the concealing of the biggest "Political Justice Scandal" in the history of Canada?

Yours sincerely



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE 613 748 7330
FACSIMILE 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

The Right Hon. Brian Mulroney, P.C., LL.D.
47 Forden Crescent

Westmount, Quebec
H3Y 2Y5

Ottawa, January 29, 2007

Dear Brian,

I refer to my letter January 19, 2006 concerning the decision of The Hon. Vic Toews, P.C. M.P. then the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada to support his predecessor The Hon. Irwin Cotler by denying the "Airbus" vendetta against you and your friends and the existence of the "Political Justice Scandal".

This case is much worth and much more dangerous than the Maher Arar case.

Imagine, a Liberal Minister of Justice initiates a political vendetta against a retired Conservative Prime Minister, his friends and the Conservative Party with the involvement of the officials of the Department of Justice, the RCMP, confidential informants and complainants, undercover agents from foreign agencies, journalists and foreign informants with criminal records.

Officials from the Department of Justice and the RCMP participate in an international political conspiracy, traveling during 12 years on taxpayer's money all over the world even violating the sovereignty of foreign countries. No confirmation concerning their allegations of fraud and bribe was found.

A victim of the vendetta files a lawsuit against the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of Canada.

The vendetta caused an extradition case against the victim. The officials from the Department of Justice and the RCMP are trying to conceal the vendetta and the abuse of power and committed crimes through extradition or detention.

I always thought that events like this belong to the political behavior in countries with totalitarian Governments.

Since February 2006 Canada has a Conservative Government. The victim informed the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Public Safety and others, including you, about the ongoing vendetta.

On December 1, 2006 the Conservative Minister of Justice confirmed his predecessor's decision to extradite the victim to Germany required through Extradition – Treaty obligations. Every Minister involved and you know that this is a huge lie.

THE CANADIAN - GERMAN EXTRADITION TREATY

ARTICLE V: EXTRADITION OF NATIONALS

(1) NEITHER OF THE CONTRACTING PARTIES SHALL BE BOUND TO EXTRADITE ITS OWN NATIONALS .

Germany will never extradite one of its Nationals to Canada. The German Constitution, Article 16 (2) will not allow the extradition of its Nationals.

Dear Brian, can you please tell me why the Conservative Minister of Justice wants the Canadian National Karlheinz Schreiber, the victim, out of the country and help to conceal the biggest "Political Justice Scandal" in Canadian history contrary to the normal political interest of the Conservative Government.

I do not believe that the Hon. Vic Toews, then the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, made this decision on his own. What is the political interest of the Conservative Government and the Prime Minister in this case and what are the benefits? Is there a serious concern about the possible result of an inquiry?

Unfortunately, you did not respond to my letter as requested and it appears to me that you have no desire to bring any support to my request for a public inquiry which could bring the insanity to an end.

All my personal problems began with Stevie Camerons book "ON THE TAKE" and Allan Rock's political witch-hunt with the RCMP against you.

Since 1996 I am fighting to bring the truth to light through my lawsuit against the Attorney General of Canada. I never received any support from you despite the fact that I provided support at your request since the late 70s.

From 1985 until 1993 I had confidence in you and your statements concerning the Thyssen Bear Head project. You always told me to hang on and that the Thyssen project would go ahead as promised when the company was asked to come to Canada and provide jobs to the people in Nova Scotia.

During the year 2001 I could read in Stevie Cameron's book "The last Amigo" on page 260 that Norman Spector told RCMP officers : Prime Minister Brian Mulroney killed the Thyssen project in 1990 or 1991. Paul Tellier and Bob Fowler were looking after the business interests of General Motors London Ontario.

This was some time after Thyssen Bear Head Industries signed agreements concerning the projects with the Federal Government and the Provincial Government of Nova Scotia and Thyssen had paid substantial amounts of Dollars to GCI Frank Moores related to the achievements.

You never told Elmer Mackay or me that you killed the project and I went on working on it to fulfill your promises to bring jobs to the people in Nova Scotia.

During the summer of 1993 when you were looking for financial help, I was there again. When we met on June 23, 1993 at Harrington Lake, you told me that you believe that Kim Campbell will win the next election. You also told me that you would work in your office in Montreal and that the Bear Head project should be moved to the Province of Quebec, where you could be of great help to me. We agreed to work together and I arranged for some funds for you.

Kim Campbell did not win the election, but we met from time to time.

At the beginning of November 1995 I informed you about the letter of request from the Canadian Department of Justice (the IAG) to the Swiss Department of Justice.

Some days later your wife Mila was extremely concerned about you and told me that you are considering committing suicide. I was shocked and spoke to you for quite a while and you may recall that I told Mila to buy a little lead pipe to cure the disease.

I did not understand what your problem was since the Airbus story was a hoax as I told Bob Fife from the Sun. When I look back and consider what all you have done in the meantime I have the suspicion that there must be something else of great concern to you.

When we met in Zuerich, Switzerland on February 2, 1998 at the Hotel Savoy, I left with the impression that you were in good shape.

On October 17, 1999 you asked for an affidavit or assurance from me which confirms that you never received any kind of compensation from me.

At the beginning of October 1999 to my great surprise I learnt that your spokesman Luc Lavoie told Harvey Cashore: "*Karlheinz Schreiber is the biggest fucking liar the world has ever seen. That is what we believe!*"

Believing the story, I got from you through a friend, I filed a lawsuit against the CBC which I had to drop when I got to know the truth and listening to the tapes. The fee: \$ 50.000.

During the Christmas Holydays 1999 I visited Fred Doucet at his home and told him that he should tell you that I would not commit perjury if I would have to testify and that I cannot understand why you don't simply tell the truth. A few days later, when I met with Fred again, he asked me to sign certain agreements concerning our business relationship. I refused to do so.

On January 24, 2000 Mila sent a letter to Baerbel and wrote: "the truth is certainly the best weapon!" She was right. If you would have taken her advice, you might have avoided a lot of trouble for you.

Until now you have to recognize that the Vendetta is not going away by itself.

During the summer of 2006, you again asked for a certain letter from me to be able to support my case, which I have sent to you on July 20, 2006 for your meeting on July 30, 2006.

When I look at the news during the last week and the activities from last year within the Department of Justice, concerning your settlement with the Government, I have a certain idea why your meeting was very important.

To assure that we have the same understanding about my case:

The Decision to Surrender


The judicial phase of the extradition process is a determination only that the evidence is sufficient to warrant that the person be extradited. The ultimate decision with respect to whether the person will, in fact, be surrendered to the extradition partner is that of the Minister of Justice.

When you look at my extradition case you have to agree with me that Baerbel's and my life is in the hands of the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister or the IAG, who can arbitrarily decide since they have no obligation to extradite me to Germany.

Since the Minister of Justice decided on my surrender he must have a special reason to do so. What is the reason, becomes the most interesting question.

Dear Brian, I would like to ask you what the reason might be in your opinion, besides this I think it is in your and my best interests that you show up and help me now and bring this insanity to an end. If I am forced to leave Canada this will not end the matter.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brian", written in a cursive style.

AIRBUS INQUIRY URGED; MULRONEY SUSPECTS HIGH-LEVEL COVERUP IN SCANDAL

Journal: The Toronto Sun
November 17, 1997 pg 7
Authors: Robert Fife; Ottawa Bureau
Publication Date: 971117
Word Count: 467
Accession Number: TSU9711170123

Fulltext:

Former prime minister Brian Mulroney is calling for a royal commission into a possible coverup of the Airbus scandal.

Mulroney suspects there is a high-level coverup because no one in government or in the RCMP has taken responsibility for the fiasco, which has cost taxpayers more than \$3 million.

He alleges that Prime Minister Jean Chretien and some other senior officials were not innocent bystanders in the kickback investigation of him.

"The only way this can be dealt with is a royal commission inquiry into this entire matter," Mulroney told The Sun in an exclusive interview.

"You can give it a limited mandate to examine the conduct of the ministers and the key personnel and my own... so that the Canadian people will know all of the facts."

Mulroney suspects the government hoped to use the Airbus probe to destroy his reputation and divert attention from the Liberals' botched handling of the Quebec referendum.

Federal officials said Chretien, en route from Hanoi to Ottawa last night, would not respond to Mulroney's allegations until today.

Chretien has denied knowledge of the Airbus probe before it became public in November 1995. RCMP Commissioner Philip Murray and federal ministers Allan Rock and Herb Gray insist they were not directly involved.

But Mulroney said he doesn't believe RCMP Staff Sgt. Fraser Fiegenwald and a mid-level justice department lawyer were solely responsible for the false accusations against him.

"When a former prime minister's name is dragged through the mud... and nobody is responsible - not a minister, not a deputy minister, not a commissioner, nobody is responsible... this is the greatest insult to the Canadian people," he said.

"If there has been a coverup, I think it has to be dealt with very severely."

AIRBUS INQUIRY URGED; MULRONEY SUSPECTS HIGH-LEVEL COVERUP IN SCANDAL

Journal: The Toronto Sun
November 17, 1997 pg 7
Authors: Robert Fife; Ottawa Bureau
Publication Date: 971117
Word Count: 467
Accession Number: TSU9711170123

Fulltext:

Former prime minister Brian Mulroney is calling for a royal commission into a possible coverup of the Airbus scandal.

Mulroney suspects there is a high-level coverup because no one in government or in the RCMP has taken responsibility for the fiasco, which has cost taxpayers more than \$3 million.

He alleges that Prime Minister Jean Chretien and some other senior officials were not innocent bystanders in the kickback investigation of him.

"The only way this can be dealt with is a royal commission inquiry into this entire matter," Mulroney told The Sun in an exclusive interview.

"You can give it a limited mandate to examine the conduct of the ministers and the key personnel and my own... so that the Canadian people will know all of the facts."

Mulroney suspects the government hoped to use the Airbus probe to destroy his reputation and divert attention from the Liberals' botched handling of the Quebec referendum.

Mulroney said he's also suspicious of a secret deal that allowed Fiegenwald to retire with a full pension and a job with an RCMP-connected security firm.

"I think that is very worrisome and a royal commission is the appropriate instrument to get to the bottom of this," he said.


Mulroney warned he may file another lawsuit against the government if it doesn't withdraw a Sept. 29, 1995 letter it sent to Swiss authorities that accused him of accepting \$5 million in kickbacks on the sale of Airbus jets to Air Canada.

\$2M FOR LEGAL COSTS

"My lawyers have written to the commissioner of the RCMP and the appropriate ministers," Mulroney said. "We want that letter withdrawn..."

Now if we don't get that withdrawn, we will take appropriate action in the near future."

In January, the government was forced to apologize to Mulroney and pay him \$2 million in legal expenses after he launched a \$50-million libel suit to clear his name.



Français
Home

Contact Us
A-Z Index

Help
Scams/Fraud

Search
Detachments

Canada Site
Publications



RCMP

British Columbia



Interpol


I - The Canadian Central Authority

The Minister of Justice is the central authority for Canada under the *Extradition Act* and the *Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act*. The International Assistance Group (IAG), which is part of the Federal Prosecution Service at the Headquarters of the Department of Justice in Ottawa, was established to carry out the functions assigned to the Minister of Justice as central authority for Canada under the *Extradition Act* and the *Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act* and to provide advice to the Minister on his/her responsibilities under these statutes.

The IAG reviews and coordinates extradition and mutual legal assistance requests made to Canada, as well as those made by Canada to other countries. It deals only with requests for assistance in criminal matters. The IAG also has the additional mandate to develop and advise on policy in the area of bilateral treaties and multilateral conventions concerning extradition and mutual legal assistance.

Under the authority of the Assistant Deputy Attorney General (Criminal Law), the IAG is responsible for the development of operational policy in the area of extradition and mutual legal assistance, in consultation with other branches of the Department of Justice and other interested government departments. As well, the IAG participates in the negotiation of extradition and mutual legal assistance agreements and provides consultative advice, to the requesting state if necessary, with respect to the preparation of requests for assistance and extradition to Canada.

The IAG also has established linkages with the International Criminal Tribunals concerned with the prosecution of persons responsible for violations of international law in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia, and also with the International Criminal Court. Finally, the IAG also carries out, *inter alia*, the following duties: coordinates and/or supports the provision of Canadian viva voce evidence at foreign trials in other countries, coordinates and provides operational policy advice and support for Canada's participation in international bodies involved in criminal law policy with operational consequences, training



- Home
- About the RCMP
- Priorities
- Programs and Services
- Operations
- Strategic Direction
- Corporate Management and Comptrollership
- National Police Services
- Technology
- Newsroom
- Careers / Recruiting

be served, issue an authority to proceed. An authority to proceed authorizes an extradition hearing to be held in order to consider whether the person should be committed for extradition.

These responsibilities are, in practice, performed by counsel at the International Assistance Group (the IAG) on behalf of the Minister of Justice.

2.2. Court Proceedings.

Once approved, the IAG forwards the request and all supporting material to the regional office of the Department of Justice in the region where the person sought is believed to be. That regional office will assign legal counsel to take conduct of the case and to initiate and conduct proceedings before a judge to seek an order for the committal for extradition of the person. Regional counsel will also represent the extradition partner throughout any appeal or judicial review hearings.

A person arrested in Canada pursuant to a request for provisional arrest or extradition must be brought before a judge within 24 hours after arrest or if no judge is available during this time, the person must be brought before a judge as soon as possible. The individual is entitled to be considered for bail. In Canada, there is not a presumption against bail in extradition matters.

Generally, the person whose extradition is sought appears at the extradition hearing and participates, with the assistance of legal counsel. In the case of a person sought for the purpose of prosecution, the judge will determine if the evidence provided by the extradition partner is such that the person would be committed for trial in Canada if the offence had occurred in this country. In the case of a person sought for the imposition or enforcement of a sentence, the judge will determine if the person has been convicted with respect to a matter that corresponds to a Canadian offence.

2.3. Evidence at the Extradition Hearing

At the extradition hearing, the *Extradition Act* allows evidence to be presented in a variety of ways:

- In the usual manner applicable to Canadian domestic proceedings such as through the testimony of witnesses;
- In reliance on the provisions for the introduction of evidence set out in an applicable extradition agreement; or
- By means of a «record of the case».

The record of the case is a new and innovative provision which permits the admissibility at the extradition hearing of a document summarizing the evidence available to the extradition partner for use in the prosecution, even if it contains evidence otherwise inadmissible in Canadian domestic proceedings, as long as certain safeguards are respected

the requesting state. The most appropriate authority may be the person who certified the record of the case. The general legal statement should include the following :


- identification of the person providing the statement by name and position, with a brief description of that person's expertise with respect to the law of the requesting state ;
- a description of the person's relationship to the case, i.e. in charge of the case, familiar with it ;
- a statement that the extradition of the person sought is requested for prosecution or imposition or enforcement of sentence for the offence(s) of ... contrary to ... (reference should be made to the applicable statute and section number) with reference to and attaching a copy of the arrest warrant and any relevant charging document ;
- a description or a copy of the text of the laws describing the offence(s) and setting out the applicable punishment ;
- reference to any law of prescription which would apply to the offence(s) as well as a declaration as to whether the prosecution is barred or not by prescription in view of that law ; and
- a declaration that the law with respect to the offence(s) was in force at the time of the alleged conduct and continues to be in force at the time of the request for extradition ;
- where the alleged offence(s) is extraterritorial, an explanation of the basis for jurisdiction to prosecute , attaching if possible any statutory provision setting out the same.

If the presiding judge is satisfied with the evidence, he or she orders the person detained pending the decision of the Minister of Justice whether to surrender the person. Otherwise, the person is discharged and released.

2.4. *The Decision to Surrender*

The judicial phase of the extradition process is a determination only that the evidence is sufficient to warrant that the person be extradited. The ultimate decision with respect to whether the person will, in fact, be surrendered to the extradition partner is that of the Minister of Justice. At this phase of the process, the Minister will consider any written representations from the person or the person's counsel with respect to why the person should not be extradited or concerning any conditions to which the surrender should be subject. In reaching a decision on surrender the Minister will be obliged to weigh the submissions of the person against Canada's international obligations with respect to extradition. The Minister in reaching his or her decision must respect the rights of the person sought as guaranteed by the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. The *Extradition Act* obliges the Minister to deny surrender if he or she is satisfied that the surrender would be unjust or oppressive having regard to all the relevant circumstances; or the request for extradition is made for the purpose of prosecuting or punishing the person by reason of their race, religion, nationality, ethnic origin, language, colour, political opinion, sex, sexual orientation, age, mental or physical disability or status or that the person's position may be prejudiced for any of those reasons.

If the person is serving a sentence in Canada, the Minister may order



attachments

710 20178

KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHON: 613 748 7330
FACSIMILE: 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

Personal, for his eyes only

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, April 8, 2007

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal"
Letter to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General

Dear Prime Minister,

I take the liberty to send you a copy of a letter April 3, 2007 from my Lawyer Robert W. Hladun Q.C. to The Honourable Robert Douglas Nicholson P.C. Q.C. Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada for your personal information.

In my opinion the content of the letter is an excellent reason for the Minister to return the principles of Fundamental Justice to the Department of Justice and to correct the arrows of his predecessors and officials of the (IAG) International Legal Assistance Group.

Please note: **"The judicial phase of the extradition process is a determination only that the evidence is sufficient to warrant that the person be extradited. The ultimate decision with respect to whether the person will, in fact, be surrendered to the extradition partner is that of the Minister of Justice."**

(See my letter I sent to you March 29, 2007 and the attached copy of a letter to The Right Hon. Brian Mulroney with attachments.)

Under the current circumstances the Minister is independent of the political directions of Germany and in fact has no legal obligations to extradite a Canadian Citizen.

However the Ministers in the past have believed that they do have a legal obligation and that position is legally, morally and ethically wrong .

If the Minister has any doubts, concerning my case and the "Political Vendetta", he must call for an independent judicial inquiry. An independent inquiry would disclose to the Canadian public what is going on in his Department.

Dear Prime Minister, I refer to the sincere efforts by the Prime Minister to clean-up or at least clear up the obvious problems in the Solicitor Generals and the Attorney Generals Departments.

I respectfully request to hold you to your promise to clean-up Ottawa.

Yours sincerely



Karlheinz Schreiber



Tel.780.423.1888 100, 10187 - 104 Street, inquiries@hladun.com
Fax.780.424.0934 Edmonton Alberta
www.hladun.com T5J 0Z9

Our File 15737.1

Your File

April 3, 2007

Via Fax: (613)992-7910

The Honourable Robert Douglas Nicholson
Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
284 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON K1A 0H8

Dear Sir:

Re: Karlheinz Schreiber and the Government of Canada

I represent Karlheinz Schreiber with respect to an action he commenced in the Alberta Court of Queens Bench in October, 1997 as a result of the Letter of Request that was sent to Switzerland in September of 1995. Mr. Schreiber has been the subject of extradition proceedings since the fall of 1999 and Edward Greenspan, Q.C. has represented his interests in that regard. On May 4, 2007, the Ontario Court of Appeal will hear an appeal relating to the surrender decision made by the Honourable Vic Towes on the 6th of December, 2006.

I recently received and reviewed a number of Crown documents in relation to the Alberta lawsuit. I have also reviewed certain newspaper articles and correspondence relating to the position the Swiss Minister of Justice has taken about the banking documents they seized then forwarded to Germany, and in which they have advised the Augsburg Prosecutors they cannot use as the documents were obtained on the basis of improper and misleading information provided by the German authorities. Incidentally, this same evidence is being relied on by the German authorities and proffered to the Canadian authorities as a basis for the extradition of Mr. Schreiber.

There is no question but that Mr. Schreiber's proceedings have taken a significant period of time. On the other hand, the fundamental principles of our justice system demand that issues of importance to Canadian citizens be dealt with in a fair, proper and reasonable manner. The purpose of my letter is to petition you to reconsider your decision to surrender Mr. Schreiber to Germany. I ask for your reconsideration as there is no question but that the cumulative effect of the matters I will outline hereunder has not been considered by any Court. The cumulative effect of the many things that have transpired over the course of the investigation is such that the principles of fundamental justice would be violated if Mr. Schreiber is returned to Germany before there has been a proper consideration of this matter, particularly a complete review of the actions of the RCMP.

Honourable Robert Douglas Nicholson

April 3, 2007

2

Therefore, I ask for your indulgence in reviewing Mr. Schreiber's position in the context of the following:

- a) the abuse of process and abuse of Mr. Schreiber's rights as gleaned from a review of RCMP actions in their investigations of Airbus and in relation to Eurocopter Canada;
- b) the misleading statement of Commissioner Murray that he did not know anything about the Letter of Request when it was he who in fact instructed an investigation into the matter when he was provided with briefing notes about the ongoing investigation;
- c) that an official letter from the Swiss Justice authorities to the German authorities withdrawing documents sent to Germany and the implication of the Germans not providing correct information to the Canadian authorities at the time they sought the assistance of the Canadian authorities and Courts;
- d) the fact that many of the charges against Mr. Schreiber are time barred in Germany and Lex Schreiber will operate retrospectively;
- e) the implications on the right to a fair trial in light of the comments made by the spokesperson for the Augsburg Court and by the Chief Prosecutor of Augsburg;
- f) that the charges against Mr. Schreiber stem as a result of political developments and issues in Germany; and
- g) that a Canadian citizen ought to be given the benefit of the legal safeguards provided in the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* before being surrendered to a foreign government.

Mr. Schreiber's case is not the usual MLAT case in that he became the subject of the Letter of Request, a party to a lawsuit against the Attorney General, and the subject of Extradition proceedings that have been conducted by members of the IAG. It is my understanding that the IAG also provides advice to the Minister of Justice in relation to your review and decision relating to surrender. The overall impression of a reasonable person, fully informed of the circumstances of the case could be none other than that there is an apprehension of bias. The apprehension is not in relation to any one individual but more so to the office of the Minister of Justice and to the duties members of the IAG must perform. The apprehension of bias arises in the context of the appearance of the conflicts of interest in the peculiar circumstances of Mr. Schreiber's case.

The RCMP have not conducted themselves in a honorable manner in relation to this matter from the inception of the investigation in January, 1995 to the conclusion of the investigation in April, 2003. The most egregious action occurred when the RCMP, in concert with a "foreign agency", arranged to have a foreign spy ingratiate himself to Mr. Schreiber with the express purpose of entrapping Mr. Schreiber into committing a criminal act. The spy was thus instructed by the RCMP on their own accord after the RCMP had obtained the materials relating to the Letter of Request and during the time Mr. Schreiber was subject to extradition proceedings.

Honourable Robert Douglas Nicholson

April 3, 2007

3

The statements made by the Augsburg Court spokesperson and the Augsburg chief prosecutor relative to awaiting Mr. Schreiber's surrender, convey no other meaning than that Mr. Schreiber is not considered innocent and that he is not going to receive a fair and impartial trial. The comments are suggestive of the political atmosphere Mr. Schreiber faces in Augsburg. How can the Canadian government justify sending a Canadian citizen to a jurisdiction that will not adhere to the principles of fundamental justice and that appears to have prejudged Mr. Schreiber? The political nature of the actions against Mr. Schreiber is brought home with the passage of "Lex Schreiber" in the summer of 2005 whereby the Germans will extend the limitation periods relating to the charges facing Mr. Schreiber. The *Extradition Act* obliges you to consider limitation periods in making your surrender decision. How can Canada, where laws do not apply retrospectively, send a citizen of Canada to a country that has passed legislation to ensure Mr. Schreiber will be prosecuted, despite the fact that many of the charges are now time barred?

The Courts and the Minister of Justice have stated that the surrender decision is at the "extreme end of the continuum of administrative decision making" and it has been said that the decision the Minister must make is a "political one". The Swiss Minister of Justice has informed the Augsburg Prosecutors that they are not at liberty to use the documents that the Swiss officials seized. The Swiss have taken that position as they are of the view that the German authorities misled them at the time the initial request for the seizure of documents was made. The letter from the Swiss and the media commentary relating to the same are available for your review. The documents referred to are precisely the documents that were relied upon by the Honourable Mr. Justice Wait when he made his committal decision. If the documents are tainted (as the Swiss have indicated to the Germans), then there can be no other conclusion but that the committal order was made on the basis of tainted evidence. How can the government of Canada justify surrendering one of its citizens on the basis of tainted/improper evidence? It is respectfully submitted that to surrender Mr. Schreiber would be contrary to the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, contrary to the tenets of fundamental justice and would bring the administration of justice into disrepute.

There is no statutory nor legal obligation for Canada to extradite Mr. Schreiber to Germany; in fact, Germany would not extradite one of its citizens to Canada.

Please reconsider your decision in light of the above information and rescind the decision to surrender Mr. Schreiber to the German authorities.


Yours truly,

HLADUN & COMPANY



ROBERT W. HLADUN, Q.C.

RWH/ms



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE 613 748 7330
TELEFAX 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

PERSONAL / FOR HIS EYES ONLY

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, April 10, 2007

**Subject: "Bomb kills 6 Canadian soldiers in Afghanistan"
"All LAV IIIs to be replaced within the year"**

Dear Prime Minister,

Great sadness in my heart concerning our killed soldiers and the fear of more casualties to come is the reason for this letter to you.

The attached article of the Globe & Mail, 03/04/07 "War taking unexpectedly harsh toll on vehicles", page 3 : "Other supplements to the battered fleet of vehicles are already on their way to Afghanistan, he added. In addition to the 45 boxy, tracked M113s armoured vehicles that arrived on the last ship, he said, another 100 M113s will be prepared in the next six to eight month and shipped over. (Lt.-Gen.Leslie)

The attached article of the Globe & Mail March 22, 1993: "Vintage vehicles drive up risk." The M113 "is not fit for the type of job it's doing." retired Canadian Major – General Lewis MacKenzie, who commanded the Sarajevo sector when a Canadian battalion took control of the airport in July, said in an interview last week.

"The job is not peacekeeping, for there is no peace. It is delivering humanitarian relief, often through combat zones."

(page 2) "While no one is questions the quality, training or professionalism of the soldiers, most of the armoured vehicles are the M113s, which date from 1965."

" The Canadian army was to have had a similar vehicle (like the British warrior), the MRCV (like the Thyssen Bear-Head TH 495 Multy Role Combat Vehicle)."

" The Progressive Conservative government scrapped that program two years ago, along with other plans to replace obsolete equipment, despite longstanding pledges to end years of what they called Liberal neglect."

Dear Prime Minister,

I take the liberty to send you a copy of my letter April 10, 2007 to The Right Hon. Brian Mulroney with attachments,
a copy of my letter March 17, 1993, to the Hon. Kim Campbell, then the Minister of National Defence,
a copy of my letter October 18, 1990, to the Hon. Bill McKnight, then the Minister of National Defence,
a copy of the letter August 1, 1995 from the Canadian Ambassador Paul Heinbecker to me
and the copy of an article of The Ottawa Citizen August 17, 1995 concerning the vehicles, which now have to be replaced within the year, for your information which might be of interest to you.


I can assure you that I made a lot of friends with Ottawa's bureaucrats when I tried, as requested from the Canadian government, to create jobs and protect the life of Canadian soldiers.

The use of Vintage Vehicles in Afghanistan puts our soldiers on high risk which could amount to manslaughter.

Dear Prime Minister, you have a tough job. I hope that I could provide some help with this information.

Yours sincerely


Karlheinz Schreiber



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

170
615239
TELEPHONE: 613 748 7330
FACSIMILE: 613 748 9697
schreiberb:il@aol.com

Personal / For his eyes only

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, May 3, 2007.

**Subject: "Child obesity an epidemic in Canada"
Brian Mulroney & Karlheinz Schreiber
Director of Public Prosecution**

Dear Prime Minister,

I take the liberty to send you a copy of my letter April 15, 2007 to The Right Honourable Brian Mulroney P.C., LL. D. for your personal information.


I am surprised you appointed Brian Saunders to be the acting Director of Public Prosecution after he recommended reopening the Mulroney settlement case and represented with the IAG and the Department of Justice the Attorney General against me in my lawsuit against the Attorney General of Canada for many years.

You named the "Airbus Affair" to be one of the reasons for the need of the Office of the Director of Public prosecution. Do you recommend I should take my case to him now?


I am very disappointed that you, until today, did not start the clean up of Ottawa with a public inquiry into the "Airbus" affair and the "Political Justice Scandal".

It looks to me you can not take the risk to call such an inquiry because of the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, your important advisor.

Yours sincerely



Karlheinz Schreiber



NR

KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

72750150

629096

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE: 613 748 7330
FACSIMILE: 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

P4P

Personal

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, September 26, 2007

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal"
The "Airbus Affair" & Brian Mulroney
Abuse of Public Trust

Dear Prime Minister,

I take the liberty to lead your attention to an article of The Canadian Press,
September 7, 2007: (article attached)

Mulroney slams Liberals over Airbus, but won't explain dealings with Schreiber

"Mulroney says he was the victim of a smear campaign orchestrated by his liberal opponents in the Airbus scandal – but he's not yet ready to offer an explanation of his own for his personal dealings with businessman Karlheinz Schreiber, a key figure in the affair.

In a television interview, on the eve of the official publication of his memoirs, Mulroney blamed the government of Jean Chretien – thought he didn't name him personally – for an RCMP investigation that called his reputation into question."

"The matter was indeed organized by the government, acting on flimsy and false information," Mulroneu declared.

On the subject of the RCMP investigation during the Liberal years in power, he maintained that all Canadians should draw a lesson from his difficulties.

"I think that any time the force of the government is used against any citizens, unfairly and inappropriately, it represents a fundamental threat to our most basic rights," he said.

"It happened that, in my case I was able to fight back...(but) if the government comes after you and uses the resources, financial and otherwise, of the state, they can crush any Canadian. This is the greatest threat to the individual liberties of the ordinary Canadian citizen that can exist anywhere, and we have to fight this."

Dear Prime Minister,

how do you feel when you look at this statement of your advisor the Right Hon. Brian Mulroneu and your announcements on November 30, 2005 in Quebec City concerning the same subject:

Stand up for Canada. 30 November 2005, Quebec City:

Harper calls for office of public prosecutions.

"A Conservative government would institute an independent office of public prosecutions responsible for investigating criminal activity on Parliament Hill," party Leader Stephen Harper said Wednesday.

"There's going to be a new code on Parliament Hill: bend the rules, you will be punished; break the law, you will be charged; abuse the public trust, you will go to prison," warned Harper.

It appears to me that The Right Hon. Stephen Harper, Prime Minister of Canada, The Right. Hon. Brian Mulroneu and Karlheinz Schreiber, a victim of criminal activity on Parliament Hill, want the same: A clean up on Parliament Hill.

Until now only Karlheinz Schreiber is fighting for a clean up asking Prime Minister Stephen Harper without success since June 16, 2006 to call an inquiry.

The Issue: (Stephen Harper, November 5, 2005 Quebec City)

“The Liberal party’s 12 years in power have been 12 years of consecutive scandal. Despite Paul Martin’s promises to clean up Ottawa, nothing has changed. Worse, the Liberals have made no attempt to ensure that those responsible for these scandals pay the price – and they still pretend they are victims in the sponsorship scandal !” (The Right Hon. Paul Martin called the Gomery Inquiry. Not you.)

Additional examples of the need for prosecutorial independence:

“The Mulroneu – Airbus affair: Officials in the federal Department of Justice advised the RCMP during its investigation and it was the Justice Department that signed and sent the letter asking the Swiss authorities to cooperate. The Department’s letter wrongly indicated that the RCMP had reached conclusions about criminal activity and then – Attorney General Allan Rock subsequently apologized in writing.

(The apology was sent to the Right. Hon. Brian Mulroneu, the Hon. Frank D. Moores and Karlheinz Schreiber)

To avoid any possibility of interference, this is precisely the sort of issue that should have been handled by an independent Director of Public Prosecutions.”

The choice:

“The Liberals have failed to move swiftly and decisively to find justice in the sponsorship scandal. They continue to be distracted by their scandals and have been trying to micro-manage the response to the scandal. Only the Conservatives recreate an independent body to make binding and final decisions to prosecute those responsible for breaking the public trust. Only a Conservative government can get on with the job of governing, to deliver accountable government that Canadians deserve” (documents attached).

Since June 16, 2006 I provided information and evidence to you that officials of the Department of Justice and the RCMP, you mentioned with the “Airbus” affair, are still involved in my lawsuit against the Attorney General of Canada and in my extradition case with Germany. I explained the circumstances why I can only turn to you.

The same officials of the Department of Justice including Brian Saunders, your acting Director of Public Prosecution and the RCMP are involved in the “Political Justice Scandal”, the “Airbus” affair, illegal activities with German officials against me, a Minister who lies to the courts and a huge cover up action.

The same officials of the Department of Justice, who sent the letter of request to Switzerland and initiated the "Airbus" affair, fabricated the new Canadian Extradition Act 1999 after the Airbus settlement - disaster with Brian Mulroney and the commencement of my lawsuit against the Attorney General of Canada in 1996/1997.

The new Extradition Act neutralized the power of the Canadian qualified judges and made it become a nearly uncontrolled political tool in the hands of the Minister of Justice, which means in reality the IAG, International Assistance Group, who initiated the "Airbus" affair and costs millions of Canadian taxpayer's dollars so far in an ongoing crime.

Dear Prime Minister,

Your own statements provide the evidence that you are fully aware of the situation concerning the Department of Justice and the RCMP but you do nothing. I ask you for a long time, like the Conservatives asked the Liberal Government for many years, to call an inquiry to assure that the truth comes to light and fundamental Justice will be brought back to the Department of Justice and the RCMP.

The Department of Justice and the RCMP became political weapons to hunt political opponents and help to win political elections.

National Post, June 15, 2007 Craig Offman: *"Mandate unwieldy say RCMP critics"*
(Article attached)

Reading the article with the comments of Mr. David Brown, Ms. Shirley Heafey, the former chair of the force's commission of public complaints, author Mr. Paul Palango, Professor Ms. Linda Duxbury, Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj M.P. adding my own experience with the RCMP, the Department of Justice and the Commission for Public Complaints against the RCMP, it seems to me that I find the same practices which are used in countries with totalitarian Governments.

May I remind you what the Attorney General Allan Rock, the Solicitor General Herb Gray and the RCMP did to Sgt. Fraser Fiegenwald related to the "Airbus" affair and Stevie Cameron?

Since November 28, 2006 I receive reports from the RCMP concerning my complaints through the Commission for Public Complaints against the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, in the cases of Commissioner Zaccardelli and 7 RCMP officers.

Please find attached 9 copies of the reports as an example for you. I hope you will enjoy the farce!

Please find attached a copy of the letter September 6, 2007 from the Department of Justice Canada to my lawyer Robert Hladun Q.C. It is an additional piece of evidence of the abuse of power, the fear and the delay tactics of the Attorney General of Canada.

Please find also attached copies of the letter July 9, 2007 from the Department of Justice of Switzerland to the Department of Justice of Germany and my lawyer Dr. Heinz Raschein. The letters will tell you how the German Prosecutors in Augsburg mislead the officials of the Swiss Department of Justice, the German Federal Court (Supreme Court) and consequently the Canadian Courts with the knowledge and the support of the IAG of the Canadian Department of Justice.

Without qualified highly respected independent Judges and the Media, Canada would be in danger to loose it's international reputation and attraction for people which come to Canada, hoping to find shelter and fundamental Justice.

My suspicion is that for personal and political reasons you became part of the illegal activities against me and the cover up action of the Department of Justice (IAG) and the RCMP.

Based on your own new code on Parliament Hill, in my opinion you face a classical example of abuse of public trust, by ignoring this case any longer.

You know: Canada has no treaty obligations to extradite its Nationals to Germany.
You know: Germany will never extradite its Nationals to Canada.

For all the reasons of my case, known to you, I ask you in the interest of all Canadians to stop the political motivated vendetta against me immediately and to assure the return of fundamental Justice to the Department of Justice of Canada and to the RCMP.

As a reminder I attaché my letter of March 29, 2007 to you, a copy of my letter January 29, 2007 to The Right Hon. Brian Mulroney and a copy of his photo.

The Right Hon. Brian Mulroney stated:

"I think that any time the force of the government is used against any citizens, unfairly and inappropriately, it represents a fundamental threat to our most basic rights!"


"It happened that, in my case I was able to fight back... (but) if the government comes after you and uses the resources, financial and otherwise, of the state, they can crush any Canadian. This is the greatest threat to the individual liberties of the ordinary Canadian citizen that can exist anywhere, and we have to fight this."

I urge you to fulfill your election promises to clean up Parliament Hill in Ottawa and start to fight for the protection of the individual liberties of the ordinary Canadian citizen.

Assure that the Canadian Citizenship provides the same values citizens in most of the civilized countries around the world are privileged to enjoy.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "J. McLean". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping initial "J" and "M".



VIA COURIER AND FAX 1-613-

Monday, November 19, 2007

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper, P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Political Justice Scandal
Abuse of Public Trust
Germany's Breach of International Law

Dear Prime Minister,

On September 26, 2007 I sent by courier to you a letter with several attachments. Since I did not receive an answer to this letter, which you received on September 28, 2007, and as I learned from your public statements that you did not receive said letter which also included my previous letter to you dated March 29, 2007, I enclose herewith a copy of my September 26, 2007 letter with attachments and additional attachments concerning the latest developments in my case including information of an illegal kidnapping attempt on October 4, 2007.

Today I would like to bring some facts concerning the ongoing political vendetta against me and the conspiracy of the Department of Justice of Canada and the Augsburg public prosecutor to your attention.

1. On August 31, 1999 I was arrested in Canada based on allegations as set out in the request ("Request") of the German public prosecutor's office in Augsburg dated August 27, 1999 and later recorded in the record of the case which allegations were fabricated by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with the support of the Canadian Department of Justice. Officials from the Department of Justice traveled twice to Germany to meet with the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg.
2. In my previous correspondence I informed you about all the details regarding my extradition case and tried to explain to you why I can only turn to you. May I remind you that my law suit against The Attorney General of Canada (Federal Action No.: A-334-07) is finally about to go to trial in spite of all the attempts by The Attorney General of Canada to delay the proceedings and avoid the case from ever getting to trial.
3. aa
4. The allegations of the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg against me and others were summarized in the request as follows: "...as further enquiries have revealed that the accused person is also strongly suspected of having committed

- a. bribery and
 - b. aiding and abetting criminal breach of trust (fraud)
 - c. as well as other cases of tax evasion in the years 1994 and 1995.”
5. Details of these allegations to this date have not been clarified but we have learned the following:
- a. That I bribed Germany’s Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls;
 - b. That I aided and abetted a fraud on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to have been committed by Thyssen AG managers Juergen Massmann and Winfrid Haastert (“Fuchs Tank Deal”);
 - c. That I aided and abetted a fraud on Thyssen AG committed by Juergen Massmann and Winfrid Haastert in Germany; and
 - d. That I committed tax fraud (not just cases of tax evasion).
6. In a letter dated July 9, 2007 from the Swiss Department of Justice addressed to the German Department of Justice you will find confirmation that the above allegations against me and others cannot be unsubstantiated.
7. Therefore, the Swiss Government has requested that all previous judgments rendered by the German Courts based on documents falsely obtained from the Swiss Government should be revoked.
8. The highest court in Germany (Bundesgerichtshof) held that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was not defrauded because the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia voluntarily paid a higher price and advised Thyssen AG that the overpayment had to be transferred to several companies based in Panama. The German tax authorities are fully aware of all the details of these transactions (letter from the Swiss Department of Finance, Mr. Waldberger dated Nov. 26, 2002).
9. The Regional Court of Augsburg confirmed in its judgment regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls that he was not bribed.
10. The Swiss Department of Justice also confirmed in its letter dated July 9, 2007 (“Swiss Letter”) and in previous letters that I did not commit any tax fraud and that the German tax authorities were fully informed of the details of the Fuchs Tank Deal including the change of documents at the request of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (letter from Edward Greespan to The Honourable Robert Nicholson dated September 20, 2007).

I can assure you that if this matter were brought before a Canadian jury it would be decided in one day and the nightmare would come to an end.

All the above facts and much more are well known to the Canadian Department of Justice and the to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada ("Minister of Justice") had the Minister taken the time to read the documentation sent to you and others.

From the Swiss Letter the Minister of Justice would have come to realize that the German authorities withheld information in the case against Juergen Massmann and Winfrid Haastert.

The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf dated January 7, 2003 confirmed that neither a tax fraud nor any other offences were committed and that the complaints of the Swiss Department of Justice regarding the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg were valid and justified.

In effect the handling of my extradition case by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg shows a total disregard for due process since German Government officials withheld evidence, mislead the Bundesgerichtshof and mislead on numerous occasions the Swiss Department of Justice.

Furthermore, the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg mislead the Government of Canada and in particular the Canadian Courts with the support of the Department of Justice and by continuing to insist its right to base my case on documentation it cannot use Germany is violating international law which not only has brought to a halt all co-operation between the Swiss and the Germans but by condoning and participating in the actions of the German authorities by sending me to Germany will draw Canada into this breach of international law.

What is the reason that you refused to call a public inquiry into this affair which I requested since June 2006 and instead, so it appears to me, continued the previous Government's attempts to conceal the biggest justice scandal in Canadian history.

On top of this your Minister of Justice undertook steps that in effect were an attempt to get me out of the country in the fastest thinkable way. What is the urgency? There is no time constraint on my extradition since the German Government in passed a Lex Schreiber. There is only one reason for this haste to remove me, a key witness, from Canada so that I cannot bring to light the wrongs committed by the Governments of Germany and Canada.

This stands in direct juxtaposition to your election commitment to clean up our Government institutions!

Have you forgotten about your commitment to up hold the public trust?


Since the issuance of the Request in 1999 and the compilation of "the record of the case" the German authorities have refused to amend the Request and continue the allegations set out in the record of the case in spite of all the facts that have come to be known since it the information was initially drawn up by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with supporting documentation and information from Government of Canada officials and have been confirmed by the following parties:

1. The Swiss Department of Justice;
2. The Swiss Department of Revenue and Taxes;
3. The Bundesgerichtshof (Germany's highest court);

4. Judgement rendered by the Regional Court of Augsburg regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls; and
5. The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf.

None of the above seems to have been properly considered by the Minister of Justice or you and I can only urge you to restore fundamental justice to and maintain the public trust in the Department of Justice, the RCMP and the office of the Prime Minister.





KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE: 613.478.7330
FACSIMILE: 613.748.9697
SCHREIBERBARBEL@AOL.COM

PRIVATE
VIA COURIER AND FAX (without enclosures)

November 20, 2007

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper, P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Political Justice Scandal
Abuse of Public Trust
Germany's Breach of International Law

Dear Prime Minister,

On September 26, 2007 I sent by courier to you a letter with several attachments (Tab 1). Since I did not receive an answer to this letter, which was delivered to your attention and received by "Merenger" on your behalf on September 28, 2007 (Tab 2), and as I learned from your public statements that you did not receive said letter which also included my previous letter to you dated March 29, 2007 (Tab 3), I enclose herewith a copy of my September 26, 2007 letter with attachments and additional attachments concerning the latest developments in my case including information of an illegal kidnapping attempt on October 4, 2007 (Tab 4).

Today I would like to bring some facts concerning the ongoing political vendetta against me and the conspiracy of the Department of Justice of Canada and the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg, Germany to your attention.

1. On August 31, 1999 I was arrested in Canada based on allegations as set out in the request ("Request") of the German public prosecutor's office in Augsburg dated August 27, 1999 (Tab 5) and later recorded in the record of the case (Tab 6) which allegations were fabricated by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with the support of the Canadian Department of Justice. Officials from the Department of Justice traveled twice to Germany to meet with the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg.
2. In my previous correspondence I informed you about all the details regarding my extradition case and tried to explain to you why I can only turn to you. May I remind

you that my law suit against The Attorney General of Canada (Federal Action No.: A-334-07) is finally about to go to trial in spite of all the attempts by The Attorney General of Canada to delay the proceedings and prevent the case from ever getting to trial.

3. The allegations of the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg against me and others were summarized in the Request as follows:

"...as further enquiries have revealed that the accused person is also strongly suspected of having committed

- a. bribery and
- b. aiding and abetting criminal breach of trust [fraud]
- c. as well as other cases of tax evasion in the years 1994 and 1995."

4. Details of these allegations to this date have not been clarified but we have learned the following:

- a. That I allegedly bribed Germany's Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls;
- b. That I allegedly aided and abetted a fraud on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to have been committed by Thyssen AG managers Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert ("Fuchs Tank Deal");
- c. That I allegedly aided and abetted a fraud on Thyssen AG committed by Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert in Germany; and
- d. That I allegedly committed tax fraud [not just "cases of tax evasion"].

5. In a letter dated July 9, 2007 from the Swiss Department of Justice addressed to the German Department of Justice ("Swiss Letter") (Tab 6) you will find confirmation that the above allegations against me and others cannot be unsubstantiated.

6. Therefore, the Swiss Government has requested that all previous judgments rendered by the German Courts based on documents falsely obtained from the Swiss Government should be revoked.

7. The highest court in Germany ("Bundesgerichtshof") held that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was not defrauded because the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia voluntarily paid a higher price and advised Thyssen AG that the overpayment had to be transferred to several companies based in Panama (Tab 7).

8. The management of Thyssen AG could not defraud Thyssen AG, because the overpayment did not belong to Thyssen AG.

9. The German tax authorities are fully aware of all the details of these transactions (Tab 8).
10. The Regional Court of Augsburg confirmed in its judgment regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls that he was not bribed (Tab 9).
11. The Swiss Department of Justice also confirmed in the Swiss Letter and in previous letters that I did not commit any tax fraud and that the German tax authorities were fully informed of the details of the Fuchs Tank Deal including the change of documents at the request of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (Tab 10).

I can assure you that if this matter were brought before a Canadian jury it would be decided in one day in my favour and the nightmare would come to an end.

All the above facts and much more are well known to the Canadian Department of Justice and also to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada ("Minister of Justice") had the Minister taken the time to read the documentation sent to you and others.

From the Swiss Letter the Minister of Justice would have come to realize that the German authorities withheld information in the case against Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert.

The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf [responsible for the prosecution of the Fuchs Tank Deal] dated January 7, 2003 (Tab 11) confirmed that neither a tax fraud nor any other offences were committed and that the complaints of the Swiss Department of Justice regarding the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg were valid and justified.

In effect the handling of my extradition case by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg shows a total disregard for due process since German Government officials withheld evidence, misled the Bundesgerichtshof and misled on numerous occasions the Swiss Department of Justice.

Furthermore, the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg misled the Government of Canada and in particular the Canadian Courts with the support of the Department of Justice and by continuing to insist that it is entitled to base my case on documentation it cannot use Germany is violating international law which not only has brought to a halt all co-operation between Switzerland and Germany but by condoning and participating in the actions of the German authorities by sending me to Germany will draw Canada into this breach of international law.

What is the reason that you refused to call a public inquiry into this affair which I requested since June 2006 and instead, so it appears to me, continued the previous Government's attempts to conceal the biggest "political justice scandal" in the history of Canada.

On top of this your Minister of Justice undertook steps that in effect were an attempt to get me out of the country in the fastest thinkable way. What is the urgency?

Since the German Government passed the *Lex Schreiber* (Tab 12), there is no time constraint on my extradition.

Since the Canadian Government reformed the *Extradition Act* in 1999, judges were supposed to decide whether there is "dual criminality and sufficient evidence for the extradition request" and the Minister of Justice was to decide "whether to surrender the person to the requesting state, including the responsibility to determine matters arising from the foreign law or the state of political/human rights affairs in the requesting state". But this has not happened in my case. On the contrary the Courts have refused to address the lack of "dual criminality" and lack of "sufficient of evidence" (Tab 13), and the Minister of Justice has refused to challenge not just the breach of international law by the German Government but also the political nature of the proceedings commenced against me in Germany (Tab 14).

There is only one reason for this haste to remove me, a key witness, from Canada so that I cannot bring to light the wrongs committed by the Government of Germany and the Government of Canada respectively.

This stands in direct juxtaposition to your election commitment to clean up our Government institutions!

Have you forgotten about your commitment to up hold the public trust?


Since the issuance of the Request in 1999 and the compilation of "the record of the case" the German authorities have refused to amend the Request and continue the allegations set out in "the record of the case" in spite of all the facts that have come to be known since the information was initially drawn up by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with supporting documentation and information from Government of Canada officials.

The "facts of the case" have been confirmed by the following parties:

1. The Swiss Department of Justice (Tab 15),;
2. The Swiss Department of Revenue and Taxes (Tab 16),;
3. The Bundesgerichtshof (Germany's highest court) (Tab 17);
4. Judgment rendered by the Regional Court of Augsburg regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls (Tab 18),; and
5. The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf (Tab 19),.

None of the above seems to have been properly considered by the Minister of Justice or you and I can only urge you to restore fundamental justice to and maintain the public trust in the Department of Justice, the RCMP and the Office of the Prime Minister.

Yours sincerely,



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE: 613.478.7330
FACSIMILE: 613.748.9697
SCHREIBERBARBEL@AOL.COM

PRIVATE

VIA COURIER AND FAX (without enclosures)

November 20, 2007

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper, P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Political Justice Scandal
Abuse of Public Trust
Germany's Breach of International Law

Dear Prime Minister,

On September 26, 2007 I sent by courier to you a letter with several attachments (Tab 1). Since I did not receive an answer to this letter, which was delivered to your attention and received by "Merenger" on your behalf on September 28, 2007 (Tab 2), and as I learned from your public statements that you did not receive said letter which also included my previous letter to you dated March 29, 2007 (Tab 3); I enclose herewith a copy of my September 26, 2007 letter with attachments and additional attachments concerning the latest developments in my case including information of an illegal kidnapping attempt on October 4, 2007 (Tab 4).

Today I would like to bring some facts concerning the ongoing political vendetta against me and the conspiracy of the Department of Justice of Canada and the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg, Germany to your attention.

1. On August 31, 1999 I was arrested in Canada based on allegations as set out in the request ("Request") of the German public prosecutor's office in Augsburg dated August 27, 1999 (Tab 5) and later recorded in "the record of the case" (Tab 6) which allegations were fabricated by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with the support of the Canadian Department of Justice. Officials from the Department of Justice traveled twice to Germany to meet with the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg.
2. In my previous correspondence I informed you about all the details regarding my extradition case and tried to explain to you why I can only turn to you. May I remind you that my law suit against The Attorney General of Canada (Federal Action No.: A-334-07) is finally about to go to trial in spite of all the attempts by The Attorney General of Canada to delay the proceedings and prevent the case from ever getting to trial.
3. The allegations of the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg against me and others were summarized in the Request as follows:

“...as further enquiries have revealed that the accused person is also strongly suspected of having committed

- a. bribery and
 - b. aiding and abetting criminal breach of trust [fraud]
 - c. as well as other cases of tax evasion in the years 1994 and 1995.”
4. Details of these allegations to this date have not been clarified but we have learned the following:
- a. That I allegedly bribed Germany’s Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls;
 - b. That I allegedly aided and abetted a fraud on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to have been committed by Thyssen AG managers Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert (“Fuchs Tank Deal”);
 - c. That I allegedly aided and abetted a fraud on Thyssen AG committed by Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert in Germany; and
 - d. That I allegedly committed tax fraud [not just “cases of tax evasion”].

-
5. In a letter dated July 9, 2007 from the Swiss Department of Justice addressed to the German Department of Justice ("Swiss Letter") (Tab 7) you will find confirmation that:
 - a. the above allegations against me and others cannot be substantiated, and
 - b. therefore, the Swiss Government has requested that all previous judgments rendered by the German Courts based on documents falsely obtained from the Swiss Government should be revoked (Tab 8).
 6. The highest court in Germany ("Bundesgerichtshof") held that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was not defrauded because the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia voluntarily paid a higher price and advised Thyssen AG that the overpayment had to be transferred to several companies based in Panama (Tab 9).
 7. The management of Thyssen AG could not defraud Thyssen AG, because the overpayment did not belong to Thyssen AG.
 8. The German tax authorities are fully aware of all the details of these transactions (Tab 10).
 9. The Regional Court of Augsburg confirmed in its judgment regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls that he was not bribed (Tab 11).

10. The Swiss Department of Justice also confirmed in the Swiss Letter and in previous letters that I did not commit any tax fraud and that the German tax authorities were fully informed of the details of the Fuchs Tank Deal including the change of documents at the request of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (Tab 12).

I can assure you that if this matter were brought before a Canadian jury it would be decided in one day in my favour and the nightmare would come to an end.

All the above facts and much more are well known to the Canadian Department of Justice and also to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada ("Minister of Justice") had the Minister taken the time to read the documentation sent to you and others.

From the Swiss Letter the Minister of Justice would have come to realize that the German authorities withheld information in the case against Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert.

The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf [responsible for the prosecution of the Fuchs Tank Deal] dated January 7, 2003 (Tab 13) confirmed that neither a tax fraud nor any other offences were committed and that the complaints of the Swiss Department of Justice regarding the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg were valid and justified.

In effect the handling of my extradition case by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg shows a total disregard for due process since German Government officials withheld evidence, misled the Bundesgerichtshof and misled on numerous occasions the Swiss Department of Justice.

Furthermore, the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg misled the Government of Canada and in particular the Canadian Courts with the support of the Department of Justice and by continuing to insist that it is entitled to base my case on documentation it cannot use Germany is violating international law which not only has brought to a halt all co-operation between Switzerland and Germany but by condoning and participating in the actions of the German authorities by sending me to Germany this will draw Canada into Germany's breach of international law.

What is the reason that you refused to call a public inquiry into this affair which I requested since June 2006 and instead, so it appears to me, continued the previous Government's attempts to conceal the biggest "political justice scandal" in the history of Canada.

On top of this your Minister of Justice undertook steps that in effect were an attempt to get me out of the country in the fastest thinkable way. What is the urgency?

Since the German Government passed the *Lex Schreiber* (Tab 14), there is no time constraint on my extradition.

Since the Canadian Government reformed the *Extradition Act* in 1999, judges were supposed to decide whether there is "dual criminality and sufficient evidence for the extradition request" and

the Minister of Justice was to decide "whether to surrender the person to the requesting state, including the responsibility to determine matters arising from the foreign law or the state of political/human rights affairs in the requesting state". But this has not happened in my case.

On the contrary the Courts have refused to address the lack of "dual criminality" and lack of "sufficient of evidence" (Tab 15), and the Minister of Justice refused to challenge the breach of international law by the German Government and the political nature of the proceedings commenced against me in Germany and instead decided that "in accordance with the discretion given to me, ...I do not consider it appropriate to accept your late submissions"(Tab 16).

There is only one reason for this haste to remove me, a key witness, from Canada so that I cannot bring to light the wrongs committed by the Government of Germany and the Government of Canada respectively.

This stands in direct juxtaposition to your election commitment to clean up our Government institutions!

Have you forgotten about your commitment to up hold the public trust?

Since the issuance of the Request in 1999 and the compilation of "the record of the case" the German authorities have refused to amend the Request and continue the allegations set out in "the record of the case" in spite of all the facts that have come to be known since the information was initially drawn up by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with supporting

documentation and information from Government of Canada officials.

The "facts of the case" have been confirmed by the following parties:

1. The Swiss Department of Justice (Tabs 7 and 8),;
2. The Swiss Department of Revenue and Taxes (Tab 17);
3. The Bundesgerichtshof (Germany's highest court) (Tab 9);
4. Judgment rendered by the Regional Court of Augsburg regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls (Tab 11),; and
5. The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf (Tab 13),.

None of the above seems to have been properly considered by the Minister of Justice or you and I can only urge you to restore fundamental justice to and maintain the public trust in the Department of Justice, the RCMP and the Office of the Prime Minister.

Finally, you must not forget to ask why the Minister of Justice has not invoked Article 5 of the *Treaty between Canada and The Federal Republic of Germany Concerning Extradition* ("Treaty") (Tab 18)?

In particular Article 5, Section 1 states that "Neither of the Contracting Parties shall be bound to extradite its own nationals" and if the Minister of Justice were to refuse Germany's request for extradition only on the ground that I am a citizen of Canada, then and only if Germany asks


Canada, would Canada be obligated to "take all possible measures in accordance with its own law to prosecute the person claimed" at the expense of Germany.

You will also note that to date Germany has never extradited to Canada a citizen of Germany and certainly will always invoke Article 5 of the Treaty to refuse to do so. Why should Canada treat its nationals/citizens any differently?

Surely, this would be a more desirable manner to proceed in order to bring closure to this entire affair!

Yours sincerely,

Enclosures:



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE: 613.478.7330
FACSIMILE: 613.748.9697
SCHREIBERBARBEL@AOL.COM

VIA COURIER AND FAX

November 20, 2007

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper, P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Political Justice Scandal Abuse of Public Trust Germany's Breach of International Law

Dear Prime Minister,

On September 26, 2007 I sent by courier to you a letter with several attachments. Since I did not receive an answer to this letter, which you received on September 28, 2007, and as I learned from your public statements that you did not receive said letter which also included my previous letter to you dated March 29, 2007, I enclose herewith a copy of my September 26, 2007 letter with attachments and additional attachments concerning the latest developments in my case including information of an illegal kidnapping attempt on October 4, 2007.

Today I would like to bring some facts concerning the ongoing political vendetta against me and the conspiracy of the Department of Justice of Canada and the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg, Germany to your attention.

1. On August 31, 1999 I was arrested in Canada based on allegations as set out in the request ("Request") of the German public prosecutor's office in Augsburg dated August 27, 1999 and later recorded in the record of the case which allegations were fabricated by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with the support of the Canadian Department of Justice. Officials from the Department of Justice traveled twice to Germany to meet with the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg.

2. In my previous correspondence I informed you about all the details regarding my extradition case and tried to explain to you why I can only turn to you. May I remind you that my law suit against The Attorney General of Canada (Federal Action No.: A-334-07) is finally about to go to trial in spite of all the attempts by The Attorney General of Canada to delay the proceedings and avoid the case from ever getting to trial.
3. The allegations of the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg against me and others were summarized in the request as follows: "...as further enquiries have revealed that the accused person is also strongly suspected of having committed
 - a. bribery and
 - b. aiding and abetting criminal breach of trust (fraud)
 - c. as well as other cases of tax evasion in the years 1994 and 1995."
4. Details of these allegations to this date have not been clarified but we have learned the following:
 - a. That I bribed Germany's Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls;
 - b. That I aided and abetted a fraud on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to have been committed by Thyssen AG managers Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert ("Fuchs Tank Deal");
 - c. That I aided and abetted a fraud on Thyssen AG committed by Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert in Germany; and
 - d. That I committed tax fraud (not just cases of tax evasion).
5. In a letter dated July 9, 2007 from the Swiss Department of Justice addressed to the German Department of Justice you will find confirmation that the above allegations against me and others cannot be unsubstantiated.
6. Therefore, the Swiss Government has requested that all previous judgments rendered by the German Courts based on documents falsely obtained from the Swiss Government should be revoked.
7. The highest court in Germany (Bundesgerichtshof) held that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was not defrauded because the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia voluntarily paid a higher price and advised Thyssen AG that the overpayment had to be transferred to several companies based in Panama. The German tax authorities are fully aware of all the details of these transactions (letter from the Swiss Department of Finance, Mr. Waldberger dated Nov. 26, 2002).

8. The Regional Court of Augsburg confirmed in its judgment regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls that he was not bribed.
9. The Swiss Department of Justice also confirmed in its letter dated July 9, 2007 ("Swiss Letter") and in previous letters that I did not commit any tax fraud and that the German tax authorities were fully informed of the details of the Fuchs Tank Deal including the change of documents at the request of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (letter from Edward Greespan to The Honourable Robert Nicholson dated September 20, 2007).

I can assure you that if this matter were brought before a Canadian jury it would be decided in one day and the nightmare would come to an end.

All the above facts and much more are well known to the Canadian Department of Justice and the to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada ("Minister of Justice") had the Minister taken the time to read the documentation sent to you and others.

From the Swiss Letter the Minister of Justice would have come to realize that the German authorities withheld information in the case against Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert.

The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf dated January 7, 2003 confirmed that neither a tax fraud nor any other offences were committed and that the complaints of the Swiss Department of Justice regarding the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg were valid and justified.

In effect the handling of my extradition case by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg shows a total disregard for due process since German Government officials withheld evidence, mislead the Bundesgerichtshof and mislead on numerous occasions the Swiss Department of Justice.

Furthermore, the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg mislead the Government of Canada and in particular the Canadian Courts with the support of the Department of Justice and by continuing to insist its right to base my case on documentation it cannot use Germany is violating international law which not only has brought to a halt all co-operation between the Swiss and the Germans but by condoning and participating in the actions of the German authorities by sending me to Germany will draw Canada into this breach of international law.

What is the reason that you refused to call a public inquiry into this affair which I requested since June 2006 and instead, so it appears to me, continued the previous Government's attempts to conceal the biggest justice scandal in Canadian history.

On top of this your Minister of Justice undertook steps that in effect were an attempt to get me out of the country in the fastest thinkable way. What is the urgency? There is no time constraint on my extradition since the German Government in passed a Lex Schreiber. There is only one reason for this haste to remove me, a key witness, from Canada so that I cannot

bring to light the wrongs committed by the Governments of Germany and Canada.

This stands in direct juxtaposition to your election commitment to clean up our Government institutions!

Have you forgotten about your commitment to up hold the public trust?


Since the issuance of the Request in 1999 and the compilation of "the record of the case" the German authorities have refused to amend the Request and continue the allegations set out in the record of the case in spite of all the facts that have come to be known since if the information was initially drawn up by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with supporting documentation and information from Government of Canada officials and have been confirmed by the following parties:

1. The Swiss Department of Justice;
2. The Swiss Department of Revenue and Taxes;
3. The Bundesgerichtshof (Germany's highest court);
4. Judgment rendered by the Regional Court of Augsburg regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls; and
5. The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf.

None of the above seems to have been properly considered by the Minister of Justice or you and I can only urge you to restore fundamental justice to and maintain the public trust in the Department of Justice, the RCMP and the office of the Prime Minister.

Yours sincerely,





KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE: 613.478.7330
FACSIMILE: 613.748.9697
SCHREIBERBARBEL@AOL.COM

VIA COURIER AND FAX (without enclosures)

November 22, 2007

PERSONAL

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper, P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Political Justice Scandal
Abuse of Public Trust
Germany's Breach of International Law

Dear Prime Minister,

On September 26, 2007 I sent by courier to you a letter with several attachments (Tab 1). Since I did not receive an answer to this letter, which was delivered to your attention and received by "Merenger" on your behalf on September 28, 2007 (Tab 2), and as I learned from your public statements that you did not receive said letter which also included my previous letters to you dated March 29, 2007 and June 16, 2006 (Tab 3), I enclose herewith a copy of my September 26, 2007 letter with attachments and additional attachments concerning the latest developments in my case including information of an illegal kidnapping attempt on October 4, 2007 (Tab 4).

Today I would like to bring some facts concerning the ongoing political vendetta against me and the conspiracy of the Department of Justice of Canada and the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg, Germany to your attention.

1. On August 31, 1999 I was arrested in Canada based on allegations as set out in the request ("Request") of the German public prosecutor's office in Augsburg dated August 27, 1999 (Tab 5) and later recorded in "the record of the case" (Tab 6) which allegations were fabricated by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with the

support of the Canadian Department of Justice. Officials from the Department of Justice traveled twice to Germany to meet with the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg.

2. In my previous correspondence I informed you about all the details regarding my extradition case and tried to explain to you why I can only turn to you. May I remind you that my law suit against The Attorney General of Canada (Federal Action No.: A-334-07) is finally about to go to trial in spite of all the attempts by The Attorney General of Canada to delay the proceedings and prevent the case from ever getting to trial.
3. The allegations of the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg against me and others were summarized in the Request as follows:

“...as further enquiries have revealed that the accused person is also strongly suspected of having committed

 - a. bribery and
 - b. aiding and abetting criminal breach of trust [fraud]
 - c. as well as other cases of tax evasion in the years 1994 and 1995.”
4. Details of these allegations to this date have not been clarified but we have learned the following:
 - a. That I allegedly bribed Germany's Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls;
 - b. That I allegedly aided and abetted a fraud on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to have been committed by Thyssen AG managers Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert (“Fuchs Tank Deal”);
 - c. That I allegedly aided and abetted a fraud on Thyssen AG committed by Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert in Germany; and
 - d. That I allegedly committed tax fraud [not just “cases of tax evasion”].
5. In a letter dated July 9, 2007 from the Swiss Department of Justice addressed to the German Department of Justice (“Swiss Letter”) (Tab 7) you will find confirmation that:
 - a. the above allegations against me and others cannot be substantiated, and
 - b. therefore, the Swiss Government has requested that all previous judgments rendered by the German Courts based on documents falsely obtained from the Swiss Government should be revoked (Tab 8).

6. The highest court in Germany ("Bundesgerichtshof") held that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was not defrauded because the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia voluntarily paid a higher price and advised Thyssen AG that the overpayment had to be transferred to several companies based in Panama (Tab 9).
7. The management of Thyssen AG could not defraud Thyssen AG, because the overpayment did not belong to Thyssen AG.
8. The German tax authorities are fully aware of all the details of these transactions (Tab 10).
9. The Regional Court of Augsburg confirmed in its judgment regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls that he could not be bribed (Tab 11).
10. The Swiss Department of Justice also confirmed in the Swiss Letter and in previous letters that I did not commit any tax fraud and that the German tax authorities were fully informed of the details of the Fuchs Tank Deal including the change of documents at the request of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (Tab 12).

I can assure you that if this matter were brought before a Canadian jury it would be decided in one day in my favour and the nightmare would come to an end.

All the above facts and much more are well known to the Canadian Department of Justice and also to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada ("Minister of Justice") had the Minister taken the time to read the documentation sent to you and others.

From the Swiss Letter the Minister of Justice would have come to realize that the German authorities withheld information in the case against Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert.

The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf [responsible for the prosecution of the Fuchs Tank Deal] dated January 7, 2003 (Tab 13) confirmed that neither a tax fraud nor any other offences were committed and that the complaints of the Swiss Department of Justice regarding the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg were valid and justified.

In effect the handling of my extradition case by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg shows a total disregard for due process since German Government officials withheld evidence, misled the Bundesgerichtshof and misled on numerous occasions the Swiss Department of Justice.

Furthermore, the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg misled the Government of Canada and in particular the Canadian Courts with the support of the Department of Justice and by continuing to insist that it is entitled to base my case on documentation it cannot use Germany is violating international law which not only has brought to a halt all co-operation between Switzerland and Germany but by condoning and participating in the actions of the German authorities by sending me to Germany this will draw Canada into Germany's breach of international law.

What is the reason that you refused to call a public inquiry into this affair which I requested since June 2006 and instead, so it appears to me, continued the previous Government's attempts to conceal the biggest "political justice scandal" in the history of Canada.

On top of this your Minister of Justice undertook steps that in effect were an attempt to get me out of the country in the fastest thinkable way. What is the urgency?

Since the German Government passed the *Lex Schreiber* (Tab 14), there is no time constraint on my extradition.

Since the Canadian Government reformed the *Extradition Act* in 1999, judges were supposed to decide whether there is "dual criminality and sufficient evidence for the extradition request" and the Minister of Justice was to decide "whether to surrender the person to the requesting state, including the responsibility to determine matters arising from the foreign law or the state of political/human rights affairs in the requesting state". But this has not happened in my case.

On the contrary the Courts have declined to address the lack of "dual criminality" and lack of "sufficiency of evidence" (Tab 15) and the Minister of Justice refused to challenge the breach of international law by the German Government and the political nature of the proceedings commenced against me in Germany and instead decided that "in accordance with the discretion given to me, ...I do not consider it appropriate to accept your late submissions"(Tab 16).

There is only one reason for this haste to remove me, a key witness, from Canada so that I cannot bring to light the wrongs committed by the Government of Germany and the Government of Canada respectively.

This stands in direct juxtaposition to your election commitment to clean up our Government institutions!

Have you forgotten about your commitment to uphold the public trust?

Since the issuance of the Request in 1999 and the compilation of "the record of the case" the German authorities have refused to amend the Request and continue the allegations set out in "the record of the case" in spite of all the facts that have come to be known since the information was initially drawn up by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with supporting documentation and information from Government of Canada officials.

The "facts of the case" have been confirmed by the following parties:

1. The Swiss Department of Justice (Tabs 7 and 8);
2. The Swiss Department of Revenue and Taxes;
3. The Bundesgerichtshof (Germany's highest court) (Tab 9);
4. Judgment rendered by the Regional Court of Augsburg regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls (Tab 11); and

5. The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf (Tab 13).

None of the above seems to have been properly considered by the Minister of Justice or you and I can only urge you to restore fundamental justice to and maintain the public trust in the Department of Justice, the RCMP and the Office of the Prime Minister.

Finally, you must not forget to ask why the Minister of Justice has not invoked Article 5 of the *Treaty between Canada and The Federal Republic of Germany Concerning Extradition* ("Treaty") (Tab 17)?


In particular Article 5, Section 1 states that "Neither of the Contracting Parties shall be bound to extradite its own nationals" and if the Minister of Justice were to refuse Germany's request for extradition only on the ground that I am a citizen of Canada, then and only if Germany asks Canada, would Canada be obligated to "take all possible measures in accordance with its own law to prosecute the person claimed".

You will also note that to date Germany has never extradited to Canada a citizen of Germany and certainly will always invoke Article 5 of the Treaty to refuse to do so. Why should Canada treat its nationals/citizens any differently? I would welcome the opportunity to be prosecuted in Canada under Canadian law. Let Germany supply to Canada the files, documents and exhibits relating to the offences that Germany alleges I have committed and let Canadian Courts decide whether I am guilty.

Surely, this would be a more desirable manner to proceed in order to bring closure to this entire matter and have fundamental justice restored!

Yours sincerely,

Enclosures:



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE: 613.478.7330
FACSIMILE: 613.748.9697
SCHREIBERBARBEL@AOL.COM

VIA COURIER AND FAX (without enclosures)

November 22, 2007

PERSONAL

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper, P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Political Justice Scandal
Abuse of Public Trust
Germany's Breach of International Law

Dear Prime Minister,

On September 26, 2007 I sent by courier to you a letter with several attachments. Since I did not receive an answer to this letter, which was delivered to your attention and received by "Merenger" on your behalf on September 28, 2007, and as I learned from your public statements that you did not receive said letter which also included my previous letter to you dated March 29, 2007 and June 16, 2006, I enclose herewith a copy of my September 26, 2007 letter with attachments and additional attachments concerning the latest developments in my case including information of an illegal kidnapping attempt on October 4, 2007.

Today I would like to bring some facts concerning the ongoing political vendetta against me and the conspiracy of the Department of Justice of Canada and the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg, Germany to your attention.

1. On August 31, 1999 I was arrested in Canada based on allegations as set out in the request ("Request") of the German public prosecutor's office in Augsburg dated August 27, 1999 and later recorded in "the record of the case" which allegations were fabricated by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with the support of the

Canadian Department of Justice. Officials from the Department of Justice traveled twice to Germany to meet with the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg.

2. In my previous correspondence I informed you about all the details regarding my extradition case and tried to explain to you why I can only turn to you. May I remind you that my law suit against The Attorney General of Canada (Federal Action No.: A-334-07) is finally about to go to trial in spite of all the attempts by The Attorney General of Canada to delay the proceedings and prevent the case from ever getting to trial.
3. The allegations of the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg against me and others were summarized in the Request as follows:

“...as further enquiries have revealed that the accused person is also strongly suspected of having committed

 - a. bribery and
 - b. aiding and abetting criminal breach of trust [fraud]
 - c. as well as other cases of tax evasion in the years 1994 and 1995.”
4. Details of these allegations to this date have not been clarified but we have learned the following:
 - a. That I allegedly bribed Germany's Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls;
 - b. That I allegedly aided and abetted a fraud on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to have been committed by Thyssen AG managers Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert (“Fuchs Tank Deal”);
 - c. That I allegedly aided and abetted a fraud on Thyssen AG committed by Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert in Germany; and
 - d. That I allegedly committed tax fraud [not just “cases of tax evasion”].
5. In a letter dated July 9, 2007 from the Swiss Department of Justice addressed to the German Department of Justice (“Swiss Letter”) you will find confirmation that:
 - a. the above allegations against me and others cannot be substantiated, and
 - b. therefore, the Swiss Government has requested that all previous judgments rendered by the German Courts based on documents falsely obtained from the Swiss Government should be revoked.

6. The highest court in Germany ("Bundesgerichtshof") held that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was not defrauded because the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia voluntarily paid a higher price and advised Thyssen AG that the overpayment had to be transferred to several companies based in Panama.
7. The management of Thyssen AG could not defraud Thyssen AG, because the overpayment did not belong to Thyssen AG.
8. The German tax authorities are fully aware of all the details of these transactions.
9. The Regional Court of Augsburg confirmed in its judgment regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls that he could not be bribed.
10. The Swiss Department of Justice also confirmed in the Swiss Letter and in previous letters that I did not commit any tax fraud and that the German tax authorities were fully informed of the details of the Fuchs Tank Deal including the change of documents at the request of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

I can assure you that if this matter were brought before a Canadian jury it would be decided in one day in my favour and the nightmare would come to an end.

All the above facts and much more are well known to the Canadian Department of Justice and also to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada ("Minister of Justice") had the Minister taken the time to read the documentation sent to you and others.

From the Swiss Letter the Minister of Justice would have come to realize that the German authorities withheld information in the case against Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert.

The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf [responsible for the prosecution of the Fuchs Tank Deal] dated January 7, 2003 confirmed that neither a tax fraud nor any other offences were committed and that the complaints of the Swiss Department of Justice regarding the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg were valid and justified.

In effect the handling of my extradition case by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg shows a total disregard for due process since German Government officials withheld evidence, mislead the Bundesgerichtshof and mislead on numerous occasions the Swiss Department of Justice.

Furthermore, the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg mislead the Government of Canada and in particular the Canadian Courts with the support of the Department of Justice and by continuing to insist that it is entitled to base my case on documentation it cannot use Germany is violating international law which not only has brought to a halt all co-operation between Switzerland and Germany but by condoning and participating in the actions of the German authorities by sending me to Germany this will draw Canada into Germany's breach of international law.

What is the reason that you refused to call a public inquiry into this affair which I requested since June 2006 and instead, so it appears to me, continued the previous Government's attempts to conceal the biggest "political justice scandal" in the history of Canada.

On top of this your Minister of Justice undertook steps that in effect were an attempt to get me out of the country in the fastest thinkable way. What is the urgency?

Since the German Government passed the *Lex Schreiber*, there is no time constraint on my extradition.

Since the Canadian Government reformed the *Extradition Act* in 1999, judges were supposed to decide whether there is "dual criminality and sufficient evidence for the extradition request" and the Minister of Justice was to decide "whether to surrender the person to the requesting state, including the responsibility to determine matters arising from the foreign law or the state of political/human rights affairs in the requesting state". But this has not happened in my case.

On the contrary the Courts have declined to address the lack of "dual criminality" and lack of "sufficiency of evidence" and the Minister of Justice refused to challenge the breach of international law by the German Government and the political nature of the proceedings commenced against me in Germany and instead decided that "in accordance with the discretion given to me, ...I do not consider it appropriate to accept your late submissions".

There is only one reason for this haste to remove me, a key witness, from Canada so that I cannot bring to light the wrongs committed by the Government of Germany and the Government of Canada respectively.

This stands in direct juxtaposition to your election commitment to clean up our Government institutions!

Have you forgotten about your commitment to uphold the public trust?

Since the issuance of the Request in 1999 and the compilation of "the record of the case" the German authorities have refused to amend the Request and continue the allegations set out in "the record of the case" in spite of all the facts that have come to be known since the information was initially drawn up by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with supporting documentation and information from Government of Canada officials.

The "facts of the case" have been confirmed by the following parties:

1. The Swiss Department of Justice;
2. The Swiss Department of Revenue and Taxes;
3. The Bundesgerichtshof (Germany's highest court);
4. Judgment rendered by the Regional Court of Augsburg regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls; and
5. The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf.

None of the above seems to have been properly considered by the Minister of Justice or you and I can only urge you to restore fundamental justice to and maintain the public trust in the Department of Justice, the RCMP and the Office of the Prime Minister.


Finally, you must not forget to ask why the Minister of Justice has not invoked Article 5 of the *Treaty between Canada and The Federal Republic of Germany Concerning Extradition* ("Treaty")?

In particular Article 5, Section 1 states that "Neither of the Contracting Parties shall be bound to extradite its own nationals" and if the Minister of Justice were to refuse Germany's request for extradition only on the ground that I am a citizen of Canada, then and only if Germany asks Canada, would Canada be obligated to "take all possible measures in accordance with its own law to prosecute the person claimed".

You will also note that to date Germany has never extradited to Canada a citizen of Germany and certainly will always invoke Article 5 of the Treaty to refuse to do so. Why should Canada treat its nationals/citizens any differently? I would welcome the opportunity to be prosecuted in Canada under Canadian law. Let Germany supply to Canada the files, documents and exhibits relating to the offences that Germany alleges I have committed and let Canadian Courts decide whether I am guilty.

Surely, this would be a more desirable manner to proceed in order to bring closure to this entire matter and have fundamental justice restored!

Yours sincerely,



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE: 613.478.7330
FACSIMILE: 613.748.9697
SCHREIBERBARBEL@AOL.COM

VIA COURIER AND FAX (without enclosures)

November 22, 2007

PERSONAL

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper, P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Political Justice Scandal
Abuse of Public Trust
Germany's Breach of International Law

Dear Prime Minister,

On September 26, 2007 I sent by courier to you a letter with several attachments. Since I did not receive an answer to this letter, which was delivered to your attention and received by "Merenger" on your behalf on September 28, 2007, and as I learned from your public statements that you did not receive said letter which also included my previous letter to you dated March 29, 2007 and June 16, 2006, I enclose herewith a copy of my September 26, 2007 letter with attachments and additional attachments concerning the latest developments in my case including information of an illegal kidnapping attempt on October 4, 2007.

Today I would like to bring some facts concerning the ongoing political vendetta against me and the conspiracy of the Department of Justice of Canada and the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg, Germany to your attention.

1. On August 31, 1999 I was arrested in Canada based on allegations as set out in the request ("Request") of the German public prosecutor's office in Augsburg dated August 27, 1999 and later recorded in "the record of the case" which allegations were fabricated by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with the support of the

Canadian Department of Justice. Officials from the Department of Justice traveled twice to Germany to meet with the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg.

2. In my previous correspondence I informed you about all the details regarding my extradition case and tried to explain to you why I can only turn to you. May I remind you that my law suit against The Attorney General of Canada (Federal Action No.: A-334-07) is finally about to go to trial in spite of all the attempts by The Attorney General of Canada to delay the proceedings and prevent the case from ever getting to trial.
3. The allegations of the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg against me and others were summarized in the Request as follows:

“...as further enquiries have revealed that the accused person is also strongly suspected of having committed

 - a. bribery and
 - b. aiding and abetting criminal breach of trust [fraud]
 - c. as well as other cases of tax evasion in the years 1994 and 1995.”
4. Details of these allegations to this date have not been clarified but we have learned the following:
 - a. That I allegedly bribed Germany's Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls;
 - b. That I allegedly aided and abetted a fraud on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to have been committed by Thyssen AG managers Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert (“Fuchs Tank Deal”);
 - c. That I allegedly aided and abetted a fraud on Thyssen AG committed by Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert in Germany; and
 - d. That I allegedly committed tax fraud [not just “cases of tax evasion”].
5. In a letter dated July 9, 2007 from the Swiss Department of Justice addressed to the German Department of Justice (“Swiss Letter”) you will find confirmation that:
 - a. the above allegations against me and others cannot be substantiated, and
 - b. therefore, the Swiss Government has requested that all previous judgments rendered by the German Courts based on documents falsely obtained from the Swiss Government should be revoked.
6. The highest court in Germany (“Bundesgerichtshof”) held that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was not defrauded because the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia voluntarily paid a

higher price and advised Thyssen AG that the overpayment had to be transferred to several companies based in Panama.

7. The management of Thyssen AG could not defraud Thyssen AG, because the overpayment did not belong to Thyssen AG.
8. The German tax authorities are fully aware of all the details of these transactions.
9. The Regional Court of Augsburg confirmed in its judgment regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls that he could not be bribed.
10. The Swiss Department of Justice also confirmed in the Swiss Letter and in previous letters that I did not commit any tax fraud and that the German tax authorities were fully informed of the details of the Fuchs Tank Deal including the change of documents at the request of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

I can assure you that if this matter were brought before a Canadian jury it would be decided in one day in my favour and the nightmare would come to an end.

All the above facts and much more are well known to the Canadian Department of Justice and also to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada ("Minister of Justice") had the Minister taken the time to read the documentation sent to you and others.

From the Swiss Letter the Minister of Justice would have come to realize that the German authorities withheld information in the case against Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert.

The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf [responsible for the prosecution of the Fuchs Tank Deal] dated January 7, 2003 confirmed that neither a tax fraud nor any other offences were committed and that the complaints of the Swiss Department of Justice regarding the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg were valid and justified.

In effect the handling of my extradition case by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg shows a total disregard for due process since German Government officials withheld evidence, mislead the Bundesgerichtshof and mislead on numerous occasions the Swiss Department of Justice.

Furthermore, the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg mislead the Government of Canada and in particular the Canadian Courts with the support of the Department of Justice and by continuing to insist that it is entitled to base my case on documentation it cannot use Germany is violating international law which not only has brought to a halt all co-operation between Switzerland and Germany but by condoning and participating in the actions of the German authorities by sending me to Germany this will draw Canada into Germany's breach of international law.

What is the reason that you refused to call a public inquiry into this affair which I requested since June 2006 and instead, so it appears to me; continued the previous Government's attempts to conceal the biggest "political justice scandal" in the history of Canada.

On top of this your Minister of Justice undertook steps that in effect were an attempt to get me out of the country in the fastest thinkable way. What is the urgency?

Since the German Government passed the *Lex Schreiber*, there is no time constraint on my extradition.

Since the Canadian Government reformed the *Extradition Act* in 1999, judges were supposed to decide whether there is "dual criminality and sufficient evidence for the extradition request" and the Minister of Justice was to decide "whether to surrender the person to the requesting state, including the responsibility to determine matters arising from the foreign law or the state of political/human rights affairs in the requesting state". But this has not happened in my case.

On the contrary the Courts have declined to address the lack of "dual criminality" and lack of "sufficiency of evidence" and the Minister of Justice refused to challenge the breach of international law by the German Government and the political nature of the proceedings commenced against me in Germany and instead decided that "in accordance with the discretion given to me, ...I do not consider it appropriate to accept your late submissions".

There is only one reason for this haste to remove me, a key witness, from Canada so that I cannot bring to light the wrongs committed by the Government of Germany and the Government of Canada respectively.

This stands in direct juxtaposition to your election commitment to clean up our Government institutions!

Have you forgotten about your commitment to uphold the public trust?

Since the issuance of the Request in 1999 and the compilation of "the record of the case" the German authorities have refused to amend the Request and continue the allegations set out in "the record of the case" in spite of all the facts that have come to be known since the information was initially drawn up by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with supporting documentation and information from Government of Canada officials.

The "facts of the case" have been confirmed by the following parties:

1. The Swiss Department of Justice;
2. The Swiss Department of Revenue and Taxes;
3. The Bundesgerichtshof (Germany's highest court);
4. Judgment rendered by the Regional Court of Augsburg regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls; and
5. The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf.

None of the above seems to have been properly considered by the Minister of Justice or you and I can only urge you to restore fundamental justice to and maintain the public trust in the Department of Justice, the RCMP and the Office of the Prime Minister.

Finally, you must not forget to ask why the Minister of Justice has not invoked Article 5 of the *Treaty between Canada and The Federal Republic of Germany Concerning Extradition* ("Treaty")?

In particular Article 5, Section 1 states that "Neither of the Contracting Parties shall be bound to extradite its own nationals" and if the Minister of Justice were to refuse Germany's request for extradition only on the ground that I am a citizen of Canada, then and only if Germany asks Canada, would Canada be obligated to "take all possible measures in accordance with its own law to prosecute the person claimed".

You will also note that to date Germany has never extradited to Canada a citizen of Germany and certainly will always invoke Article 5 of the Treaty to refuse to do so. Why should Canada treat its nationals/citizens any differently? I would welcome the opportunity to be prosecuted in Canada under Canadian law. Let Germany supply to Canada the files, documents and exhibits relating to the offences that Germany alleges I have committed and let Canadian Courts decide whether I am guilty.

Surely, this would be a more desirable manner to proceed in order to bring closure to this entire matter and have fundamental justice restored!

Yours sincerely,

Enclosures:

Letter dated November 21, 2007

Letter dated September 26, 2007

Courier receipt dated September 28, 2007

Letter dated March 29, 2007

The Star Article dated November 11, 2007

The Request dated August 27, 1999

The Record of the Case dated September 27, 2006

Letter dated July 9, 2007

Letter dated July 9, 2007

Decision of the Bundesgerichtshof dated January 10, 2007

Letter from the Swiss Department of Finance, Mr. Waldberger dated Nov. 26, 2002

Decision of the Regional Court of Augsburg dated September 1, 2005

Letter from Edward Greenspan to The Honourable Robert Nicholson dated September 20, 2007


Memorandum by Mr. Goette dated January 7, 2003

Lex Schreiber dated August 4, 2005

Court of Appeal decision dated November 15, 2007

Letter dated October 11, 2007

Extradition Treaty dated July 11, 1977 as amended May 13, 2002



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE: 613.478.7330
FACSIMILE: 613.748.9697
SCHREIBERBARBEL@AOL.COM

VIA COURIER, FAX AND EMAIL

November 25, 2007

PERSONAL

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper, P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Political Justice Scandal
Abuse of Public Trust
Germany's Breach of International Law

Dear Prime Minister,

On September 26, 2007 I sent by courier to you a letter with several attachments (1). Since I did not receive an answer to this letter, which was delivered to your attention and received by "Merenger" on your behalf on September 28, 2007 (2), and as I learned from your public statements that you did not receive said letter which also included my previous letter to you dated March 29, 2007 with a copy of my letter to the Right Hon. Martin Brian Mulroney dated January 29, 2007 attached thereto (in which I reference Mr. Mulroney's request for a letter to support my case for his meeting on July 30, 2006 [with you]), I enclose herewith a copy of said September 26, 2007 letter with attachments and additional attachments concerning the latest developments in my case including information of an illegal kidnapping attempt on October 4, 2007 (3).

Today I would like to bring some facts concerning the ongoing political vendetta against me and the conspiracy of the Department of Justice of Canada and the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg, Germany to your attention.

1. On August 31, 1999 I was arrested in Canada based on allegations as set out in the request ("Request") (4) of the German public prosecutor's office in Augsburg dated August 27, 1999 and later recorded in "the record of the case" which allegations were fabricated by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with the support of the Canadian Department of Justice. Officials from the Department of Justice traveled

twice to Germany to meet with the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg. A "Case Report" (5) which is in your possession was prepared by Karlheinz Schreiber and is dated September, 2006.

2. In my previous correspondence I informed you about all the details regarding my extradition case and tried to explain to you why I can only turn to you. May I remind you that my law suit against The Attorney General of Canada (Federal Action No.: A-334-07) is finally about to go to trial in spite of all the attempts by The Attorney General of Canada to delay the proceedings and prevent the case from ever getting to trial.
3. The allegations of the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg against me and others were summarized in the Request as follows:

“...as further enquiries have revealed that the accused person is also strongly suspected of having committed

 - a. bribery and
 - b. aiding and abetting criminal breach of trust [fraud]
 - c. as well as other cases of tax evasion in the years 1994 and 1995.”
4. Details of these allegations to this date have not been clarified but we have learned the following:
 - a. That I allegedly bribed Germany's Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls;
 - b. That I allegedly aided and abetted a fraud on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to have been committed by Thyssen AG managers Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert (“Fuchs Tank Deal”);
 - c. That I allegedly aided and abetted a fraud on Thyssen AG committed by Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert in Germany; and
 - d. That I allegedly committed tax fraud [not just “cases of tax evasion”].
5. In a letter dated July 9, 2007 from the Swiss Department of Justice addressed to the German Department of Justice (“Swiss Letter”) (6) you will find confirmation that:
 - a. the above allegations against me and others cannot be substantiated, and
 - b. therefore, the Swiss Government has requested that all previous judgments rendered by the German Courts based on documents falsely obtained from the Swiss Government should be revoked (7).
6. The highest court in Germany (“Bundesgerichtshof”) held that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was not defrauded because the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia voluntarily paid a

higher price and advised Thyssen AG that the overpayment had to be transferred to several companies based in Panama (8).

7. The management of Thyssen AG could not defraud Thyssen AG, because the overpayment did not belong to Thyssen AG.
8. The German tax authorities are fully aware of all the details of these transactions.
9. The Regional Court of Augsburg confirmed in its judgment regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls that he could not be bribed and was not bribed (9).
10. The Swiss Department of Justice also confirmed in the Swiss Letter and in previous letters that I did not commit any tax fraud and that the German tax authorities were fully informed of the details of the Fuchs Tank Deal including the change of documents at the request of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (10).

I can assure you that if this matter were brought before a Canadian jury it would be decided in one day in my favour and the nightmare would come to an end.

All the above facts and much more are well known to the Canadian Department of Justice and also to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada ("Minister of Justice") had the Minister taken the time to read the documentation sent to you and others.

From the Swiss Letter the Minister of Justice would have come to realize that the German authorities withheld information in the case against Juergen Massmann and Winfried Haastert.

The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf [responsible for the prosecution of the Fuchs Tank Deal] dated January 7, 2003 confirmed that neither a tax fraud nor any other offences were committed and that the complaints of the Swiss Department of Justice regarding the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg were valid and justified (11).

In effect the handling of my extradition case by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg shows a total disregard for due process since German Government officials withheld evidence, mislead the Bundesgerichtshof and mislead on numerous occasions the Swiss Department of Justice.

Furthermore, the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg mislead the Government of Canada and in particular the Canadian Courts with the support of the Department of Justice and by continuing to insist that it is entitled to base my case on documentation it cannot use Germany is violating international law which not only has brought to a halt all co-operation between Switzerland and Germany but by condoning and participating in the actions of the German authorities by sending me to Germany this will draw Canada into Germany's breach of international law.

What is the reason that you refused to call a public inquiry into this affair which I requested since June 2006 and instead, so it appears to me, continued the previous Government's attempts to conceal the biggest "political justice scandal" in the history of Canada.

On top of this your Minister of Justice undertook steps that in effect were an attempt to get me out of the country in the fastest thinkable way. What is the urgency?

Since the German Government passed the *Lex Schreiber*, there is no time constraint on my extradition (12).

Since the Canadian Government reformed the *Extradition Act* in 1999, judges were supposed to decide whether there is "dual criminality and sufficient evidence for the extradition request" and the Minister of Justice was to decide "whether to surrender the person to the requesting state, including the responsibility to determine matters arising from the foreign law or the state of political/human rights affairs in the requesting state". But this has not happened in my case.

On the contrary the Courts have declined to address the lack of "dual criminality" and lack of "sufficiency of evidence" and the Minister of Justice refused to challenge the breach of international law by the German Government and the political nature of the proceedings commenced against me in Germany and instead decided that "in accordance with the discretion given to me, ...I do not consider it appropriate to accept your late submissions" (13).

There is only one reason for this haste to remove me, a key witness, from Canada so that I cannot bring to light the wrongs committed by the Government of Germany and the Government of Canada respectively.

This stands in direct juxtaposition to your election commitment to clean up our Government institutions!

Have you forgotten about your commitment to uphold the public trust?

Since the issuance of the Request in 1999 and the compilation of "the record of the case" the German authorities have refused to amend the Request and continue the allegations set out in "the record of the case" in spite of all the facts that have come to be known since the information was initially drawn up by the public prosecutor's office in Augsburg with supporting documentation and information from Government of Canada officials.

The "facts of the case" have been confirmed by the following parties:

1. The Swiss Department of Justice;
2. The Swiss Department of Revenue and Taxes;
3. The Bundesgerichtshof (Germany's highest court);
4. Judgment rendered by the Regional Court of Augsburg regarding the Deputy Minister of Holger Pfahls; and
5. The Memorandum by Mr. Goette of the public prosecutor's office in Duesseldorf.

None of the above seems to have been properly considered by the Minister of Justice or you and I can only urge you to restore fundamental justice to and maintain the public trust in the Department of Justice, the RCMP and the Office of the Prime Minister.

Finally, you must not forget to ask why the Minister of Justice has not invoked Article 5 of the *Treaty between Canada and The Federal Republic of Germany Concerning Extradition* ("Treaty") (14)?

In particular Article 5, Section 1 states that "Neither of the Contracting Parties shall be bound to extradite its own nationals" and if the Minister of Justice were to refuse Germany's request for extradition only on the ground that I am a citizen of Canada, then and only if Germany asks Canada, would Canada be obligated to "take all possible measures in accordance with its own law to prosecute the person claimed".

You will also note that to date Germany has never extradited to Canada a citizen of Germany and certainly will always invoke Article 5 of the Treaty to refuse to do so. Why should Canada treat its nationals/citizens any differently? I would welcome the opportunity to be prosecuted in Canada under Canadian law. Let Germany supply to Canada the files, documents and exhibits relating to the offences that Germany alleges I have committed and let Canadian Courts decide whether I am guilty.

Surely, this would be a more desirable manner to proceed in order to bring closure to this entire matter and have fundamental justice restored!

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Schreiber', written in a cursive style.

Enclosures:

1. Letter dated November 21, 2007
2. Courier receipt dated September 28, 2007
3. Toronto Star Article dated November 11, 2007
4. Bundeskriminalamt Request dated August 27, 1999
5. Mr. Schreiber's Case Report dated September 27, 2006
6. Letter dated July 9, 2007
7. Letter dated July 9, 2007
8. Bundesgerichtshof Decision dated January 10, 2007
9. Regional Court of Augsburg Decision dated September 1, 2005
10. Mr. Greenspan's Letter to The Honourable Robert Nicholson dated September 20, 2007
11. Mr. Goette Memorandum dated January 7, 2003
12. *Lex Schreiber* dated August 4, 2005
13. Letter dated October 11, 2007
14. *Extradition Treaty* dated July 11, 1977, as amended May 13, 2002



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE: 613 748 7330
FACSIMILE: 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

Personal /

Fax: 613 941 6900

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister.

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, January 10, 2008

**Subject: "Political Justice Scandal" & the "Airbus" Affair
Public Inquiry:
Questions, Canadians need answered**

Dear Prime Minister,

I am taking the liberty to send you a list of questions which must be answered for Canadians.

The \$ 300.000,00 paid to the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney is not the main issue. The questions are where the millions went, why they went there and why the government now tries to silence me on these and other critical issues!

Yours sincerely


Karl Heinz Schreiber

cc. The Hon. Stephane Dion
The Hon. Jack Layton
Mr. Gilles Duceppe

8 pages

The Public inquiry into Mulroney – Schreiber dealings,

The “Political Justice Scandal” and the “Airbus” Affair

A

The important questions concerning the years of the Conservative Governments September 17, 1984 - June 24, 1993 and The Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, Prime Minister of Canada:

1. Did PM Brian Mulroney actively support the lobbying business of GCI Government Consultants International [Frank D. Moores, Gary Ouellet, Gerry Doucet]?
2. Did PM Brian Mulroney actively support the lobbying business of Fred Doucet or his company?
3. Was the support of PM Brian Mulroney related to the business affairs of Ward Air, Air Canada, Canadian Airlines, Airbus Industries, Thyssen Bear- Head - Industrie LTD, MBB Messerschmitt - Boelkow - Blohm GmbH ?
4. Did PM Brian Mulroney actively support business activities of Karlheinz Schreiber?
5. Did PM Brian Mulroney support the activities of President Francois Mitterrand and Minister-President Franz Josef Strauss to sell Airbus aircrafts in North America, helping Airbus-Industries to survive and to bring business to Bombardier Inc and Canadair Ltd.?
6. Did PM Brian Mulroney receive any compensation for his support in Canada or abroad?
7. What was the role of Karlheinz Schreiber concerning the business affairs?
8. What was exactly the agreement PM Brian Mulroney and Karlheinz Schreiber reached on June 23, 1993 at Harrington Lake?
9. Why did PM Brian Mulroney cancel the Thyssen Bear Head project which he wanted so badly to fulfill his promises to bring jobs to the people in Nova Scotia, not telling Karlheinz Schreiber, the chairman of Thyssen Bear - Head -Industries

[A decision which may be responsible for the death of many Canadian soldiers]?

10. Why did PM Brian Mulroney quietly cancel the Thyssen Bear - Head project after Thyssen Industries had paid a success - fee of Can. \$ 4 million to GCI. Why did he breach the agreement the Canadian Government had signed with Thyssen Bear- Head -- Industries?
11. Why did PM Brian Mulroney tell Karlheinz Schreiber on June 23, 1993 that he believes that Kim Campbell will win the next election, which will put him in an excellent position to bring the Thyssen Bear-Head project to Montreal east.?

The Public inquiry into Mulroney – Schreiber dealings,
The “Political Justice Scandal” and the “Airbus” Affair

B

The important questions concerning the years of the Liberal Governments November 11, 1993 – February 6, 2006 and the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, Frank D. Moores, Gary Ouellet, Karlheinz Schreiber.

1. On November 2, 1993 Mr. Allan Rock conducted a private investigation into Brian Mulroney’s affairs. Why?*

2. On December 2, 1993 Allan Rock, since November 4, 1993 the then Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, sent a letter to Herb Gray, the then Solicitor General of Canada, and reported about information received from two journalists about the contracting practices of the previous Conservative Government that, if true, suggests serious wrongdoing and possible criminal offences.*

[*Book, William Kaplan, “Presumed Guilty”]

With no evidence, the Hon. Allan Rock, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, initiated the vendetta against Brian Mulroney, Frank Moores, Gary Ouellet and Karlheinz Schreiber. The Hon. Allan Rock also initiated the biggest “Political Justice Scandal” with remarkable international implications in Canadian history. Why?

3. In October 1994 Stevie Cameron, a confidential RCMP Informant, Code A2948 and complainant published her book: “On the Take”: Crime, Corruption and Greed in the Mulroney Years. The RCMP and the Department of Justice started an investigation. On May 24, 1995 a prosecutor in Augsburg Germany confirmed that the Canadian Embassy in Germany informed the prosecutors in Augsburg about their investigation in Switzerland and Liechtenstein and initiated an investigation into the business affairs of Karlheinz Schreiber. Why?

4. Kimberley Prost, Senior Counsel Director International Assistance Group [IAG] of the Department of Justice, RCMP officer Fraser Fiegenwald and other officials of the IAG drafted the Letter of Request and sent it on September 29, 1995 to Switzerland, knowing that they had no evidence in hands. Why?

5. On November 20, 1995 Brian Mulroney filed a \$ 50 Million lawsuit against the Canadian Government. On January 5, 1997 the Government of Canada, the RCMP and others entered into a settlement agreement with Brian Mulroney. Why?

6. RCMP Staff Sergeant Fraser Fiegenwald spoke to Stevie Cameron about the investigation violating his RCMP oath, lost his job with the RCMP and forced the government into the settlement agreement with Brian Mulroney. Why? Stevie Cameron was a confidential RCMP informant and entitled to entire confidential information.

7. It looks like all the parties involved for different reasons, were happy that the lawsuit came to an end before more witnesses would testify under oath. Why?

8. The only terrible problem left with the "Airbus" affair was Karlheinz Schreiber. Why? On January 9, 1997 the Hon. Allan Rock, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, and Philip Murray, Commissioner of the RCMP, sent a letter of apology to Karlheinz Schreiber. On January 20, 1997 Karlheinz Schreiber responded to the letter of apology and wrote: I recognize your apology but this matter will only be properly clarified in a courtroom. This is my understanding." Karlheinz Schreiber filed a \$ 35 Million law suit against the Attorney General and the Canadian Government. Since 1997 the IAG of the Justice Department of Canada and the RCMP try every possibility to keep the lawsuit away from a courtroom. How?

Through all kind of delay tactics, legal proceedings and formalities.

Through the attempt of a foreign undercover agent to involve Karlheinz Schreiber in criminal activities to find a reason to put Karlheinz Schreiber in a jail.

Through the cooperation of German prosecutors, who ask for the extradition of Karlheinz Schreiber, based on a record of the case, which was fabricated in Germany with the involvement of officials of the Department of Justice of Canada, who traveled several times to Germany.

Through the involvement of Canadian Ministers of Justice who lied to the judges in Canadian Courts.

The reason is to avoid that the truth comes to light through testimonies under oath and Canadians would learn about all the illegal activities of the RCMP and the Department of Justice of Canada. Why?

The Public inquiry into Mulroney – Schreiber dealings,
The “Political Justice Scandal” and the “Airbus” Affair

C

The important questions concerning the time of the Conservative Government since February 6, 2006 and The Right Honourable Stephen Joseph Harper, Prime Minister of Canada.

1. For several years prominent Conservative Politicians including Prime Minister Stephen Harper and Brian Mulroney demanded a Public Inquiry into the “Airbus Affair” and the vendetta against The Right Honourable Brian Mulroney. It was the same vendetta against Karlheinz Schreiber.

On November 30, 2005 Stephen Harper P.C., M.P. asked the Canadians to vote for a Conservative Government to clean up Ottawa and stated: “Only a Conservative Government can get on with the job of governing, to deliver accountable government that Canadians deserve.” “The Liberal party’s 12 years in power have been 12 years of consecutive Scandal.”

It was not unreasonable for Karlheinz Schreiber to expect that Prime Minister Stephen Harper, with the assistance of his advisor, The Right Hon. Brian Mulroney, would clean up Ottawa after all the scandalous years of the Liberal governments.

Since June 16, 2006 Karlheinz Schreiber sent letters to Prime Minister Stephen Harper and Brian Mulroney and asked for a Public inquiry into the “Political Justice Scandal” and the “Airbus” Affair. The Globe & Mail and the CBC reported the demand for a public inquiry from Karlheinz Schreiber. Karlheinz Schreiber never received an answer. [letter June 16, 2006 attached] Why ?

If the statements of Prime Minister Harper and Brian Mulroney are true, they should be happy for the gift of a political scandal to win a majority Conservative government during the next election. Experienced politicians around the world are aware of the enormous power of the political scandals.

What is wrong with the Conservative Government of The Right Honourable Stephen Harper?

There is only one possible answer: The Prime Minister is scared of potential revelations and Brian Mulroney is concerned about his business interests and potential revelations. It was all about money at that time and it is the same today. The inquiry will confirm it.

C

2. Was the correspondence of Karlheinz Schreiber to Prime Minister Stephen Harper deliberately shielded from the Prime Minister and his key Ministers?
3. If the correspondence was shielded the question will arise: Who is responsible? The Prime Minister's staff? Members of his Cabinet? The Right Hon. Brian Mulroney through his friends in the government? Prime Minister Stephen Harper?
4. What does Prime Minister Stephen Harper know about the business activities of Fred Doucet, Brian Mulroney and the government?
5. Does the Prime Minister know that lobbyist Fred Doucet was registered to DND, ACOA, Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Industry Canada, Public Works, Transport Canada, The Treasury Board and individual MPs? Where Fred Doucet is, there is Brian Mulroney, does the Prime Minister not know this?
Will the Prime Minister agree that the set up is perfect? Nothing has changed. It is still the same old story: The Money of the Canadian taxpayers!
6. Does Prime Minister Stephen Harper have an idea how much money Karlheinz Schreiber brought to Canada with the intention to create jobs and conduct business on the request of the Canadian Governments?
7. Prime Minister Stephen Harper confirmed on January 22, 2007 and on December 18, 2007 the receipt of correspondence from Karlheinz Schreiber and advised the forwarding of a copy of his letters and enclosures to the Honourable Robert Nicholson, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, for his information.
Did the Prime Minister receive a reply or a report from the Minister concerning the contents of the letters?
8. Did the Honourable Robert Nicholson, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, seek advice or guidance from the Honourable Stephen Harper, Prime Minister of Canada, before he misled the Canadian public and the Canadian Courts by telling the Judges that he has an obligation under the Treaty concerning extradition with Germany to extradite the Canadian national Karlheinz Schreiber?

The Treaty Article V Extradition of Nationals

(1) Neither of the Contracting Parties shall be bound to extradite its own nationals

(3) If a request for extradition is refused only on the ground that the person claimed is a national of the requested state, that state shall, if asked to do so by the requesting state, take all possible measures in accordance with its own law to prosecute the person claimed.

9. Did the Honourable Robert Nicholson, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, inform the Honourable Stephen Harper, Prime Minister of Canada, that Germany will never extradite its nationals but will prosecute them in accordance with its own law, if asked to do so by the Canadian Minister of Justice?

What is the reason that the Canadian Minister of Justice is not prepared to grant the same proceedings to the Canadian national Karlheinz Schreiber ?

Is the minister of Justice and the Conservative Government scared of potential revelations in a Canadian Court, when Canadians get to know what happened in the case of Karlheinz Schreiber, when Canadians recognize the criminal activities, committed by officials of the Department of Justice and the RCMP in cooperation with German prosecutors, when Canadians realize how the Canadian Courts were misled?

10. Does the Prime Minister believe that Canadian nationals should enjoy a Citizenship with lower values than the nationals of other civilized countries, governed by a treaty without reciprocity? Does the Prime Minister believe that Canadians know this? Did the Minister of Justice discuss this matter with the Prime Minister?

11. Did the Honourable Robert Nicholson, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada consult with the Right Honourable Stephen Harper, Prime Minister of Canada, before he refused on October 3, 2007 to read the letter dated July 9, 2007 of the Department of Justice of Switzerland to the German Department of Justice which was sent to him by Edward Greenspan on September 20, 2007?

In the letter the authorities of the Department of Justice of Switzerland demand that the German Supreme Court (BGH) Judgments related to the Schreiber affair be revoked and that the German authorities confirm that no documents obtained from Switzerland will be used as evidence in the case of Karlheinz Schreiber. Through this demand the record of the case of the extradition request concerning Karlheinz Schreiber was converted to an useless pamphlet with the contend of tainted evidence.

In addition to the demands of the Department of Justice of Switzerland, Prosecutor Goette from Duesseldorf, who had a lead function in the case, confirmed that neither an offence of tax fraud nor other criminal offences related to the Saudi Fox Tank case exist.

How can the Minister of Justice of Canada ignore the demands of the Minister of Justice of Switzerland and violate international law? Would the Minister of Justice of Canada do this without the authorization from Prime Minister Stephen Harper? No.

What is so important that the Prime Minister is involved in such an action and the attempt to extradite Karlheinz Schreiber as soon as possible? Is it Brian Mulroney?

C

12. On October 3, 2007 Karlheinz Schreiber surrendered into custody at the Toronto West Detention Centre at approximately 5:45 p.m. due to the fact that he was advised that a decision on the leave application would be ready to be released on Thursday, October 4, 2007 at 9:45 a.m.

On October 4, 2007 at approximately 8:15, he was approached in his jail cell by two jail guards and told that he needed to get dressed in order to see the physician and secondly he was told that he needed to be ready to go to court. He was told that the RCMP were coming to the jail to pick him up and take him to court on new charges. He was not told which court and he was not told what charges. Karlheinz Schreiber knew immediately that he was facing another set up from the RCMP and the Department of Justice because he had never any charges against him, how could he have new charges. Later during the day he learned that the RCMP had already informed the authorities of the jail around 6:00 a.m. that they would pick him up in the morning. Why ?

Without any doubt, it was a kidnapping attempt organized by the Department of Justice and the RCMP. Why?

Who is putting that kind of pressure to the Honourable Robert Nicholson, the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, that he gets involved in criminal activities?

Is it The Right Honourable Stephen Harper, Prime Minister of Canada, or The Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, or both?

This will become a very interesting question for the public inquiry!

13. During the next couple of days the Department of Justice tried everything in a truly obsessive manner to get Karlheinz Schreiber's application for judicial review quashed by the Court of Appeal for Ontario. Why?

14. Can Canadians still believe that Canada is a country with fundamental justice?



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE: 613 748 7330
FACSIMILE: 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

Personal / For his eyes only

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, February 7, 2008

**Subject: "Political Justice Scandal" & the "Airbus" Affair
Extradition of a Canadian National**

A case for the Courts, not for the Department of Justice

Dear Prime Minister,

Today I take the liberty to send you a copy of my letter February 3, 2008 to Mr. Paul Szabo, M.P. Chair, Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics for your information.

Since June 16, 2006 I explained to you in my letters why I can only turn to you. I provided to you a substantial amount of information and evidence concerning my case.

Did you never seek the advice from an independent Political - Law - Expert which you will not get from the IAG of the Department of Justice of Canada?

In my opinion an independent expert and advisor would ask you:

“Why don't you stay away from this case with your government and leave it with the Canadian Courts to do the clean up in front of the Canadian public in accordance with the treaty between Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany concerning extradition?”

You have no reason to get involved in an international scandal from the past.”


The Canadian government has no obligation under the Canadian / German Extradition Treaty to extradite a Canadian national.

The Canadian government has only one obligation based on the Extradition Treaty between Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany:

The Canadian government shall prosecute a Canadian national in accordance with Canadian law, if the German authorities asked the Canadian government to do so.
This is exactly how Germany is treating its nationals under the same treaty.
(See the documents attached)

In 1993 The Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, then the Prime Minister of Canada destroyed the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, you may kill it.

Yours sincerely



Katherine Schreiber

KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHON 613 748 7330
TELEFAX 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

Mr. Paul Szabo, M.P.
Chair, Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics
Confederation Building
House of Commons
Room 175
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6

PCO-	BCP-
Original:	36605-10
Copies:	_____
Ident:	72

Ottawa, February 3, 2008

Subject: Testimony, Dec.13. 2007 of the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney

National Post, Dec. 13. 2007: Mulroney says Schreiber credibility destroyed, no need for inquiry (document attached)

Dear Mr. Szabo:

Please accept the following as part of my testimony under oath in front of the Standing Committee on Access to Information and Ethics.

On December 14, 2007 the Globe & Mail published Poll Results:
Whose testimony to the Commons ethics do you find more credible?
Karlheinz Schreiber's 84% 23127 votes.
Brian Mulroney's 16% 4287 votes. (document attached)
An other Poll of the same day shows that 65% of the voters have no faith in the Canadian justice system.(document attached)

I very much believe this result is an obligation for me not to disappoint the confidence of the Canadian voters.

Since my attendance before the Committee is postponed, I take the liberty to send you a copy of the transcript of Mr. Mulroney's testimony which presents a remarkable

Attachment : File Separately. 7

competition to Baron Muenchhausen's Narrative of his Marvelous Travels and Campaigns in Russia. (document attached). The two gentlemen share the same initials: "B.M.", but Baron Muenchhausen did not face the risk of criminal charges related to his international travels and activities.

In the transcript of Mr .Mulroneys testimony are only the most potential lies highlighted in yellow color. I will deal with them during my next attendance before the Ethic Committee. The statements, highlighted in grey, carry illegal and criminal activities which may lead to criminal investigations in Canada and Germany.

I told the Committee why I have asked The Right Honourable Stephen Harper, Prime Minister of Canada and his Advisor, The Right Honourable Brian Mulroneys to call a public inquiry into the "Airbus" affair and the "Political Justice Scandal.

I was still waiting for some surprising answers related to these cases.

The desperate illegal and criminal efforts of the Honourable Robert Nicholson, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, with the backup of the Prime Minister, to shut me up and have me extradited as soon as possible must be based on other reasons than the payment of \$300.000.00 to Brian Mulroneys.
(Prof. Michael Byers: "Extraditing him now violates international law" article attached)

The constant support of the Prime Minister to protect his important advisor Brian Mulroneys and the refusal of the Minister of Justice to prosecute my case under Canadian law in accordance with the Canadian /German Extradition Treaty increased my suspicion.

Canada has no obligation to extradite a Canadian national to Germany.

Canada has only one obligation to prosecute a Canadian national in Canada

TREATY BETWEEN CANADA AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY
CONCERNING EXTRADITION

ARTICLE V

Extradition of Nationals

- (1) Neither of the Contracting Parties shall be bound to extradite its own nationals.
(3) If a request for extradition is refused only on the ground that the person claimed is a national of the requested state, that state shall, if asked to do so by the requesting state, take all possible measures in accordance with its own law to prosecute the person claimed etc.(treaty document attached)

Germany will never extradite its nationals (Document of German Basic Law attached)

I was proven right with my suspicion and my expectations on the first day of Brian Mulroney's appearance in front of the Committee.

During the testimony of Mr .Mulroney I learnt for the first time in my life that The Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, once Prime Minister of Canada, traveled 1993 /1994 to Communist countries like Russia and China to promote the sale of armored vehicles with the most sophisticated NIAG - NATO – Technology. (Document NIAG TH 495 attached)

Neither Thyssen Henschel in Germany nor Thyssen Bear Head Industries in Canada would have ever received export permissions from their Governments with very strict laws concerning Export Controls on Military Goods to export the TH 495 to countries with Communist Governments.

At that time The Honourable Andre Ouellet was the responsible Minister of Foreign Affairs. (letter Feb.1, 1994 attached).

I never hired Brian Mulroney to promote the TH 495 Armoured Fighting Vehicle internationally.

I hired Brian Mulroney on August 27, 1993 in Mirabel, as agreed upon on June 23, 1993 at Harrington Lake, to lobby the activities of Thyssen Bear Head Industries Inc. to establish production facilities for Thyssen Bear Head Industries Inc: at the City of Montreal East, or an other place if requested by the government.

On July 12, 1993 I ordered a Swiss Bank to open an account with the codename Britan (related to the Cape Breton Thyssen Bear Head Project) and to deposit Can \$. 500.000.00. Brian Mulroney received Can \$ 300.000.00.

Brian Mulroney did not report to me about his international activities during our meeting Dec.1994 in New York.

If he would have told me in New York, what I have learnt now from his testimony on Dec.13.2007, I would have been forced to report his illegal and criminal activities to the Canadian and German Government officials.

With his unauthorized activities Brian Mulroney put himself into the category of an illegal arms dealer and a crook.

The remaining question is: "What documents or drawings, he received when he was the Prime Minister of Canada, did he show, give or sell to the Communist Leaders?"

Imagine international Conservative leaders like Ronald Regan, George W. Bush senior, Margaret Thatcher, John Major and Joe Clark would have traveled to Russia and China after they had left office and would have offered the most sophisticated weapon systems of their countries to the Communist leaders?

What is the position of the Honourable Stephen Harper, Prime minister of Canada after he learnt about the testimony of his advisor Brian Mulroney? What did he know about the activities of Brian Mulroney and since when did he know?

Is this chapter of the "Political Justice Scandal", which came to light through the activities of the members of the Ethics Committee, one of the reasons why the Right Honourable Stephen Harper, Prime Minister of Canada and the Honourable Robert Nicholson Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada try everything to protect their friend, the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney by getting Karlheinz Schreiber out of the country, avoid a public inquiry and the Schreiber case in a Canadian court.

Is Brian Mulroney the reason why Prime Minister Stephen Harper can not afford to have me prosecuted in accordance with Canadian Law in a Canadian Court, like Germany is prosecuting its nationals in accordance with German law in a German court?


There seems to be the existence of a tremendous fear that Canadians could find out what happened to my family and me during the phase of a most painful experience when I followed the invitation of the Canadian Conservative government and Brian Mulroney to fulfill his election promises to create jobs, jobs, jobs, for the people in Nova Scotia and Canada. (Mulroney, Schreiber: "A tale of pals and cash" article attached, with Sinclair Stevens interview)

Unfortunately, the testimony given by Brian Mulroney before the committee proceedings is protected by the law of parliamentary privilege and can not be used in any other legal proceedings in Canada. Does the Law apply to legal proceedings in other countries?

Yours sincerely



Karlheinz Schreiber



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHONE 613 748 7330
TELEFAX 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

Personal

Fax: 613 941 6900

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, February 21, 2008

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal"

**The Honourable Robert Nicholson's, Minister of Justice and Attorney
General of Canada, involvement in illegal activities:**

**Attempt of kidnapping by the Department of Justice and the RCMP,
Misleading the Court of Appeal of Ontario by the Department of Justice,
Misleading the House of Commons,
Misleading the Canadian Public,
Misleading the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy
and Ethics,
Abuse of Public Office
Ignoring the Canadian Conflict of Interest Act**

Dear Prime Minister,

Thank you for your letter of December 18, 2007 and the acknowledgement of the receipt of my correspondence of November 25, 2007, which includes my letter of September 26, 2007.

I received a similar letter dated January 22, 2007 from you. In both letters you informed me that you had sent a copy of my correspondence to the Honourable Robert Nicholson, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada.

Unfortunately, to this day, I have not received any response from the Minister of Justice or from you concerning my serious complaints. This leads me to believe that you don't care about the illegal activities and the abuse of public office by the Department of Justice and the RCMP, violating fundamental justice of Canada.

The remaining main questions are:

Will The Honourable Stephen Harper, Prime Minister of Canada fulfill his election promise to clean up Ottawa and bring to light the biggest "Political Justice Scandal" with international implications in the history of Canada, Yes or No?

Will The Honourable Stephen Harper, Prime Minister of Canada assure that the illegal and criminal activities by the Department of Justice, the RCMP and German prosecutors in the case of Karlheinz Schreiber will be brought to light in a Canadian Court, Yes or No?

Will The Honourable Stephen Harper, Prime Minister of Canada assure that Canadian nationals enjoy equal rights with German nationals under the Treaty between Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany concerning Extradition, Yes or No?

Will The Honourable Stephen Harper, Prime Minister of Canada assure that the Canadian national Karlheinz Schreiber will be prosecuted under Canadian law in Canada, like Germany is prosecuting its nationals under German law in Germany in accordance with Article V (3) of the Treaty between Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany concerning extradition, Yes or No?
(First 3 pages are attached)

Since June 16, 2006, I have been explaining to you in my letters why I can only turn to you concerning the biggest "Political Justice Scandal" in the history of Canada. I provided to you a substantial amount of evidence so that you know or ought to know a lot of the details of my case. Until today, contrary to your election promises, you did not deal with the issues. How much longer do you want to be part of the cover up and prevent the truth from coming to light for Canadians? Don't you see what all has happened in the meantime?

You should not underestimate the judgment of Canadians, they all are immigrants, coming to Canada, some earlier, some later. **All Canadians have something in common; They care about the value of their citizenship!**

Not too long ago, the Canadian Government offered to people from around the world the possibility to obtain Canadian citizenship together with a Canadian passport if they would invest \$ 250.000,00 in Canada.

Millions of human beings brought millions of dollars to Canada, believing in the value of a Canadian citizenship, including the protection of the Canadian Law and the Canadian Government against subsequent unreasonable, politically motivated extradition requests of the countries they came from.

With the new Canadian Extradition Act in place since 1999 and the decision of the Canadian Government to extradite its nationals without reciprocity, or even a single affidavit from a foreign prosecutor included in a extradition request, the Canadian Government downgraded the value of the Canadian Citizenship contrary to most of the civilized countries around the world and defrauded the Canadian Citizens with respect to their payments of \$ 250.000.00 and the value of their Canadian citizenship.

With the new Extradition Act in place, Canadian politicians took most of the jurisdiction away from the Canadian Judges and put it in their own hands, to be arbitrarily used.

Imagine all the defrauded Canadian citizens will get organized, will ask the Canadian government to return their payments in total or impartial and will initiate a fraud investigation against the Canadian Government of the Right Honourable Stephen Harper, Prime Minister of Canada.

In his letter October 31, 2004, The Honourable Irwin Cotler, then the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, wrote to my Lawyer Edward Greenspan Q.C.:

"The civil proceedings are judicial in nature, while my decision on surrender is political. Completely different considerations apply in either circumstance.

In deciding the issue of surrender, I am performing a political role which involves public interest considerations, including a balancing of the interests of the person sought and Canada's international obligations."

RCMP, Interpol: 1 – The Canadian Central Authority:

“The Minister of Justice is the central authority for Canada under the Extradition Act and the Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act. The International Assistance Group (IAG), which is part of the Federal Prosecution Service at the Headquarters of the Department of Justice in Ottawa, was established to carry out the functions assigned to the Minister of Justice as central authority for Canada under the Extradition Act and the Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act and to provide advise to the Minister on his/her responsibilities under these statutes.” (Page 1 attached)

2.4. The Decision to Surrender

“The judicial phase of the extradition process is a determination only that the evidence is sufficient to warrant that the person be extradited. The ultimate decision with respect to whether the person will, in fact, be surrendered to the extradition partner is that of the Minister of Justice.” (Page 1 and pages 13 - 17 attached)

TREATY BETWEEN CANADA AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY CONCERNING EXTRADITION

ARTICLE V

Extradition of Nationals

- (1) Neither of the Contracting parties shall be bound to extradite its own nationals
- (2) The requested state shall suspend any proceedings for the naturalization of the person claimed until a decision on the request for extradition has been reached and, if extradition is granted, until his surrender.
- (3) If a request for extradition is refused only on the ground that the person claimed is a national of the requested state, that state shall, if asked to do so by the requesting state, take all possible measures in accordance with its own law to prosecute the person claimed. For this purpose, the files, documents and exhibits relating to the offence shall be transmitted to that state. All expenses incurred in connection with such prosecution shall be borne by the requested state. The requesting state shall be informed of the result of the prosecution.

You will agree with me that there is no obligation under the Canadian/German Extradition Treaty for the Minister of Justice of Canada to extradite a Canadian national to Germany.

The Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada have only one obligation based on the Extradition Treaty between Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany; to prosecute a Canadian national in accordance with Canadian law, if the German authorities asked him to do so.

The documents prove that the Canadian Courts are not involved in the decision to surrender a person and that the Honourable Robert Nicholson, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada is the only personnel responsible political authority in my case.

What do you believe, when you consider the facts, the reason might be that the Honourable Robert Nicholson, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada voluntarily tries to get my out of the country in the fastest possible way, involving himself in an attempt of kidnapping, misleading the Ontario Court of Appeal, misleading the members of the House of Commons, ignoring International Law related to the demands of the Department of Justice of Switzerland, ignoring the fact that prosecutors of Germany are misleading Canadian Courts, with the support of officials of the Department of Justice of Canada, and on top of all of this, *violating Section 4 and 6 of the Canadian Conflict and Interest Act, your own establishment?*

It is a historical event that the Canadian parliament had to seek a rare Speaker's Warrant to force the Canadian Minister of Justice to recognize the constitutional role of the Canadian parliament.

Nobody will ever believe that the Honourable Richard Nicholson, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, would have ever taken the risk to insult the Canadian parliament in such an unbelievable way with out your blessing and your own disrespect concerning the Canadian parliament.

You have received my correspondence of November 25, 2007, January 10, 2008 and February 7, 2008 including a substantial amount of documents and information.

I can assure you that I am not interested in becoming your Pen-Pal. It was your decision to become the Prime Minister of Canada with all the obligations of that position that leads me to write to you.

I am the person which was misused and betrayed by the Conservative Governments of Canada. I have enough of the lies and betrayals. I want the truth to come to light for all Canadians. I want that you fulfill your election promises. I want you to stop protecting your advisor Brian Mulroney and his business partner Fred Doucet.

Since the Minister of Justice is involved in illegal activities concerning my case and it is common knowledge that none of the Ministers of your government are allowed to make decisions or announcements without your approval, you are involved and you are the highest political authority in Canada I can turn to. When may I to receive an answer from you concerning my complaints and the letters I have sent to you since June 2006?

In my opinion Canada does not need a new warrior, a new sheriff or an emperor. Canada needs a Prime Minister who loves Canadian citizens, protects their interests, keeps his word and assures the respect of Fundamental Rights in Canada.


Will you launch an investigation into the case or would you prefer that I will take the initiative? Under the circumstances I have to hold you responsible.

Yours sincerely



Karlheinz Schreiber

PS: I would appreciate, if you would let me know, what the best address is I should send my correspondence for you. In the meantime I will try to make sure that you receive my mail trough facsimiles which gives me the hope that at least one person will see it and give it to you.



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

7 BITTERN COURT, ROCKCLIFFE PARK
OTTAWA, CANADA K1L 8K9

TELEPHON: 613 748 7330
FACSIMILE: 613 748 9697
schreiberbarbel@aol.com

Open Letter

Wednesday, September 24, 2008

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

**Subject: Two Prime Ministers – Harper and Mulroney-
Responsible for Manslaughter in Afghanistan**

**So far 98 dead and at least 200 wounded Canadian Soldiers:
Leaving 32 widows, 1 widower, 62 children without father and
3 pregnant wives behind.
How many more must die or suffer unnecessarily until 2011?**

Dear Prime Minister,

Your pledge to continue the deployment of Canadian soldiers in Afghanistan until 2011^{[1](see tabs/links)} and your refusal to respond to my letter addressed to you dated April 10, 2007: Subject: **“Bomb kills 6 Canadian soldiers in Afghanistan”** **“All LAV IIIs to be replaced within the year”**^[2] and the responses to my more recent letters which I received from your Deputy Secretary, Mr. Yvan Roy, lead me to write this open letter to you today. Mr. Roy confirmed that: “in view of the ongoing proceedings of a legal and parliamentary nature” in which I am involved, you had not reviewed my correspondence.^[3]

Mr. Roy’s letters were the first response I received to several letters I sent to you starting on June 16, 2006 and it seems that I was finally getting at least an acknowledgement that my letters were being looked, was triggered only as a result of the “public inquiry into the

former prime minister Brian Mulroney's business dealings with Karlheinz Schreiber", which you initially announced in the House of Commons on Friday November 9, 2007, then confirmed after receiving the report from the independent and impartial third party, University of Waterloo president David Johnston, on January 11, 2008, and now scheduled to begin at the earliest in February 2009.^[4]

No longer can I stand by and watch what conservative Governments initially under the leadership of Mr. Brian Mulroney and now under your leadership are doing to our Canadian soldiers. Its now time, I must bring to the attention of all Canadians the real impact of the Afghanistan mission on our Canadian soldiers.

Believing in your pledge in November 2005 and repeated during the February 2006 election campaign to "clean up government" and hold a public inquiry into the Airbus Affair^[5], as had been demanded by the conservatives when in opposition, I supported the conservative party and I believed in your leadership just as I believed in Mr. Jean Charest^[6] during his leadership campaign in 1993 to bring a fresh and clean start to Parliament Hill.

I had an agreement with the CBC The Fifth Estate not to air the fifth estate investigative program: "**Money Truth and Spin**" until after the February 6, 2006 election. The program was aired on February 8, 2006^[7]. Had this program been aired during the election campaign the outcome may very well have been quite different.

With the benefit of hindsight I now have my doubts whether anything has changed: what have you done to "clean up government"?

Nobody could have foreseen that Mr. Brian Mulroney would return to power after February 6, 2006 by not just being your advisor but by surrounding you with people in government positions who had his confidence leaving the impression that you became his puppet.^[8]

Your pledge on September 10, 2008 to continue sending Canadian soldiers to Afghanistan until 2011 is not acceptable because you must know that you are sending Canadian soldiers to certain death and unnecessary bodily harm.^[9]

Surely you are aware that 75% of Germans, 70 % of Italians, and 72% of Spaniards did not support the deployment of their properly equipped and protected troops to participate in combat operations in Afghanistan. Similarly, you must appreciate the majority of Canadians are not in support of a combat mission in Afghanistan and yet you make this pledge at the beginning of your election campaign on September 10, 2008.^[10]

The Minister of Defence, Peter MaKay, the one person in your cabinet who has direct knowledge of the nature of the equipment of the Canadian military from his involvement with the Thyssen MRCV project, even argued that your commitment is a reasonable political decision and not a "cut and run" approach. Surely, it should not come as a complete surprise to you that yesterday the French opposition "withdrew its support for

the country's military deployment in Afghanistan and accused President Sarkozy of sending under-equipped troops into an unwinnable "war of occupation".^[11]

Do you know that since you came to power ninety (90) Canadian soldiers died in Afghanistan? In 2002 there were four (4) soldiers who died in Afghanistan, then in 2003 there were two (2), then in 2004 one (1) and 2005 one (1). However, in 2006 there were thirty seven (37), then in 2007 thirty (30), and as of September 7, 2008 twenty three (23).^[12] You must know that without proper equipment many more Canadian soldiers will die needlessly. Going by past statistics at least one hundred and twenty (120) troops will die over the next three (3) years and no one can begin to estimate how many will be wounded. The pain and suffering as well as social and economic problems for the families and children of the dead and wounded Canadian soldiers is difficult to measure under normal circumstance^[13] but particularly difficult to accept if by providing proper equipment the casualties could be significantly reduced, if not eliminated altogether.

Since 1985 as Chairman of Thyssen Bear Head Industries I was confronted with the problem of an ill equipped Canadian Army. With the support of five Canadian Army Generals we designed the TH 495 Multi Role Combat Vehicle.^[14] The TH 495 was meant to provide the necessary protection for Canadian soldiers not just on peace keeping missions but also in a combat role. The roll out of the TH 495 took place on September 28, 1992 in the presence of several army Generals and Government officials.^[15]

During a Senate hearing regarding "Armored Personnel Carriers" on May 26, 1987 L. Gen. J.A. Fox, Commander Mobile Command reported to the Senate of Canada on the role of the M 113,^[16] the LAV III,^[17] the Bison,^[18] and the Bradley,^[19] Warrior^[20] and Marder^[21] used by allied forces.

On November 16, 1987 the Financial Post printed a special with the headline: "Army needs New Material for European commitment".^[22]

On September 27, 1988 The Government of Canada signed an Understanding in Principle with Bear Head Industries Ltd. regarding the implementation of the establishment of a production facility for defence products in Cape Breton, Nova Scotia.^[23]

Then on September 17, 1991 the Minister of National Defence, Marcel Masse, delivered an Address to the National Press Theatre on the **Canadian Military needs for tanks and multi role combat Vehicles:**

"The Army

The land forces will henceforth have to rely more on the militia, whose numbers will gradually increase in the coming years. This is one of the basic ideas of the "total force" concept.

In addition, the army will be structured on a balanced geographical model to further increase its flexibility and mobility.

My Department intends, first and foremost, to maintain a flexible, versatile military force. It will be equipped with multi-role combat vehicles, short- and medium-range heavy anti-tank weapons, modernized howitzers, and air defence weapons. The main battle tanks currently in Germany will remain in service there for a few more years, after which they will be replaced by an appropriate version of the multi-role combat vehicle.”^[24]

On February 10, 1992 the Canadian Embassy in Bonn, Germany sent a letter outlining the multi- role- combat vehicle project as had been discussed during the visit of the Minister of Defence, Mr. Marcel Masse, to the German Department of Defence, Dr. Holger Pfahls.^[25]

On April 7, 1992 the Department of National Defence in a News Release announced the procurement for the Canadian Militia of up to 229 LAV 25 (reconnaissance-enhanced light armored vehicles) at a total project cost of \$800 Million from the Diesel Division of General Motors. When the Department of National Defence was asked “why was Thyssen not allowed to participate in this procurement?” the answer seemed to be due to insurmountable economic considerations:

“The government agreed to consider the participation of Thyssen-Bearhead in the context of the proposed major acquisition program for light armored vehicles. The program evolved into MRCV which envisaged the ultimate acquisition of three vehicle variants. MRCV is now unaffordable and has been cancelled.”

And when asked whether it is “the department’s intention to use the LAV 25 as its future MRCV” the response was: “No. Future armoured vehicle requirements will be dealt with as the need arises.”^[26]

Then on June 2, 1992 Mr. R.D. Gillespie, on behalf of the Minister of National Defence, provided further direction to Thyssen Bearhead Industries that the Understanding of Principle of September 1988 would remain in place and that there was a continued effort among the Canadian Government to develop a “practical approach to your objective.”^[27]

In a report for The Journal on the **Canadian Peacekeepers in Sarajevo** on June 22, 1992 the reporter stated:

“These armoured personnel carriers have been sitting idle for about a week now waiting to go to Sarajevo. The soldiers here call them taxis because even with those guns on top, they’re not really good for much else. The[y] say the bullets from one of their own guns can go through one of these things like butter and it’s all the protection they have.”^[28]

On September 25, 1992 the Honourable Benoit Bouchard, Minister, Federal Office of Regional Development (Quebec), sent a further letter of support to Thyssen BHI:

“Based on the preliminary documentation and information which has been provided and on the eventual significant benefits which your project would represent and considering my mandate which is precisely the regional development in Quebec, it has been concluded that the continuation of our analysis is fully justified and that further consultations with my colleagues and with the Quebec government officials should take place, on a priority basis, with a view to reach a final decision on your proposal.”^[29]

But then a few months later before the House of Commons on February 17, 1993 when Admiral John Anderson, Chief of the Defence Staff Committee on National Defence and Veteran Affairs responded to questions relating to the protection provided by the M113 instead of dealing with the question himself Admiral Anderson asked “his resident expert to deal with that:

“The M-113 will provide protection up to 7.62. It does not provide protection against heavy machineguns and so forth...in fact, as I speak, we’re trying to improve the overall protection of those vehicles. There is only one other armoured vehicle in Yugoslavia in the UN forces that has a better overall protection level, and that’s the British Warrior. Ours is vulnerable, in a sense, but we are taking these measures to improve the protection.”^[30]

The fact is that the M-117 does protect against 7.62 mm caliber gunfire but not against 7.62 mm caliber “armour-piercing machinegun fire” and this was well known to the government. Therefore, on March 16, 1993 I sent a letter to the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, then the Prime Minister of Canada, reminding him once again of the samples of the aluminum plate of an M-113 which had been fired on and completely pierced by a basic 7.62 mm armoured piercing round.^[31] You received a copy of this letter under cover of my letter to you dated April 10, 2007.

What had happened? The Department of National Defence had already in 1992 announced the procurement of up to 229 light armoured vehicles “enhanced for the reconnaissance role” and built by GM.^[32] Why was the Canadian Government under the leadership of Mr. Brian Mulroney on the one hand announcing the procurement of hundreds of vehicles and yet not prepared to fully support the efforts of Thyssen BHI to provide the Canadian military with equipment that would significantly enhance the protection for the troops not just on peace keeping missions, but also in other deployments?

Had I known that Mr. Brian Mulroney had “killed” the Thyssen Bear Head project already on December 16, 1990 as confirmed by Mr. Norman Spector before the Ethics Committee^[33], the media quotes in March 1993 would have had a truly different impact:

“Someone, or more likely a bunch of people, will have to get killed before it gets changes,” one Canadian officer serving in Bosnia said.

The biggest question mark hangs over the survivability of Canada's vintage armoured vehicles: the tracked M113 armoured personnel carrier and the wheeled Cougar fire-support vehicle.

One M113 already bears the smooth tell-tale hole of an armour-piercing grenade that cut through its back like butter, tore through the commander's position and lodged in the radiator.

The M113 "is not fit for the type of job that it's doing" retired Canadian Major-General Lewis MacKenzie, who commanded the Sarajevo sector when a Canadian battalion took control of the airport in July, said.^[34]

In early 1993 the then Defence Minister Ms. Kim Campbell said cabinet had received assurances from the military that the "equipment they have is appropriate" before it decided to send a Canadian battalion to central Bosnia...but then Ms. Campbell, in the midst of the Conservative leadership race, said she was concerned about any suggestion that Canadian soldiers lacked adequate protection. She cited Admiral John Anderson as authority assuring cabinet that the military equipment was "adequate".^[35]

But as we now know Mr. Brian Mulroney knew better and even confirmed this on December 13, 2007 when he stated before the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics that the "...Thyssen product -which by the way, everybody agreed was superb- would better protect our peacekeepers and anybody's else."^[36]

In his article on "**Vintage vehicles drive up risk**" Globe and Mail reporter, Mr. Paul Koring, wrote on March 22, 1993:

"The Warrior travel up to 100 kilometers an hour, and its crew is encased in thick protective armour. Heavy machine-gun fire and mortars literally bounce off. In at least one case in the gulf war, a Warrior took a direct hit from an artillery shell and its crew survived. If necessary, its crew can fight back from the safety of armoured turrets.

The Canadian army was to have had a similar vehicle, the MRCV. The Progressive conservative government scrapped that program two years ago, along with other plans to replace obsolete equipment, despite long standing pledges to end years of what they called Liberal neglect.

Many Canadian soldiers and officers believe there is a better vehicle sitting in Canada, but the M113s were sent to Bosnia because there were lots of them at the soon-to-be-closed base at Lahr, Germany.

And nobody is betting that there will not be more casualties. Indeed, when the government erected a monument near the Canadian base in Croatia, the chiseled tribute was to "Canadian soldiers" who died in former Yugoslavia."^[37]

Then in his article dated May 10, 1996 on “**Canadian Troops forced to use unsafe vehicles**” Globe and Mail reporter, Mr. Paul Korning, reported that “last year, Defence Minister David Collonette announced a \$ 1.2 billion contract to buy 240 new armoured personnel carriers...Yet even the new carriers...will be vulnerable to relatively light weapons in medium intensity conflicts such as Bosnia and Somalia. Canadian soldiers deployed to such areas, even as non-combat peacekeepers will remain far more vulnerable than their British and U.S. counterparts.”^[38]

We now know what Mr. Brian Mulroney was prepared to do, but why have the Conservatives under your leadership followed his footsteps and continue this criminal behaviour?

With his secret decision to kill the Thyssen BHI project on December 16, 1990 Mr. Brian Mulroney sealed the faith of Canadian soldiers being sent on peace keeping / war missions. He left them exposed and unprotected. What Mr. Brian Mulroney did in 1992 in Bosnia, which may have started as a “peace keeping mission” but that there was no peace, and the Canadian that had to face enemy fire and undertake combat missions.^[39] They were ill-equipped because of the Mr. Mulroney’s disregard and neglect to properly secure the necessary funding and procurement measures for the Canadian military so that it could also take on missions that potentially put Canadian soldiers in harms way. In my opinion Mr. Brian Mulroney committed manslaughter.^[40]

Was it not your personal grandstanding before the international community that committed Canada to the Afghanistan mission?^[41] What does Canada stand to gain by remaining in Afghanistan? When you continued to commit Canada to the Allied Joint Force in Afghanistan you knew that Canadian soldiers were not on a “peace keeping mission” in Afghanistan; you knew this was a combat mission. Nevertheless, you did nothing to ensure that Canadian soldiers would be equipped and properly prepared for such a mission: this will secure your position in the history books of Canada as the Canadian Prime Minister having the highest number of Canadian soldiers coming home dead and heavily wounded without there being any possible expectation of securing peace.

Prior to you becoming Prime Minister the total number of soldiers that died during all Canadian peace keeping missions as reported by the Canadian Peacekeeping Veterans Association^[42] were as follows:

United Nations Peacekeeping	1947- 2006 (59 years)	115
Multinational Peacekeeping	1954- 2007 (53 years)	8
Gulf War	1991- 1992	0
NATO in Somalia	1992- 1993	0
NATO in Southwest Asia	2001- 2006	6
NATO in Yugoslavia	2002- 2006	12

But during the past thirty (30) months between February 6, 2006 and September 7, 2008 the number of Canadian soldiers that have died on duty in Afghanistan was ninety (90) and the total number as reported by Canwest News Service was ninety-seven (97) which is almost as many as died during all UN peacekeeping missions during fifty-nine (59) years.^[43] And if the Canadian soldiers remain in Afghanistan until 2011, surely more will die needlessly.^[44] Only if the Canadian government is prepared to provide the appropriate equipment and protection to prevent further unnecessary casualties will the current manslaughter of Canadian soldiers in Afghanistan stop.

In closing I wish to draw your attention to the Poll Results conducted by the Globe and Mail in December, 2007 regarding whose testimony to the Commons Ethics Committee is more credible.^[45] Surely, you will agree with me that Canadians are not prepared to believe in Mr. Brian Mulroney's lies and can very well distinguish between stories and facts: and so should you.


Canada is one of the richest countries in the world and is endowed with great natural resources and is internationally well respected as a peacekeeping country. Canada should not have to deploy its soldiers on a war mission equipped like a mountaineer climbing the Mount Everest in a summer suit, tennis shoes, cowboy hat and a close line.

In my opinion the sad problem seems to be: You do not care!

Yours sincerely,



Kath Heinz Schreiber



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

OTTAWA, CANADA

Open Letter via Fax: 613 941 6900

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa, March 1, 2009

**Subject: "Second Report of Prof. David Johnston"
"Testimony before the Commons Ethics Committee"
"Time to stop the cover up concerning the Political Justice Scandal"**

Dear Prime Minister,

On April 4, 2008 the Independent Advisor David Johnston sent his "Second Report" to you and wrote on page – 6 – of the report:

"Some of the further evidence given before the Ethics Committee is consistent with the understanding that there was a business relationship between Airbus and GCI. However, Mr. Greg Alford, the former president of GCI, has now testified that Airbus was not a client of GCI and that GCI was not involved in the Airbus deal. Whether Airbus was in fact a GCI client might therefore no longer be considered as "known."

Mr. Schreiber's counsel has suggested that an inquiry explore a whole series of questions in relation to Airbus. As I stated in the first report, in light of the extensive RCMP investigation in to the Airbus matter I consider it inappropriate that an inquiry should do so."

Dear Prime Minister,

I take the liberty to send you an article of CBC News: the fifth estate December 3, 2008 concerning the testimonies before the Ethics Committee and documents of the Hon. Frank Moores, Mr. Greg Alford, Mr. James Mac Eachern, Mr. Fred Doucet.

The documents speak for themselves.

I also send you the copy of my diary Tuesday, January 6, 1987, the day when I met the Hon. Lucien Bouchard, then the Canadian ambassador to France, together with Mr. Greg Alford, president of GCI, Mr. James Mac Eachern, employee of GCI, responsible for the Airbus project and Mr. Stuart Iddles, senior vice president of AIRBUS – INDUSTRIES Toulouse, to discuss the Air Canada - Airbus project and the industrial benefits for Canadian companies.

In my opinion it is time for you to recall that the Right. Hon. Brian Mulroney and many members of the Conservative Party since 1996 asked for a Public Inquiry to clear Brian Mulroney's name and his Conservative Government for the Canadian history books. (Attached my letter August 30, 2006 to you)

During the 2006 Federal Election you promised to clean up Ottawa and made reference to the AIRBUS scandal.


Don't you think that it is time and in the interest of Canadians to fulfill your election promise to clean up Ottawa and also respond to the demand of The Right Hon. Brian Mulroney by granting a broad mandate for the Oliphant Commission, as recommended by Ethics Committee.

To avoid the cleanup will leave you in the eyes of Canadians with the suspicion of an involvement in a huge cover up.

Yours sincerely

Original signed and delivered

Karlheinz Schreiber



News

Sports

Entertainment

Radio

TV

My Region



the fifth estate

WINNER: 3 GEMINI AWARDS
including BEST NEWS INFORMATION SERIES

Main Reporters About The Show Past Programs Contact Us

THE CHESS MASTER | Originally aired Dec. 3 on CBC-TV; Repeats Dec. 7 at 11pm on CBC-TV; Check your local listings for CBC Newsworld airings

the fifth estate: *The Chess Master*

Lobby firm involved in Airbus file, new documents show

By Andreas Wesley, CBC News: the fifth estate | Last Updated: Wednesday, December 3, 2008

Internal memos obtained by *CBC News: the fifth estate* show that an Ottawa lobbying firm was deeply involved in the efforts by Airbus Industrie to sell airplanes to Air Canada in 1988.

"For years, executives at GCI (Government Consultants International), set up by former Newfoundland premier Frank Moores, denied involvement.

Most recently former GCI VP Greg Alford under oath last February before the House of Commons ethics committee testified that "GCI had no involvement" with Airbus.

"Maybe I missed what you said," Alford was asked a second time by MP Charles Hubbard, "but you seemed to indicate, or at least what I heard, is that GCI was not involved with the Airbus deal. Did I hear correctly?"

"That's correct," Alford replied.

But a GCI memo written by Alford himself in 1987 to Schreiber with the subject heading 'Airbus' seems to suggest that GCI was involved in the Airbus deal.

"If Air Canada commits to purchase these aircraft before the end of September, Airbus Industrie will commit to putting this work into Canada," Alford wrote to Schreiber.

Alford's memo to Schreiber re: Airbus [PDF 41kb]

The memo also refers to conversations Alford had with then Minister of Transport John

Syn
Time
Vide
Dou
GCI
"PM
New
Wat
Com
Rela
Un
Rela

Rec



Crosbie's staff about how to best lobby the Minister and his team at the upcoming Paris Air Show. Alford told Schreiber how Crosbie's Air Policy Advisor, Karen Mosher, was an admirer of Airbus chairman Franz Joseph Strauss.

"I have asked her to look for you and have told her of your association with FJS, whom she admires," Alford wrote.

When *the fifth estate* first contacted Mosher in 1995, she admitted to having met Schreiber a couple of times, but said she didn't know anything about Airbus.

"I don't remember having any direct contact with anybody at Airbus, or anybody representing them," Mosher told *the fifth estate* in '95.

When contacted recently by *the fifth estate* for this story, Mosher, who is now Director General of Citizenship and Immigration Canada, refused all comment. She did not want to discuss the matter nor even be provided with the document in which her name had been mentioned.

When *the fifth estate* spoke to Alford about the memos he repeatedly maintained what he had told the Ethics Committee earlier this year.

"I wasn't involved in an Airbus file," Alford said. But he did allow that Schreiber often talked about Airbus.

In December of 1987, another GCI employee James MacEachern wrote a detailed memo with the subject heading "Airbus" to Schreiber and the entire executive of GCI: Frank Moores, Gerry Doucet, Gary Ouellet and Greg Alford. The memo was a report on GCI's lobbying efforts to convince Air Canada to purchase airplanes from Airbus. He described a meeting in November between lawyer and lobbyist Marc Lalonde and then Air Canada president Pierre Jeannot to see where Airbus stood in fierce bidding for the airplane deal.

 [MacEachern to Schreiber, Doucet, Alford, Ouellett, Moore \[PDF 124kb\]](#)

Lalonde did not share this information with the Ethics Committee earlier this year when he appeared on February 12, 2008.

"Did you work on the Airbus or MBB files as part of your professional relationship?" MP Robert Thibault asked Lalonde about Schreiber.

"Neither Mr. Schreiber nor any of his businesses hired me to represent them regarding the Airbus affair. Nor GCI." Lalonde replied.

"He was representing Airbus on that occasion." Pierre Jeannot, now a private businessman, recently told *the fifth estate* about his meeting with Lalonde on November 26, 1987. "I think that what basically he was interested in is to see how Airbus was being considered, probably

methic



 [We](#)

trying to find out what chances they had to be selected."

When asked if Mr. Lalonde had told him he was representing GCI, Jeannot recalled, "He said at the time that he had been hired by Airbus to help promote – to see about opportunities for manufacturing pieces for Airbus in Canada in order to enhance their chances of being selected."

According to the GCI memo written by MacEachern, Lalonde briefed him about his meeting with Jeannot later that same day.

James MacEachern declined *the fifth estate's* request to comment on this story.

When contacted by *the fifth estate*, Lalonde maintained that he had been hired directly by Airbus and was not hired by Schreiber or GCI to work on the Airbus file. He told CBC News: *the fifth estate* that Schreiber called him out of the blue one day in the spring of 1987 to see if he would help him lobby Air Canada to purchase airplanes. Lalonde says he then met with Schreiber, Airbus President Jean Pierson, and the VP of marketing, Stuart Iddles in Paris and, after that meeting, arranged to work for Airbus Industrie.

Lalonde said he briefed GCI on his meeting with Jeannot. He also said he met with Frank Moores, the head of GCI, at their Ottawa offices to discuss the lobby project.

Until his death in 2005, Frank Moores maintained he and his lobby firm GCI had nothing to do with Airbus and its sale of \$1.8 billion worth of airplanes to Air Canada.

NDP MP Pat Martin was a member of the Ethics Committee that looked into the Mulroney Airbus Settlement.

"If these people were trying to cover something up or lying to us," Martin told *the fifth estate*, "I for one would call for any witnesses that lied to us to be called back to face consequences and I would hope serious consequences."

Former chair of the Ethics Committee, Paul Szabo, agrees that if it's found that witnesses mislead the Committee there could be serious consequences including fines or imprisonment.

"A person who is going to be recommended by a committee to be found in contempt would be brought into the chamber and stand at the brass rail at the head the opposite end from the speaker and be subject to questions by members of parliament as to why they should not be found in contempt of parliament," Szabo told *the fifth estate*.

Earlier this year Dr. David Johnston, appointed by Prime Minister Stephen Harper to set the terms of reference for a public inquiry, recommended that Airbus not be one of them.

"I would not recommend terms of reference that charge a Commissioner today with the task of

holding an inquiry to go over this well-tilled ground," Johnston wrote to Harper last January.


"My view would be different if there existed significant evidence that had only now come to light," he added in his report.

The public inquiry into the Mulroney Schreiber affair is scheduled to begin February 9th. But following the recommendation of Johnston, the mandate of the Oliphant Commission will not include Airbus.

[News](#)
[Sports](#)
[Entertainment](#)
[Radio](#)
[TV](#)
[Digital Archives](#)

[About CBC](#)
[Canadian Broadcasting Centre](#)
[CBC Merchandise and Shop](#)
[Educational Resources](#)
[Tapes, Transcripts and Image Assets](#)
[Archive Sales](#)
[Jobs](#)
[Production Facilities](#)
[Independent Production](#)
[International Sales](#)
[Advertising with CBC](#)

[Privacy](#)
[Terms Of Use](#)
[Ombudsman](#)
[Get the Facts](#)
[Reuse & Permissions](#)
[Other Policies](#)
[Help](#)
[Site Map](#)
[CBC Member Centre](#)
[Contact Us](#)



KARLHEINZ SCHREIBER

OTTAWA, CANADA

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper
Prime Minister

House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Ottawa August 30, 2006

Subject: "Political Justice Scandal"

Dear Prime Minister,

As an oversight I forget to include the attachment to my letter August 23, 2006
I am including herewith.

Document 1: Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights December 3, 1997

The motion before the Committee: That the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights conduct hearings with witnesses into what was commonly called the "Airbus Scandal," to determine whether a Publicly Commissioned Inquiry should be convened.

Recorded vote: Motion negatived : Nays 8; yeas 7

Today, 8 years and 9 month later most of the important questions remain unanswered and Canadians still do not know what happened and what terrible vendetta took place on their tax account.

The case proves again how right you were when you announced on November 30, 2005 the creation of a Director of Public Prosecutions and made reference to the Mulroney-Airbus affair as a bad example.

Document 2: Statement by the Hon. Allan Rock and the Hon. Herb Gray Regarding the Case of Brian Mulroney v. The Attorney General of Canada et al – Monday, January 6, 1997.

Document 3: Edited Hansard * 1420 * Number 031

Document 4: Oral Question Period Airbus Aircraft 3817, 3818 96-06-1

(Some of the documents are also in the "Political Justice Scandal" Case Books)

I apologize for any inconvenience.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Allan Rock", written in a cursive style.

Telegramm		Deutsche Bundespost		Veränderungswende	
Nummer	Umsatz	TSN	3312	Kaufering	Internet
Preis	Empfänger	Empfänger von		Umsatz	067.73
	Kommunikation			Ortscode	082
				Platz	3
				Netzkategorie	Be
GIS		Lte Montreal Que		5 1504	
		Tel 011-514-881 881		Identische Merkmale/Veränderungen	
		Karlheinz Huber			
		Betsleit Brigitte Botman-Blum			
		Erwinand Minid-funk and Company			
		D-332 Kaufering			
		Booth rd-January			
		Dear Karlheinz please call monday evening around			
		ten-our Montreal time (don't wish to talk to you			
		re: Canadian international trade zone and political			
		donation regards			
		Frank Protha			

4 81/6843 087 210 000 10.01.11 15.01.2009



Adjutant

1988

1983

Montag 8. August

SU 1983

7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	15:45 Tel. Orsini.
16	Tel. Frank Muehlen
17	
18	18:30 Jeger.
19	
20	

Head Bank of Nova Fran

TX David Leg,
17. August

and 22. August

Frank Tel.

Frank

Ar. 6

Dienstag 9. August

SU 1983

7	02:30 990386	Prof. Wallner
8	Tel. Madax	Tel. Madax
9		Madax 32.4
10		Tom Friend
11		Madax Madax
12		Prof. Wallner
13		Prof. Wallner
14	14:15	17:15
15	15:30 Landed.	17:15
16		Prof. Wallner
17		Prof. Wallner
18		Prof. Wallner
19		Prof. Wallner
20		Prof. Wallner

83.7

Prof. Wallner

Madax 32.4

Tom Friend

Madax Madax

Prof. Wallner

Prof. Wallner

17:15

17:15

Prof. Wallner

Prof. Wallner

Prof. Wallner

1	18	15	23	25
2	19	16	24	26
3	20	17	25	27
4	21	18	26	28
5	22	19	27	29
6	23	20	28	30
7	24	21	29	31
8	25	22	30	
9	26	23		
10	27	24		
11	28	25		
12	29	26		
13	30	27		
14	31	28		

30 31

SENDER : 013 236 7001
JUN 06 '86 16:20

GCI OTTAWA

05.06.86 22:16 NR.02-03
P03

Frank D. Mouras
Chairman

GCI
GOVERNMENT
CONSULTANTS
INTERNATIONAL

SUITE 100, GUYTONA STREET,
OTTAWA, CANADA K1P 4J7
PHONE: (613) 238-7001 TELE: (613) 238-7000

June 5, 1986

Dr. h.c. Franz Josef Strauss
Minister President
Chairman of the Christian-Social Union (CSU)
Bayerische Staatskanzlei
Prinzregentenstr. 7
8000 Munchen 22
Federal Republic of Germany

Dear Dr. Strauss:

We have had meetings with Wardair with the view of persuading them to buy the Airbus A310 for their fleet requirements in the future.

For your information, Wardair is a private airline in Canada that has, in the past, because of regulatory controls, been restricted to charter flights serving primarily the Caribbean and to a lesser extent Europe.

Since the initiation of deregulation in Canada, Wardair has become a scheduled carrier from coast to coast in Canada, as well as serving London and Frankfurt in Europe. Even considering the difficult position they were in before deregulation, they are well known as an airline that set the highest standards of quality for both service and aircraft. It is not going too far to say that whenever Mr. Max Ward, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Wardair, introduced a new line of aircraft into his fleet, the competition quickly thereafter followed his lead. This was particularly true of the Boeing 727 which Max Ward introduced into the Canadian market.

If a Wardair-Airbus deal can be finalized there will be substantial pressure on Air Canada, Canadian Pacific Airlines and Pacific Western Airlines to follow suit if they hope to remain competitive. In fact, no better airline could be identified in this country

ENDER : 613 236 7001
UN 08 '86 16:21

GCI OTTAWA

05.06.86 22:16 NR.02-04
P04

for Airbus to deal with if they want to make a significant breakthrough into the Canadian market.

Wardair, with their A310's would have exposure in Europe, coast to coast in Canada and in the various Caribbean Islands where they are presently Canada's biggest charter operator. Further it is my view that with deregulation, Wardair will be without question the fastest growing airline company in Canada. The company has always operated efficiently, a posture even more difficult in the face of heavily subsidized competition and monopoly on the prime routes. Now as Wardair expands, their competitors will have to reduce their costs, while at the same time competing with regard to state of the art aircraft.

Irrespective of a conditional sales agreement Wardair has with South African Airlines for 3 A300's, they would like to make a major acquisition of 8 A310's directly from Airbus industries. The 8 machines would be required as follows: 3 for delivery in March/April 1987; 3 for delivery in December, 1987/January, 1988; and 2 - October, 1988. It is presently their intention to make their decision as to which aircraft they buy before the end of June. If the negotiations with Airbus are successful, I believe it would be their intention to dispose of their present fleet of 747's or DC10's or both.

We were advised definitively by Wardair that \$49 million was the maximum they could afford per aircraft for the job they have to do. Further they are requesting a 30% deficiency guarantee (Boeing's offer in this regard is 37%). This means that there is a difference of \$3.5 million per aircraft between the seller and the buyer, and this of course, is the problem.

There is no question that Wardair would prefer the A310 rather than the Boeing 787. However it is equally obvious that Boeing is extremely aggressive. I can only say given the above.

SENDER : 613 236 7001
JUN 06 '86 16:22

GCI OTTAWA

05.06.86 22:16 NR.02-05
P05

that I would recommend that every effort should be made to conclude a successful sale with Wardair not just for the sake of Wardair flying the A310 flag but more importantly because of the potential sales this will generate with other Canadian airlines.

I remain,

with best personal regards,



Frank D. Moores

FDM/no'n

SA 8.3
2. Woche
5388
Gastliche Feiern in Bismarckburg und
Bayern.

Dienstag 6. Januar 1987

SU 15.28

UHR 7	Heilige Drei Könige
8	Tal. Max Ward Horn Dornant.
9	Cynita Pleani 1240 WA
10	Cassa Raffarin
11	6932 Breganzana/Bozzano Via B. Leon.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	Tal Max Ward OK N.
19	
20	

SA 9.26
UHR 7

Mittwoch 7. Januar

SU 19.31

UHR 7	Wahl Pader Almb.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	Santer 13:30 Lesnar.
14	
15	Rosch. 66351
16	Albat 460 2r Hofmann 260 r Mader 360 2r
17	MAF
18	Post 22121
19	Kudler Greg Chri 134 Hörn Mac Eochan
20	

Jim 004 20 m.

SENDER : 613 236 7001
JUN 10 '87 10:38

GCI OTTAWA

10.06.87 16:30 NR.10-03
P03

VIA FAX

TO: Karlheinz Schreiber
FROM: Greg Alford, GCI
RE: Airbus + MBB
DATE: June 10, 1987

MEMORANDUM

I have spoken today with Minister Crosbie's office regarding his visit to the Paris Air Show.

The Minister may attend the show on Friday if he has time but his main tour of the Air Show will take place on Monday which is "Canada Day" at the Air Show.

In the Minister's party, there will be:

(a) his Chief of Staff, Jim Good, who is from Newfoundland and a long-time aide to the Minister. Jim is 180 cm tall, thin, has brown hair with a receding hairline and appears to be 35 years of age; and

(b) his Air Policy Advisor, Miss Karen Mosher. I have asked her to look for you and have told her of your association with FJS, whom she admires. Karen is 140 cm tall, of medium weight, has big blue eyes, short light brown hair and is 28 years of age. Karen is very friendly and very smart. If you meet her, she will remember 100% of what you discuss. Karen is a friend of mine.

Lastly, I will remind you that Minister Crosbie is a good friend of Frank's but Crosbie also has good friends who work for Boeing, so all we can expect is a fair hearing from him. If you meet the Minister, keep in mind that he is quite shy and so it would be best not to come on too strong. One important point that applies to Crosbie and his staff is that he is very sensitive to any intervention in his Transport portfolio by Maz who used to be Transport Minister. Therefore, I suggest that you not make any reference to your recent contact with Maz.

The best friends that you can mention are Frank, Elmer and Frank Oberle and refer to these relationships only in a modest way perhaps on the Thyssen project, which Crosbie has supported in Cabinet, though he would not acknowledge this to

MEMORANDUM

TO: FDM, GD, GO, GA,
Karlheinz Schreiber

DATE: 87-12-02

FROM: JM

SUBJECT: AIRBUS

I met with Marc Lalonde on Thursday, November 26, 1987.

He had just met with Pierre Jeanniot. Jeanniot had just returned from Seattle and a meeting with Boeing. Jeanniot advised Lalonde that Boeing were offering the 737-400 which had a number of improvements including a redesigned interior which allowed for more interior room, better gallery, an improved cockpit and something called "a motor like Airbus". This plane apparently carries 103 economy passengers and either 32 or 34 business class passengers. Jeanniot advised that Boeing had cut \$4 to \$5 million off the list price and that there was room for further cutting. There had been no discussion of financing yet.

Jeanniot further advised that Macdonald Douglas were offering the MD88 with an option of trading it in in 1990 for a brand new MD90 which would have motors even more economical than those of Airbus.

With respect to Airbus, Jeanniot advised that the financing was very important. When Lalonde asked him if Air Canada was interested in the same sort of deal that Wardair obtained, Jeanniot responded positively and said that Air Canada would want a lower interest rate because they were stronger and bigger than Wardair and it would be therefore less risky to the lender.

Furthermore, Jeanniot indicated that there would be a board meeting of Air Canada on December 18 where the issue of replacement aircraft would be raised and perhaps even decided. He also indicated that he would be in Toulouse on December 22.

My analysis of this situation which I discussed with Marc Lalonde was that this is very positive to us. As expected, Jeanniot would want to tell us that the Boeing plane was not as outdated and obsolete as one might have believed and,

furthermore, that they were prepared to cut their price. If I were negotiating with an Airbus representative, I would have made the same claims so as to give myself something to bargain with. It is also interesting to note that with respect to Airbus, we have gone beyond the question of technological advantages of the plane. However with us, unlike the others, the question is financing.

This impression is reinforced when one considers that Mr. Jeannot is going to Toulouse four days after a board meeting where the issue will be raised and possibly decided. Why would Mr. Jeannot spend his time that close to Christmas and in an extremely hectic schedule if it was not to negotiate the price on their preferred aircraft. Therefore, I remain very optimistic about this project.

The two things that could derail this are:

1. Price;
2. An inability to obtain suitable industrial benefits and work sharing for Canadair.

With respect to this later problem, both FDM and I have met with Stuart Iddles and have raised the issue with him. We have a game plan to deal with this which essentially involves a suggestion that Marc Lalonde meet with senior officials at Aerospatiale and Airbus should the two Aerospatiale officials, Bruneau and Chandez, fail to reach an agreement with Canadair officials on Monday, November 30.

On December 1, Bob Brown advised that the Nov. 30 meeting was cordial but did not resolve the issue of Canadair's subcontract work on the A340 programme. Two senior Canadair officials are to go to France to negotiate with Aerospatiale on Thursday Dec. 3. We will not know the results of those meetings until Dec. 8. Only at that point will we know what steps must be taken next.

Dr. h. c. Franz Josef Strauß
Vorsitzender des Aufsichtsrates
Airbus Industrie G.I.E.

Mr Frank D. Moores
GCI Government Consultants
International
Suite 1300, 50 O'Connor Street

Ottawa K1P 6L2
Canada

APR 08 1988

March 29th, 1988

Dear Mr. Moores:

Thank you for your letter of February 3rd, 1988 in which you address the issue of an Airbus Industrie deficiency guarantee to support the financing of a potential A320 sale to Air Canada.

As to the information received from Deutsche Airbus GmbH, the German partner in the Airbus programme, the discussions between Airbus Industrie and Air Canada with regard to financing have well progressed, but have not yet advanced to a stage, where Airbus Industrie has asked their shareholders for formal approval for an Airbus Industrie manufacturer's guarantee. So in fact your information that the German partner "has turned down a request" may be based on some misunderstanding.

As I have been further informed, financing discussions between Airbus Industrie and Air Canada now are concentrating on a limited residual value guarantee to be granted in addition to export credits. This indeed seems to confirm worthiness of Air Canada by a deficiency guarantee which normally is used to support sales to weaker countries.

Please be assured that there is no reason to put doubt on the preparedness of the German partner to support any Airbus sale to Air Canada in the same way as the other Airbus partners.

Yours sincerely,



No of Apr. 1/92

Totals

On hand (existing) approx. 100,000

Due 1992	- 253
1993	- 470 (402 to be confirmed)
1994	- 612 (545 to be confirmed)
1995	- 22
	<u>1,357</u> (total to be divided)

1) 2nd Air Inc (Canadian) to be confirmed.

2) Reason for reduced figures:-

- a) Cancellation of options.
- b) Having to reduce price.
- c) Cost of selling schedule changes, etc..

All the best,

J. French

93 Ivy Crescent
Ottawa, Ontario
K1M 1Y1

July 12, 1994

Mr. Karlheinz Schreiber
Raiffelsenstrasse 27
8912 Kaufering
Germany

Dear Karlheinz,


The newspapers reported that Air Canada have recently made two large purchases of Airbus aircraft. My congratulations to you if you are still involved in the sale of Airbus Aircraft in Canada. I thought I would write you a short note as I seem to keep missing you when you are in Ottawa. It would be great for Cathy and I to get together with you and Barble again. I am not looking for any new business as I assume you are happy with the representation you have.

Rather I would hope that we might renew our friendship and catch up on events such as the trial in Alberta. I still have the briefing book you gave me. It seems you have heard some disturbing things about me. I do not know who might have said what, but I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

If you are interested in getting together please give me a call at (613) 230 - 6311 during business hours or (613) 741 - 8696 at home. Seems to me that we were both let down by one person in particular, but we have more to talk about than that.

If you do not want to get together then I will leave by saying that it was always a pleasure knowing you and I wish you, Barble and your family all the best, long life and happiness.

Yours truly,



James MacEachern

FDCI
FRED DOUCET
CONSULTING
INTERNATIONAL

24 March 1992

Mr. Karlheinz Schreiber,
Raifferser Str.27
8912 Kaufering
West Germany
Fax #011-49-8191-7888

Dear Karlheinz,


I do not want to bother you with the matter of the Birds but since you insisted when we last spoke that I raise this matter with you by March 15, I decided to drop you a note on it.

As I recall you felt that by now I would have heard from F.M. and that if not I should let you know. I have not heard from him.

I hope Switzerland was restful for you and that you are now in fighting shape. I also hope that all the "reconditioning" will stop shy of imposing new parental duties on Barbel and yourself!

Every good wish,

Yours sincerely,


J.A. Doucet
President and CEO

SUITE 320, 440 LAURIER AVENUE WEST
OTTAWA, CANADA K1R 7N5
TELEPHONE (613) 787-2436 TELEFAX (613) 782-2430

SUITE 1702, 5151 GEORGE STREET
HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA B3H 2R1
TELEPHONE (902) 421-1111 TELEFAX (902) 421-3152

111709

Dienstag 8. September

SU 16.52

27. Woche
253/174

USF
7

Tel. Mackay ✓

Tel. Lamons ✓

Tel. Mack ✓

Tel. Frank ✓

Tel. Gary ✓

Tel. Fred ✓

Tel. Laloy.

Tel. Elmer ✓ #

Frank Moors.

Bruce Verchere

Renat-Jans. Verchere

514.871.8193

Mittwoch 9. September

SU 18.50

27. Woche
253/118

Tel. Marc

Tel. Fred vs. Jim Lamons 2.2

Greg. Hotel

237.36.00

Elmer. / Ken. Oberm. #

11. Layoy + Bakem

20. Bi-Lamontre-Lamons

Bernad. Bibe. Cook

La. Marc. Montreal.


20. Jim. Gervais.

Jim Gervais Montreal.



Air Canada

Investor Relations
Relations avec les investisseurs



Receiving Fax No. (613) 782-2428 Date: AUG 27 No. of pages
No. du télécopieur du destinataire: 782-2428 Date: AUG 27 Nombre de feuilles: 1

TRANSMITTED TO / DESTINATAIRE

Name/Nom J. DOUCET
Title/Fonction _____
Company/Compagnie _____
Location/Adresse _____
Telephone No./ Numéro de téléphone: _____

TRANSMITTED FROM / EXPÉDITEUR

Name/Nom Denis A. Biro
Title/Fonction Manager, Investor Relations
Location/Adresse Air Canada - P.O. Box 14000, St. Laurent, Quebec H4Y 1H4
Telephone No. (514)422-5724 Fax No. (514)422-5739
Numéro de téléphone: _____ Numéro de télécopieur: _____

MESSAGE / MESSAGE

AIRBUS A320 DELIVERIES:
1990 - 7
1991 - 12
1992 - 12
1993 - 3
TOTAL 34

August 27 1993

MEMORANDUM

TO: Karlheinz Shreiber
FROM: Fred Doucet

Dear Karlheinz,

Mr. Biro has confirmed that 34 Airbus have been purchased and delivered to Air Canada according to the enclosed schedule.

I sincerely hope that this evidence, many times stated before, is emphatically and categorically relayed to F.M.

I hope you and Barbell had a good trip back and I hope to speak with you soon.


Every good wish.

Yours sincerely,

J.A. Doucet
Chief Executive Officer

encl.
JAD\bh

THE GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONSULTING GROUP INC.
• OTTAWA •



April 28, 1994

Mr. Karlheinz Schreiber
Bearhead Industries Ltd.
908-350 Sparks Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1R 7S8
Fax: 011-49-8191-7888

Dear Karlheinz,

I have now been able to carry out (once again) my assignment to find out accurately how many A320s were bought and fully paid by Air Canada directly from the Airbus Company.

The answer today is the same provided to me the last time I sought this information. The answer is 34 and this number is two more than what was originally contracted.

Now I can tell you the rest of the story which I believe is the cause of the confusion. And here it is: Air Canada, after it bought, fully paid, and took delivery of the 34 A320s directly from Airbus, did an internal arrangement which was quite smart. They sold seven of the A320s (over the last three years - 91, 92, 93) to a leasing company at a price higher than the price they had negotiated with Airbus (because of the large order) and agreed to lease them back from the leasing company, thereby realizing a significant profit on their books.

For our purpose, Karlheinz, we now have what we need and it is accurate beyond any doubt.

.../2

SUITE 320, 440 LAURIER AVE. WEST
OTTAWA, ONTARIO, CANADA K1R 7X6
TEL (613) 782-2338 FAX (613) 782-2428


-2-

I truly hope this removes the confusion. In fact it's even better than I had hoped because the total sale was 34, not 32, as we have on our pieces of paper from last summer.

For me, settling this matter is so very important for reasons I will tell you about in person.

Thanks very much.

Yours sincerely,



J.A. Doucet

P.S. I did not ask anything about the recent order for the large Airbus by Air Canada.

JAD/bh