

8. A summary of evidence was taken and submitted to this Headquarters on 22nd July, 1943. However, it was returned as Pte. Therrien and Pte. Beauchemin had not been heard as witnesses. These soldiers had been by this time transferred to other training centres in the district and had to be returned to C.A.B.T.C. No. 45 for the purposes of this case.

9. A new summary was prepared and submitted on 25th August, 1943. This was again returned as it contained much hearsay evidence and certain answers of the accused raised a doubt as to whether he appreciated his position.

10. On September 10th, 1943, the application for D.C.M. was again submitted and a copy of the charge sheet and summary were submitted under the provisions of K.R. (Can) 540 on 13th September, 1943.

11. On 25th September, 1943, authority to proceed with the trial was received via M.D. No. 3, as apparently the letter had been sent to that District in error.

12. In order to give the accused the usual notice of the legal qualifications of the Prosecutor, the Court Martial was convened to take place on 4th October, 1943.

13. It is thought that the above explains the delay in taking disciplinary action and in bringing the accused to trial. Owing to the peculiar circumstances there were delays which would not have occurred in an ordinary case. These delays are regretted, and it is most unlikely that there will be any repetition of similar delays.

E. J. Renaud
(E.J. RENAUD) MAJOR GENERAL,
DISTRICT OFFICER COMMANDING,
MILITARY DISTRICT NO. 4.