

Yugoslavs to demand extradition, which we weren't.

Now, he made the allegation. Anybody can make an allegation. For 32¢ American, you put it in an envelope, you make the allegation and then it gets leaked.

I was very concerned about that. I was interviewed and I frankly spoke to the people of the Office of Professional Responsibility. I don't know what their ultimate report is going to be, but they have told me specifically that the allegation against me is totally unsubstantiated. . . .

Interview: Jack Ramsay

People have concerns about retaining Sher

Mr. Ramsay is the Reform Party's Justice Critic in the Canadian House of Commons. He was interviewed by Scott Thompson on June 8.

EIR: How do you account for this lack of a background check on Neal Sher?

Ramsay: Well, I can't account for that. And, when Mr. Sims appeared before the committee, when Mr. Sher appeared, and I asked Mr. Sher to confirm that there was an investigation as to the conduct of the OSI [U.S. Department of Justice Office of Special Investigations], including his own conduct on the Artukovic case—after Mr. Sher validated that there was, in fact, an investigation—I asked Mr. Sims if he was aware of that. He said, “No.” And, that was very surprising. He later, after the meeting, sent a letter to Shaugnessy Cohen, the chairman of the committee, saying that he recalled afterwards that, last fall, Mr. Sher had brought this case to his attention. So, that's where that stands. He said in his statement before the committee that, “no,” he had not been aware of this. And then later, he said that his memory had failed him, and that later he did recall it, because Mr. Sher had made mention to him of that fact.

But, Mr. Sher did not make any mention of that when he appeared before the committee. So, I'm a little bit concerned in that area.

The real issue, is whether there is any grounds for these complaints [against Sher]. . . . So, what I'm interested in, and I think the community, particularly the Ukrainian community, is interested in, is whether the Office of Professional Responsibility in the United States has looked into these allegations in the Artukovic case, or any other case that has been brought to their attention—with a complaint—to determine whether or not it is valid.

So, I would very much like to know what the U.S. Department of Justice has determined as a result of Rad Artukovic's complaints.

Now, it's been nine years, I understand, since the thing started. And so, I don't know when it will finish. I understand it's close to being finished, and I don't know whether the findings will be reported. But, yes, we have some real concerns about a lack of a proper background check in light of the fact that many of these complaints were sent through to the Justice Department once—or prior to the hiring of Mr. Sher.

In fact, some of the members of the Ukrainian community in Canada met with the Justice Minister, and expressed their dismay over his hiring—based upon the Demjanjuk case, not upon the Artukovic case. And so, there was a clear signal sent to the Justice Department that people had concerns about retaining Mr. Sher for the purposes that they had retained him. . . .

What I'm concerned about, is answers to some of the allegations that have been raised by the people who are writing me. And not only myself, but other members of Parliament. That's why I asked for Mr. Sher to appear before the committee, so that we could place these allegations before him and have him respond to them, so that we could then send his response out to all the people who expressed a concern. What is the result of the OPR's investigation into the handling of the Artukovic case by Mr. Sher and other attorneys within the OSI? . . .

Now, all of the information that we have received, based upon the Demjanjuk case, is fine and dandy, but what I need, and what I'm interested in, is any evidence that ties Mr. Sher directly into the—he says he didn't know about this case and he wasn't the director at the time that the investigation started. But, he was the director at the time of the extradition of Mr. Demjanjuk to Israel as “Ivan the Terrible.” And so, this was a very important case. And yet, he's saying he didn't have hands-on knowledge of this.

If there's any evidence to show that that is not true, or that would refute what he's saying, I'm interested in that. . . .

EIR: What about Sher's comments that Demjanjuk is still, in his mind, a mass-murderer?

Ramsay: If you read on in the testimony, you'll find that I questioned him on that. He made a public statement that Demjanjuk was a mass-murderer. And, I questioned him on the lack of respect for the presumption of innocence contained within that remark, when there has been no court that has found him guilty of anything. But, . . . his response—and it's there if you've got the transcript—to the statements of the Israeli Supreme Court, which indicated that he [Demjanjuk] was a guard. And, so, that's his rationale for making that statement. I don't buy it, but that's his rationale. . . .

My concern goes, as far as the fact that there . . . does not seem to be respect for the presumption of innocence. . . .