

# MOSES CHARITONOFF IS ORDERED DEPORTED

---

## Immigration Board Takes Ac- tion—Case Against Alma- zoff Proceeding

---

Moses Charitonoff, radical Socialist editor, was ordered deported by the immigration board at its sitting yesterday afternoon, following the hearing of additional evidence at the morning session. The case against Solomon P. Almazoff is proceeding.

Marcus Hyman, representing Charitonoff, announced his intention of appealing from the decision at once. The grounds of the appeal, he said, would be insufficiency of evidence.

In giving the decision of the board Magistrate R. M. Noble, chairman of the board, declared that Canada was not ready for the activities of radicals of Charitonoff's kind.

### Didn't Comply With Act.

Evidence showed, he said, that Charitonoff had entered Canada with-

out complying with the provisions of the Immigration act as to having enough money.

Evidence as to his presence at the Walker theatre meeting of Jan. 22 showed, the magistrate said, that while he did not speak, he obviously participated in and countenanced the proceedings. He was present on the platform, and was referred to by speakers as an example of governmental injustice. He at that time was under conviction, later quashed, for having prohibited literature.

In making his plea for Charltonoff Mr. Hyman expressed surprise that the charges against him were of so slight a nature. He said that after seven weeks of preparations, with his client in jail, he had been led to believe there must be some conclusive evidence against him.

### Hyman Enters Protest.

He characterized the intention of the crown to ask for a conviction on the fact that Charltonoff had not had the necessary money when he entered Canada, although J. Bruce Walker, immigration commissioner, had given him permission to enter, and his presence, without speaking, at the Walker theatre, as a "prostitution of justice." He demanded to know if such evidence was to furnish the precedent for proceedings under the act.

In reply A. J. Andrews, K.C., representing the crown, said that many had been killed through the prolongation of the war, due to the treachery of the soviets of Russia. He said the nature of the meeting at the Walker theatre had not even been defended, and declared that Charltonoff was obviously an undesirable man. He threw particular emphasis on the vagueness of Charltonoff's answers to questions on the manner of his entry into Canada.

### Case Against Almazoff.

Solomon Pearl Almazoff appeared before the Immigration board yesterday for a continuation of his hearing. At the morning session of the board the evidence of Harry Daskaluk, R.N.W.M.P., regarding a meeting on May 2, when Almazoff spoke was taken. Under cross-examination by Marcus Hyman, lawyer for the accused, he was asked to define words used by Almazoff in his address. His answers were unsatisfactory.

All connection with the strike was denied by Almazoff during his cross-examination by A. J. Andrews, K.C., at the afternoon session. He declared that statements alleged to have been made by him at a meeting in the Liberty hall were false and that no statements advocating bloodshed had ever been made by him.

Telegrams sent by the accused to a Jewish paper in New York were introduced as evidence. Almazoff declared that he depended on the daily papers for the information he sent. He did not recollect taking any of the statements of the Strike

Bulletin, but admitted that he may have.

### Professor Testifies.

Professor D. L. Durkin, of Manitoba university, was put on the stand by the defence. He stated that Almazoff had been a pupil of his from Sept., 1915, until May, 1919. He had never in his knowledge expressed Bolshevick principles, although he had discussed the Russian situation with him. He gave it as his opinion that Almazoff had expressed opinions the reverse of Bolshevistik. The professor stated that as far as he knew Almazoff had a good character.

Marcus Hyman resumed the examination of Almazoff for the defence and inquired into receipts for money found in the prisoner's possession. Almazoff stated that they were for money which he had sent his mother and younger sisters and brothers in Russia. He had not had a letter from Russia for two years, he declared.

Almazoff stated that a misunderstanding of certain words used in his address on May 2 would entirely change the meaning of what he said. A list of words, whose meaning was not entirely understood by the crown witness in the morning, and which Almazoff used in his address, was submitted to the board by Marcus Hyman.

The case was adjourned till today to enable the defence to see the telegrams sent to the New York paper and to examine the dailies from which Almazoff stated he got the information for his telegrams.