

JUDGE WILKINS: No. Maybe I misunderstood you. I understood you to say that after Dr. Schilf had been ordered from the Courtroom that you then got up and said, "The situation being what it is I can't continue." Did I misunderstand you?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that is a misunderstanding.

JUDGE WILKINS: What was your statement on that?

THE WITNESS: I merely answered Dr. Kranzbuehler's question, what feelings I had at the time. I did not make any statement when I arose.

JUDGE WILKINS: Oh, I thought I understood your saying that when you arose you said, "The situation being what it is..." I was mistaken then. It is a misunderstanding.

THE PRESIDENT: I thought the translation came through that way also. But it's all right.

INTERPRETER: Your Honor, he said, "I said to myself."

JUDGE WILKINS: Well, that's fine. Well, the record won't show that of course.

DR. KRANZBUEHLER: Your Honor, the interrogation is somewhat difficult, perhaps. May I suggest that the lady who is present here take over interpreting because she is best able to take over difficult interpretation.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think we can go along. That was just, I think, a misunderstanding perhaps on my part in listening. I understood it to say that he made that statement in open session here. That is the reason that I inquired about it, because I very definitely don't remember hearing any such statement. Now I understand that what he meant was that he said that to himself. And of course, the Tribunal wouldn't know. I think we can go along.

BY DR. KRANZBUEHLER:

Q. Witness, will you admit that such a decision needs a little more than spontaneous excitement? Your impressions, do they go further than the events of the morning?

A. Yes, I am afraid I have to affirm that.

Q. Can you tell me what overall picture you had of the possibility of expressing your opinions in the interest of your client, and were they heard?

A. On various days it was different of course. I must say that there were difficulties quite often to offer matters in a calm and factual manner.

Q. Did you have a comparison on the basis of which you could say that in this proceeding you were not given the same chance that you had in other proceedings?

A. I only know the proceedings of Military Tribunal Number Four. That was the Flick case. And I must say that it seems to me impossible that I could have done a similar thing as spontaneously as I did in this trial.

Q. Is it correct, then, that your behavior goes back to a feeling as defense counsel, "I have no possibility to express my opinion," for instance, the behavior toward Dr. Schilf?

A. It may be correct that my feeling was wrong; at any rate, it was my feeling, and I let myself be guided by my feeling. Not only my slighted honor, but also the feeling that the right of my client had been violated, or at least was endangered; and the worry about my client also moved me to take this step.

Q. You heard the description given by Dr. Schilf concerning the incidents which occurred after you left the Courtroom. Can you add anything concerning what happened?

A. No; Dr. Schilf has accurately described the incidents upstairs in the room of the defense counsel. I can only compare it with a bees hive which all the time working in order, by force, to complete this statement to explain our behavior which we thought we owed to the Court. We considered it an act of decency to inform the Court immediately as to the inner motivations for our actions, which caused us to leave the Courtroom. Unfortunately, the circumstances, and the cooperation of us many colleagues made it later and later in the day. I can assure you, however, that we did not for one minute stop work on this explanation. While some

of our colleagues ate their lunch in a hurry, others continued to work upstairs in order to present the statement to the Court, at least the contents of the statement before the noon recess.

Q. You heard the opinion of the Tribunal to some extent, didn't you? Why didn't the thought occur to you, or why didn't you carry it out, to appear here once more in order to make a motion that the session be adjourned because the defense was working on a basic statement, a basic motion, in order to explain this behavior?

A. I would have considered it a further affront to the Court if we had tried once more to make a motion after the attempt by my colleague Dr. Schilf had ended in his being removed from the Courtroom. Moreover, I can make the comparison again, of the beehive. In our great hurry and worry to present the statement to the Court as soon as possible, we did not have the idea to send any delegates to the Court.

Q Didn't you have the feeling that the defendants needed some sort of representation , in some form or other, during the session?

A We thought of it. All our actions came from our worries to care for the rights of our clients. As far as we are concerned, we don't matter. However, as stated in the interrogation of Dr. Schilf, we heard in the morning that document books were to be presented and that, according to ruling of the Court, they weren't to be read but merely the content of the index was to be disclosed. In other words, it was a formal matter. Therefore we believed that the rights of our clients could be safeguarded better by our working out a clean explanation than by being present at the formal presentation by the Prosecution. However, now as then I must say it is difficult to reconstruct these matters as objectively as could be done. This is a matter of feeling - and of emotion - and these matters can be put into words only with difficulty.

Q It was your opinion then that the interests of your clients could be safeguarded best by working out a clear statement concerning the events of the morning?

A Yes, that was our only platform on which we could come into contact with the Court once more.

Q Did you intend to enter the courtroom once more with this statement or was there only an intention to have one of you read the statement and then leave the courtroom again?

A We certainly intended in a group to enter the courtroom with this statement and to read the statement to the Court. Furthermore, we had decided, if the same thing was to happen to us as had happened to our colleague, Dr. Schilf - that is to say, if we were not to be given an opportunity to read our statement - that we would hand it in to the Secretary General because we thought that something would have to be done by us and that we owed it to the Court to make a statement concerning our behavior.

JUDGE DALY: Excuse me just a minute. You don't mean that you left

the Courtroom at quarter of twelve and stayed away until about ten minutes of four to form your statement as to why you left the Courtroom, do you? I am just asking this question to make sure I understand your last answer. Did you say that you left to prepare a statement that took you from ten minutes of twelve until about ten minutes of four, or thereabouts, to tell the Court why you left the Courtroom? Is that what you just said?

THE WITNESS: I don't know whether the Court has our explanation.
At any rate --

JUDGE DALY: No, I asked you about your answer. I am afraid you don't understand me. I will go slow: Did I understand you to answer the last question of Dr. Kranzbuehler in this fashion: That you left the Courtroom in order to prepare a statement to explain why you left the Courtroom?

THE WITNESS: The reasons why I left the Courtroom, I have already explained. For the main, they were dictated by my feelings. But But moreover we all - that is, I had the feeling we would have to do something in order to resume our contact with the Court. For that reason, as my colleague Schilf did say before, I asked him before the door, "What do you suggest now?"

JUDGE DALY: I am very sorry that my question is so hard to understand. I was simply asking you to repeat to me the answer you had given to Dr. Kranzbuehler to the last question before I interrupted. Now, if that is - if you don't remember, I will ask the court reporter if she can give it to us.

(Whereupon the reporter read the last question and answer).

JUDGE DALY: "concerning our" what?

REPORTER: "behavior".

JUDGE DALY: Thank you. Will you make a note of that please, Miss Reporter, so that I may have a transcript of that?

BY DRL KRANZBUEHLER:

Q Witness, therefore part of the morning and part of the afternoon

you worked on the statement. This statement was given to me in the conference yesterday afternoon. I want to show it to you in order that you may identify it.

A Yes, that is the statement which we wanted to present through Herr Dr. Pohle.

DR. KRANZBUEHLER: May I offer this statement as an exhibit to the record, if the Court permits?

THE PRESIDENT: Go ahead.

DR. KRANZBUEHLER: Since it has more than two pages, I do not want to use the Court's time to read it completely.

THE PRESIDENT: (I think we may concede, Dr. Kranzbuehler) - You may put it in the record. We may concede that these lawyers were out preparing the statement at the time, that they were out preparing it and that they were doing so. The drux of it seems to me their failure to give the Court any intimation whatsoever of what they were doing or why they left or for what purpose. So far as I know, no one has contended here, last Friday or today, that the Court was at the time or thereafter given any intimation about what counsel were doing, why they left, or when they expected to come back. I just suggest that that seems to be of some importance at least in my mind. You may put that statement in the record, Doctor.

DR. KRANZBUEHLER: Thank you. Perhaps it would be easier to answer the question asked by the President if the Tribunal knows what the Defense counsel wanted to state and the end of the explanation. There are two short motions and I should like to read those two motions. The motion begins with the preliminary history of the appointment of the Commissioner and a short statement of the incidents in the session of the 16th of January and the leaving of the Courtroom by Dr. Schilf. Then there is the last numeral of the motion, No. 5, and I quote: "Thereupon the Defense Counsels present besides Dr. Schilf also left the Courtroom. The Defense Counsel was forced to this step for the following reasons: (a) The Presiding Judge refused the right to a

Defense Counsel to make and substantiate factual motion which had not been ruled upon by the Court. The motion intended to be put by Dr. Schilf was based on the ruling made by the Court before the appointment of the Commissioner; (b) moreover, the Defense as a whole, felt slighted because of the manner in which Dr. Schilf's words were cut off and because he was not given the chance to make his motion. We therefore request the Court to make a ruling which will do justice to the rights of the defendants and the Defense Counsel." I am handing this application, this motion, as an exhibit -

THE PRESIDENT: Pass it to the Secretary General and let it be made a part of the record in this case.

Q Dr. Wecker, now that you have heard what the motion proposed, will you once more state very clearly for what reasons the defense counsel considered it right not to return to the session and not to send individual representatives to the court before they had not presented this motion the way it was formulated by them?

A The reason for this was that he felt we owed this explanation to the court and we were afraid that our whole behavior might be misconstrued if we returned to the court without any explanation whatsoever.

Q When you say "we", do you also mean the individual defense counsels?

A Yes.

Q We just now heard the question of the presiding judge why you did not notify the Tribunal that the defense counsel were occupied with shaping this motion. Can you explain this?

A The only explanation I can give is that from minute to minute we thought the explanation would be finished and that we would go down ourselves with this explanation. There is really no other explanation for this. Once again I cite the comparison of the bee hive. There were about twenty defense counsels working on this one statement. Added to this was the fact that the sound recording had to be studied and checked because we did not want to be reproached for falsifying anything what had happened. We wanted to be absolutely certain that anything we told to the court would be exactly as we looked at the matter.

Q During that time did you consider the thought that the court might be prevented from continuing the proceedings because of the absence of defense counsel?

A No, we never thought -- I can only speak for myself -- I never considered this thought, the less so since we knew that documents were to be presented, and in the manner described just before, in the abbreviated manner.

Q Then you did know that the Tribunal continued in the absence of the defense counsel?

A Yes.

Q From former rulings of the court did you know that all objections could be submitted later on and at a later time in writing in a brief?

A Yes.

Q You didn't have any immediate concern that your absence would prejudice the rights of your client in this short period of trial?

A We needn't have had this concern, the less so since I don't know whether the court ordered that a certain number of defense counsel has to be present.

Q I don't think that has ever been ordered. Dr. Wecker, when you look at the matter in retrospect, will you admit that it would have been right to inform the Tribunal of the fact that the defense counsel were occupied with drafting a motion and request to the court?

A Yes, quite. There is no doubt about it.

Q Because of this formal offense against the rules of courtesy will you tender your apologies to the court?

A Yes.

Q Moreover, are you of the opinion that the behavior during the morning session, that is, the spontaneous arising and leaving the courtroom, of your colleagues was a breach of courtesy and of the respect due to the court? Or is it rather, in your opinion, merely that your duties as defense counsel, with his own feeling of honor, forced you to do that, in order to safeguard the interests of your clients?

A Such incidents always have two sides -- an objective and a subjective side. Without doubt, it is correct to say that of course, the court from which the whole defense counsel runaways can justly feel insulted, and objectively speaking, this is an incident which is not normal and is not desirable in the interest of the proceedings. Concerning

the subjective side of the matter, it is my opinion that today I would consider myself very bad if I acted differently. I arose at that time in the feeling of having been insulted, insulted by the manner in which our highly-revered colleague, Dr. Sehlf, had been treated. As I said, perhaps this feeling of honor is too high-faluting. We Germans are often accused of having a high-faluting feeling of honor. At any rate, a human being can't change his nature.

Q In your behavior on the 16th of January, did you at any time have the intention or consciousness that you were acting in contempt of court or disrespectful to the court?

A No, these considerations which now occur to me never occurred to me at that time. When Judge Anderson during the conference or the session on the 17th asked me whether I acted in agreement with the other gentlemen, or whether this was spontaneous, I used the word spontaneous. I said, if I recollect, that I acted because I felt my honor slighted.

THE PRESIDENT: Excuse me just a minute. Isn't there an error there? You spoke about Judge Anderson asking you something on the 17th. The 17th was Saturday, you mean the 16th, on Friday?

DR. WECKER: I mean the 16th, I beg your pardon.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY DR. KRANZBUEHLER:

Q Is it, then, correct to say that your behavior on the 16th of January was based on your conception of the professional honor of an attorney and your conception of the duties of a defense counsel to safeguard the rights of his client in a very unusual situation for you and all the other concerned?

A Yes.

DR. KRANZBUEHLER: No further questions, Your Honor.

EXAMINATION

BY JUDGE WILKINS:

Q Dr. Wecker, you have been serving as an assistant for Dr. Kranzbuehler, have you not?

A I think the word "assistant" is somewhat misleading. Dr. Kranzbuehler, when he took over the case of Kommerzienrat Roehling, requested me to act as his representative, that is, to take his place as the defense counsellor appointed by the court.

Q That was temporarily while Dr. Kranzbuehler was off on the other case in the French Zone?

A Yes.

Q Did you understand that you were to act as Chief Counsel in the case, just as Dr. Kranzbuehler had been serving?

A At least that was the understanding between myself and Dr. Kranzbuehler.

DR. KRANZBUEHLER: Excuse me, I think there is some sort of misunderstanding concerning the word "Chief Counsel". Dr. Wecker was not to be the spokesman of the defense counsel; as I told the Tribunal, that was to be Dr. Pohle.

EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY JUDGE WILKINS:

Q Thank you. I will ask you this, Dr. It is true that you and Dr. Pohle have taken the leading part in the conduct on behalf of the defense in this trial since the Christmas holidays?

A Yes, I don't know what you understand by leading part, Your Honor. If you mean that I took Dr. Kranzbuehler's place as defense counsel of Herr Von Bohlen, that is right, just so as Dr. Pohle took the place as the defense counsel for Dr. Ihn.

Q What I mean to say was, and the record will show, is that you and Dr. Pohle conducted most of the cross examination or raised objections, and so on, during the course of the trial?

A Yes.

Q In view of the fact that you recognize, don't you, that there was a greater responsibility on you and Dr. Pohle than on the other defense counsel, do you not?

A Not really, Your Honor. Each defense counsel has the same right and the same duties as we do, to take over the leadership, if you want to call it that. It is my opinion that each defense counsel must raise objections and that each lawyer must make motions in the interest of his client. The fact that Dr. Pohle and myself were a little outstanding in our activity is based on the fact that in contrast to our other colleagues, or to some of them, we have more experience in the trials before military Tribunals.

Q May I suggest, Doctor, that you just listen to my question? Try and answer as briefly as you can. You did take a leading part in the conduct of the trial as far as the defense is concerned, did you not?

A Yes.

Q In that capacity, don't you think a greater responsibility rested on your shoulders than on the shoulders of the others?

A That is not my opinion, really.

Q Did they look to you for leadership?

A No.

Q When this incident occurred, Doctor -- and I am referring now to when Dr. Schilf was finally told to remove himself from the courtroom -- what did you do?

A I rose and followed Dr. Schilf.

Q You rose and stood immediately in front of the rostrum here for a minute, looking down toward the other counsel, did you not?

A It is possible.

Q Did you lead the way out or did you follow some of the others?

A I don't remember, Your Honor.

Q Did you give any signal at all?

A I don't remember.

Q You don't remember?

A No.

Q Would you say that you were the last one out or one of the first ones out?

A I don't remember whether I was the first or the last one.

Q Now, you left, Doctor, all of you with no concert of action whatsoever?

A That is correct.

Q When you got outside you decided that a petition should be drawn up to submit to the Court?

A That was our first resolve.

Q So 24 or 26 of you worked on this and were still working on it when we sent word to you at ten minutes past three?

A Yes.

Q I think you said "like a swarm of bees"?

A Yes.

Q Now, is this the product of those hours of consultation and work together that you have submitted here?

A Yes.

Q This consists of two legal size sheets, and two lines on the third sheet?

A Yes. May I remind you of the sound record. We were determined to listen to the sound record before putting this statement into final shape.

Q Now, Doctor, under the circumstances, having been charged with this responsibility to represent the Defendant Krupp in the absence of Dr. Kranzbuehler, and I assume that he chose you because of your long experience at the bar, now don't you think that under those circumstances you were neglecting the rights of your client by agreeing with all of the others in remaining away from this Courtroom deliberately, knowing that the Court was in session and not even sending your assistant Dr. Geissler here to look after your interests, or one or two of the other assistants in this "swarm" to come down here and represent them?

A I realize now that it was quite wrong.

Q May I ask you, Doctor, is it a common occurrence, or is it usual for a group of German lawyers representing a defendant charged with crime to get up because they dislike the ruling of a German court and leave in a body?

A No, it is an unusual occurrence.

Q Have you ever done that before yourself in a German court?

A No, and neither before an American Court.

Q Have you known of any German lawyers who in a group have committed a similar act of disrespect to a German court in your vast experience?

A To my knowledge, the case occurred in which a group arose spontaneously and left the Courtroom. However, I cannot give you any detailed cases. As far as I know in this building too representatives of the defense as well as the prosecution arose and left the courtroom.

Q When was this?

A I heard this about a case; that was the RuSHA Case.

Q Well, you mean a German case?

A No, it was a case before a Military Tribunal.

Q Well, let me see it so I can understand it. Which Tribunal was that?

A I can't tell you exactly, but I was informed about this case during the recess.

Q You mean with reference to these military tribunals that have been operating here in the last two years?

A I don't know the exact details, Judge Wilkins.

Q Do I understand from what you heard that someone took offense at a ruling of the court and as a result all the members of the prosecution and of the defense left, deliberately got up and left?

A No, Your Honor.

Q That is what we are talking about.

A This case, as far as I know, refers to one member either of the defense or the prosecution, I don't know which.

Q You mean one individual getting up?

A Yes.

Q Well, it is true, Doctor, throughout the progress of this trial two or three of you get up at a time and leave, and come in at your will.

A The case that was reported to me was a spontaneous demonstration. It wasn't simply a getting up and leaving; however, I only mention this case because you asked me for my experiences.

Q Well, how many years have you practiced before the German courts?

A 10 years.

Q Ten years. You are a graduate of a law school, I take it?

A Yes.

Q Now, Doctor, what would be the reaction of a German judge hearing a case and all of the defense counsel because he ruled against one of the counsel get up and leave the courtroom? What would happen?

A I believe the court would be dissatisfied with the defense counsel.

Q Under your code of ethics would it be at all considered a disrespect to the German court?

A Certainly.

Q Well, why did you do this, then, Doctor, last Friday morning here, in order to be disrespectful to the Court?

A No, Your Honor, it was far from my thoughts to be an obstructionist or to show contempt of court. It was, as I stated before, a purely spontaneous emotion under which I was laboring, and in my opinion, one which resulted from the not quite appropriate manner in which my colleague Schilf was addressed.

Q Well, did you have an opportunity to cool off during the noon hour while you had your luncheon?

A All of us, until our return to the Court, were quite excited because we ourselves were aware of the fact that this was a special event.

Q Special event?

A And that we owed the Court an explanation of our behavior.

Q Well, why didn't you come in Court and make an explanation?

A Your Honor, we actually hoped from one minute to the next that we could present the explanation, and this explanation unfortunately dragged out --

Q Why didn't you come in personally at 1:30, Doctor, and explain to the Court what you were planning to do. You have had no difficulty in expressing yourself before this Tribunal here before, have you?

A No, Your Honor, that undoubtedly would have been the right thing to do.

Q Now, I just want to ask you one other question, and besides the particular point we have in mind, we are particularly interested in why you left; but when the two members of the court met with a committee of your group and the committee of the prosecution on either Monday or Tuesday night and again on Thursday night, did you understand that that was an act of courtesy on the part of the Court in endeavoring to help you all agree on some procedure that would speed up the trial rather than an attempt on the part of the Court

to be vicious in any way toward you?

A You are quite right in saying, Judge Wilkins, certainly as I remember it, you, yourself, addressed us in a very friendly tone and told us that you would assist us in any manner possible.

Q Excuse me, Doctor, didn't I tell you this too, that if after discussing these witnesses who have made affidavits here and whom you desire to cross examine, if after discussing those with the prosecution you really felt that some of those were vital to your defense that we would see that you had an opportunity to call them before the Tribunal?

A.- Yes.

Q.- I just wanted to have you agree to that because that is what I tried to tell you at that time, and I gathered from what you said today that you had misunderstood.

JUDGE DALY: Judge Wilkins, will you let me ask a question on that same point?

JUDGE WILKINS: I have finished anyway.

BY JUDGE DALY:

Q.- I'd like to ask you, Dr. Wecker, referring to the meeting on, I think, tuesday night, tuesday after court, I think it was the 23rd when we met in my office.

A.- Yes.

Q.- You remember my saying then at the outset of that meeting that although there was talk about commissioners or a commissioner taking evidence, I had no personal feelings in the matter. If you had some counter-proposal that would take care of everybody and expedite the case, I would be glad to have that instead of commissioners. You remember that? Then if you don't remember it say so, if that wasn't said.

A.- I do remember exactly, Judge Daly, and that is why I was so amazed to be confronted so to speak with this commissioner, namely, Mr. Dietz, at the next conference.

Q.- Well, let's just discuss the first conference for a moment; and didn't I say to you -- I talked in English and you talked in English --

A.- Yes.

Q.- And there was a lady interpreter present, and after I said anything she wrote it down, and if any of the lawyers for the defendants wanted it, she read to them then what had been said, isn't that true?

A.- Yes.

Q.- And didn't I tell you it wasn't expected that you lawyers who were there would have any opinion on the subject at all at that time that

we expected you to confer with your associates, and after you had conferred with them the matter would be taken up further and dealt with, isn't that right?

A.- Yes, that is right. You even advised us to get in touch with the Prosecution in order to achieve an agreement concerning the best proceeding possible.

Q.- Well, now, that was on the 13th of January, the last tuesday. Was there anything in that conference that I did or said that in any way caused you to feel that you or your clients were not getting justice and fairness?

A.- By no means, your Honor.

Q.- Now, then, let's go to the meeting of the 15th on last thursday which was held in this room at this table, and there were two interpreters present. The same lady and this gentleman who sits here now with the earphones on, and as I remember it, while I was present neither of them said anything. The conference was mostly between Judge Wilkins, you and me, isn't that right?

A.- Yes.

Q.- Now, at that time when I was with the lawyers about 15 minutes -- well, to go back, the defense lawyers did not get back here to this courtroom until after Judge Wilkins and I were here, and also Mr. Thayer and Mr. Ragland were in here when you arrived, isn't that right?

A.- Yes.

Q.- You remember my saying that I had an engagement and had

to leave at 5 o'clock?

A Yes, we were sorry to hear that.

Q An that my participation in the conference could only last until 5 o'clock?

A Yes.

Q Now, did anything happen at that conference to cause you to feel that you and your clients weren't being dealt with fairly by me?

A No, Your Honor.

JUDGE DALY: I think we'd better recess at this time.

THE PRESIDENT: Had you finished?

JUDGE DALY: I have some more questions.

THE PRESIDENT: Our recess time has arrived. We will have to recess until tomorrow morning at 9:30. The six members of the defense counsel in question will stand on their own recognizance.

JUDGE WILKINS: May I ask one question, Judge Anderson, so that I am sure that I have Dr. Wecker's correct statement.

BY JUDGE WILKINS:

Q Doctor, do I understand, you to say that in the light of all that has happened and now looking back, you honestly feel and you so state that your conduct was -- that is in leaving the courtroom with all of the others -- disrespectful to the Court and not in the best interests of your clients?

A Yes, in this respect I quite agree with you.

JUDGE WILKINS: All right.

THE PRESIDENT: I must make one statement further on a wholly different matter. It is imperative that we do something about this application for an examination of the Defendant Houdremont. He is ill, and the prison physician some days ago requested that he be committed to the hospital for further examination. We quite readily agreed to that and were prepared to offer him all the facilities that are available

19 January 48-4-1-ATD-24-2b-Perrin (Int. Horn)
Court 3, Case 10

here, but at that time he did not want to go, but since that we have received a written petition saying that as much as he regrets to be absent from the proceeding, he feels that his condition is such as to need the examination; and, of course, we are very glad to order that to be done. Now, is that correct, Mr. Houdremont? Wait just a minute, I haven't got this harness. Do you wish to go now to the --

THE DEFENDANT HOUDREMONT: I don't think I can accept the responsibility of refusing the medical examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, now, do you want to go? We will let you, but if you don't want to, we don't want to force you to do it.

THE DEFENDANT HOUDREMONT: If the physician is of the opinion that it is necessary, I have to do it.

THE PRESIDENT: Now, we will order also that at your request Professor Sturm be present at your examination. That is what you requested and we will try to have that done, at least as far as the Tribunal can do so, why we will have that done. So, Mr. General Secretary, why you arrange to have Mr. Houdremont taken to the hospital in accordance with this request.

(The Tribunal recessed until 0930 hours 20 January 1947.)