

83-11-201705

**ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DONALD MARSHALL, JR., PROSECUTION**

---

MARITIME CENTRE, SUITE 1026, 1505 BARRINGTON STREET, HALIFAX  
NOVA SCOTIA, B3J 3K5 902-424-4800

CHIEF JUSTICE T. ALEXANDER HICKMAN  
CHAIRMAN

ASSOCIATE CHIEF JUSTICE LAWRENCE A. POITRAS  
COMMISSIONER

THE HONOURABLE  
MR. JUSTICE GREGORY THOMAS EVANS  
COMMISSIONER

October 27, 1987

Ms. Jean C. MacDonald  
P. O. Box 400  
Reserve Mines, Nova Scotia B0A 1V0

Dear Ms. MacDonald:

The Chief Justice has received your letter of October 7th, 1987 and has asked me to respond.

While we appreciate your concern about Ms. Harriss' testimony, you must understand that it is the duty of counsel to get all of the relevant facts from witnesses, as well as to test their credibility, if necessary. It was for the latter reason that counsel inquired into Ms. Harriss' previous convictions.

I am sure you will agree that it is very important that, once and for all, the true story should be told in this matter. Our aim is to get to the truth with the most credible evidence possible.

Thank you for your interest in this matter.

Yours very truly,

Susan M. Ashley,  
Commission Executive  
Secretary

SMA/ljb

Oct 8, 1987

Chief Justice T.A. Hickman  
Marshall Inquiry Commission  
Sydney, C.B.

Dear Sir:

I have followed the case of Donald Marshall for some years.

I would like to express the thought that the recent questioning of Miss Patricia Harriss was most unfair. It left one thinking that she would have been smart not to have gone to the police with information in 1971.

The reason I thought the questioning was very unfair, was that the lawyers had dug up convictions against Miss Harriss ~~since~~<sup>after</sup> 1971. At that time she was 14 years old.

What good did or does it do to expose to the public the facts of her shoplifting and alcohol convictions? This doesn't help the Inquiry.

Also, why not tell in detail all the convictions on liquor charges made against her companion, Terrace Gushoe.

His escapades were treated as a joke, while her's were detailed for all to know about—

I do not think that anyone will be a volunteer witness if all their other conflicts with the law, if any, are made public.

I do not believe any other witness had their other conflicts with the law exposed to the public as those of Miss Harriss were.

Sincerely,

Juan McDonald

P.O. Box 400

Reserve mines rd.

BOAIVO

5. Your mandate, as I understand it, is to conduct an Inquiry as to why D. Marshall was convicted of a crime he didn't commit, to inquire into the way the Sydney police carried on their business in the 1960's, 70's and 80's and to the involvement of the provincial government elected officials in the administration of Criminal Justice in N.S.

As this is an inquiry, not a trial, why are the lawyers permitted to discredit the character of witness by digging up personal conflicts with the law in later years, if those conflicts have no bearing on the 1971 testimony of a witness? Especially if witness was a child at that time?

**Attention!**

Patricia Harriss of Skin  
Care Clinic will be attend-  
ing Esthetic Workshop in  
Toronto, Oct. 15-Nov. 5,  
1987.

Oct. 16 c.B. post.  
**Patricia Harriss**

I do not know Patricia Harriss  
nor any of her family, but feel the  
cross questioning of a witness, who did  
not take part in the crime, was most  
unfair to her future and career in  
her home town.

Gene McDonald



JEAN C MACDONALD  
PO BOX 400  
RESERVE MINES NS  
BOA 1V0

Oct 8, 1987

Chief Justice T.A. Hickman  
Marshall Inquiry Commission  
Sydney, C.B.

Dear Sir:

I have followed the case of Donald Marshall for some years. I would like to express the thought that the recent questioning of Miss Patricia Harriss was most unfair. It left one thinking that she would have been smart not to have gone to the police with information in 1971.

The reason I thought the questioning was very unfair, was that the lawyers had dug up convictions against Miss Harriss <sup>after</sup> since 1971. At that time she was 14 years old.

What good did or does it do to expose to the public the facts of her shoplifting and alcohol convictions? This doesn't help the Inquiry.

Also, why not tell in detail all the convictions on liquor charges made against her companion, Terrace Gushoe.

His escapades were treated as a joke, while her's were detailed for all to know about.

I do not think that anyone will be a volunteer witness if all their other conflicts with the law, if any, are made public.

I do not believe any other witness had their other conflicts with the law exposed to the public as those of Miss Harriss were.

Sincerely,

Jean MacDonald

P.O. Box 400  
Reserve mines rd.  
BOAIVO

P.S. Your mandate, as I understand it, is to conduct an Inquiry as to why D. Marshall was convicted of a crime he didn't commit, to inquire into the way the Sydney police carried on their business in the 1960's, 70's and 80's and to the involvement of the provincial government elected officials in the administration of Criminal Justice in N.S.

As this is an inquiry, not a trial, why are the lawyers permitted to discredit the character of witness by digging up personal conflicts with the law in later years, if those conflicts have no bearing on the 1971 testimony of a witness? Especially if witness was a child at that time?

## **Attention!**

Patricia Harriss of Skin  
Care Clinic will be attend-  
ing Esthetic Workshop in  
Toronto, Oct. 15-Nov. 5,  
1987.

Oct. 16 <sup>c.B. post.</sup>  
**Patricia Harriss**

I do not know Patricia Harriss  
nor any of her family, but feel the  
cross questioning of a witness, who did  
not take part in the crime, was most  
unfair to her future and career in  
her home town.

Tom McDonald



CODE  
CODE POSTAL

Chief Justice Alexander Hickman

Marshall Inquiry

Bentick

St Andrew's Hall

(BIP/63)

f no delivery

Sydney

N.S.

c/o. Rev Thomas G Whent  
46 Lorway Av. Sydney N.S.

BIP 472