THE CORNWALL PUBLIC INQUIRY



L'ENQUÊTE PUBLIQUE SUR CORNWALL

Public Hearing

Audience publique

Commissioner

The Honourable Justice / L'honorable juge G. Normand Glaude

Commissaire

VOLUME 251

Held at: Tenue à:

Hearings Room 709 Cotton Mill Street Cornwall, Ontario K6H 7K7 Salle des audiences 709, rue de la Fabrique Cornwall, Ontario K6H 7K7

Thursday, July 3 2008

Jeudi, le 3 juillet 2008

INTERNATIONAL REPORTING INC. www.irri.net (800) 899-0006

ERRATA Volume 249 June 27th, 2008

Transcript

Page 118, line 5

Me DUMAIS: O.k. Diligence du tribunal pour

une minute?

Should have read:

Me DUMAIS: O.k. Indulgence du tribunal pour

une minute?

Appearances/Comparutions

Mr. Peter Engelmann Lead Commission Counsel

Ms. Julie Gauthier Registrar

Ms. Maya Hamou Commission Counsel

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Ms. Mary Simms} \\ \text{M}^{\text{e}} \text{ Simon Ruel} \end{array}$

Mr. Peter Manderville Cornwall Community Police
Ms. Reena Lalji Service and Cornwall Police

Service Board

Mr. Neil Kozloff Ontario Provincial Police

Actg.Det.Supt. Colleen McQuade

Ms. Diane Lahaie

Mr. David Rose Ontario Ministry of Community

and Correctional Services and Adult Community Corrections

Mr. Abel Fok Attorney General for Ontario

Mr. Peter Chisholm The Children's Aid Society of

the United Counties

Mr. Peter Wardle Citizens for Community Renewal

Mr. Juda Strawczynski

Mr. Dallas Lee Victims' Group

Mr. David Sherriff-Scott Diocese of Alexandria-Cornwall

and Bishop Eugene LaRocque

Mr. Mark Ertel The Estate of Ken Sequin and

Doug Seguin and Father Charles

MacDonald

Me Danielle Robitaille Mr. Jacques Leduc

Mr. William Carroll Ontario Provincial Police

Association

Appearances/Comparutions

Mr. Ian Paul Coalition for Action

Père Denis Vaillancourt Père Denis Vaillancourt

Father Kevin Maloney Father Kevin Maloney

Table of Contents / Table des matières

| | Page |
|---|------|
| List of Exhibits : | vi |
| Submissions by/Représentations par Mr. Dallas Lee | 1 |
| Submissions by/Représentations par Mr. David Sherriff-Scott | 2 |
| Submissions by/Représentations par Mr. Peter Wardle | 7 |
| Submissions by/Représentations par Mr. Ian Paul | 10 |
| Submissions by/Représentations par Mr. Peter Chisholm | 11 |
| Submissions by/Représentations par Mr. David Rose | 12 |
| Submissions by/Représentations par M ^e Danielle Robitaille | 13 |
| Submissions by/Représentations par Ms. Reena Lalji | 13 |
| Submissions by/Représentations par Ms. Diane Lahaie | 14 |
| Submissions by/Représentations par Mr. William Carroll | 14 |
| Submissions by/Représentations par Mr. Peter Engelmann | 15 |
| Ruling by the Commissioner/Décision par le Commissaire | 18 |
| Submissions by/Représentations par Mr. David Sherriff-Scott | 21 |
| Submissions by/Représentations par Mr. Dallas Lee | 23 |
| Submissions by/Représentations par Mr. Peter Manderville | 27 |
| Submissions by/Représentations par Mr. Peter Engelmann | 27 |
| PÈRE DENIS VAILLANCOURT, Resumed/Sous le même serment | 33 |
| Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Dallas Lee(cont'd/suite) | 33 |

Table of Contents / Table des matières

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Peter Chisholm | 40 |
| Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par M ^e Danielle Robitaille | 43 |
| Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. David Sherriff-Scott | 48 |
| FATHER KEVIN MALONEY, Sworn/Assermenté | 51 |
| Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoire en-chef par M ^e Simon Ruel | 52 |

LIST OF EXHIBITS/LISTE D'EXHIBITS

| NO. | DESCRIPTION | PAGE NO |
|--------|---|---------|
| P-1855 | Public List of Names of Priests for Which Questions may be Asked | 31 |
| C-1856 | Confidential List of names of Priests for which Questions may be Asked | 31 |
| P-1857 | CV - Father Kevin Maloney | 53 |
| P-1858 | (129779) - Meeting of the Council of Priests dated 13 Sep 89 | 70 |
| P-1859 | (120890) - Archive Occurrence Report by CPS | 90 |
| P-1860 | (721620 -7080511) - Case Notes of CAS Richard Abell dated 22 May 97 | 110 |
| P-1861 | (721626 -7080792) - Letter from Father Kevin Maloney to Richard Abell dated 20 May 97 | 114 |
| P-1862 | (721686) - Letter from Thomas Swabey to Richard Abell dated 27 Jun 97 | 116 |
| P-1863 | (721685) - Letter from Thomas Swabey to Patrick Rudden dated 25 Jun 97 | 121 |
| P-1864 | (700931) - Letter from Lorne McConnery to Pat Hall dated 15 Aug 01 | 132 |

| 1 | Upon commencing at 9:41 a.m./ |
|----|--|
| 2 | L'audience débute à 9h41 |
| 3 | THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre |
| 4 | veuillez vous lever. |
| 5 | This hearing of the Cornwall Public Inquiry |
| 6 | is now in session. The Honourable Mr. Justice Normand |
| 7 | Glaude, Commissioner, presiding. |
| 8 | Please be seated. Veuillez vous asseoir. |
| 9 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Good morning, |
| 10 | all. |
| 11 | Good morning, Mr. Lee. |
| 12 | SUBMISSIONS BY/REPRÉSENTATIONS PAR MR. LEE: |
| 13 | MR. LEE: Good morning, sir. |
| 14 | THE COMMISSIONER: How did we make out? |
| 15 | MR. LEE: Not terribly well. |
| 16 | THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, okay. |
| 17 | MR. LEE: When we left yesterday, we I |
| 18 | had agreed to put my list to paper and email it around to |
| 19 | the parties. I did that last night, I believe around 7:30 |
| 20 | or so. I've had some discussions with a few of the parties |
| 21 | this morning, and with Mr. Sherriff-Scott obviously. We |
| 22 | have not come to any kind of consensus on how this should |
| 23 | proceed. |
| 24 | I as you know, my original intention was |
| 25 | to read out a name, ask some questions and move on to the |

next name. That is my preference.

| 2 | Yesterday it sounded like perhaps we had an |
|----|---|
| 3 | agreement that we may put some kind of list to the witness |
| 4 | file it as an exhibit and move on from there. That appears |
| 5 | to now be off the table in terms of a consensus being |
| 6 | reached on that at least. I'll let Mr. Sherriff-Scott |
| 7 | speak to it, obviously, but as I understand his suggestion |
| 8 | he would prefer the list to be put to the witness as a sort |
| 9 | of aide-mémoire, not filed in any way, and have him go |
| 10 | through the list, and if he flags anybody on the list for |
| 11 | us, we would expand on that name and otherwise his answer |
| 12 | would be, "I have nothing to say about any of these |
| 13 | people." |
| 14 | The concern I have about that is we then |
| 15 | have no kind of record of which names were on the list, |
| 16 | which I say doesn't do us a whole lot of good. |
| 17 | So that's where we're at. My position |
| 18 | remains that the easiest way to do this and the preferable |
| 19 | way of doing this is for me to simply ask this witness |
| 20 | about each of these names. And I presume that some of the |
| 21 | parties may want to address you on that, but that's that |
| 22 | remains my position. |
| 23 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Thank you. |
| 24 | SUBMISSIONS BY/REPRÉSENTATIONS PAR MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: |
| 25 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: It was proposed that I |

| 1 | speak to this first by some of my colleagues. |
|----|---|
| 2 | I received good morning, sir. |
| 3 | THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning. |
| 4 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: I received the list |
| 5 | last night and I now understand what is being proposed in |
| 6 | the concrete and I've had time to consider it and take |
| 7 | instruction with my client. |
| 8 | And having had that opportunity, I am of the |
| 9 | position and I suggest that the approach to oral |
| 10 | questioning, as proposed by my friend, or the use of a list |
| 11 | put in evidence, as I'll develop, is highly prejudicial, I |
| 12 | would submit inflammatory and, for reasons that I'll |
| 13 | develop, unnecessary, and I unequivocally object to it now |
| 14 | and in every instance in which it is attempted. |
| 15 | The approach, I submit, whether oral or in |
| 16 | list format as evidence will result, I suggest, in |
| 17 | allegations against people being repeated over and over |
| 18 | again with each witness who takes the stand, which is the |
| 19 | stated intention of the proponent. |
| 20 | Just like I suggest websites in the past, |
| 21 | this will effectively repeat allegations and innuendo about |
| 22 | people and hammer them into the collective consciousness |
| 23 | with resultant harm and, I suggest, a lack of |
| 24 | responsibility. |
| 25 | Some of these people were never charged. |

| 1 | Some were never the subject of a public allegation or an |
|----|---|
| 2 | allegation to a public institution. Others were the |
| 3 | subject of allegations investigated but no basis to charge |
| 4 | them was found. Many are alive, living and working in this |
| 5 | community. Still others are deceased and no allegations |
| 6 | against them have ever been made, but their families and |
| 7 | relatives are living and working in this community and will |
| 8 | hear this information for the first time. |
| 9 | I suggest that in the result, the Inquiry |
| 10 | would become, if this proposal is followed in this |

would become, if this proposal is followed in this instance, just like the websites, and become an instrument of harm not only in relation to people identified but in relation to the community at large.

Once more, I suggest unspecified allegations will be the threshold for public dissemination of allegations. "He is on the list" will be enough.

List format, I suggest, orally or in question vein misapprehends the need to balance the rights and interests of people affected by your proceeding, and it is the argument often repeated yesterday by the proponent that is based on a false premise, I submit; that those who may have been the subject of perhaps website allegations in the past have no rights in this regard or there is nothing to balance about them once accused on a website.

I disagree. This relegates people to the

| 1 | status | of dar | naged | god | ods, wh | nereas | the | digni | ty | and | worth | of |
|---|---------|--------|-------|-----|---------|---------|------|-------|-----|------|-------|----|
| 2 | every p | person | must | be | weighe | ed here | e in | this | pro | cess | 5. | |

I suggest the pairing of what amounts and is conceded by the proponent of effectively an innuendo or allegation over and over again will cause damage but, moreover, it is unnecessary.

I therefore propose what I consider to be a solution which advances everybody's interests: Your interest, Commissioner, in getting at information; my friend's interest in identifying what he considers to be his inquiry on this point; as well as the interests of people on the list, and that is this: That the document be used merely as an aide-mémoire by the witness; that the witness be asked in two categories of information. There are those, for example, who will be known to the witness to have been subject to public charges, investigation, or public allegations in the media or some medium, and there will be the others that the witness does not recognize in that category.

I suggest the interests of the Inquiry be satisfied in the first instance by asking the witness whether or not he recognizes or knows of information about the first category which came to his attention or to the attention of the Diocese before any of that happened; that is to say, before investigations, charges, or the

| 2 | If that is the case, the issue can be |
|----|---|
| 3 | explored by my friend. The witness can be asked, "What did |
| 4 | the Diocese do? What didn't it do?" |
| 5 | In connection with the other category that |
| 6 | the person doesn't recognize as having been the subject of, |
| 7 | say, public allegations or charges, the witness can be |
| 8 | asked the same question, "What information do you know |
| 9 | about these people, if any?" If they're not identified or |
| 10 | he doesn't have any information on any person, I submit |
| 11 | there's simply no interest in identifying that person's |
| 12 | name. The Inquiry will know that my friend's desire to |
| 13 | inquire with respect to particular names is satisfied and |
| 14 | the witness will have no information. Thus, there is no |
| 15 | need to put the name forward. |
| 16 | If the name is identified or a name is |
| 17 | identified, in a similar vein, my friend can explore, "What |
| 18 | did the Diocese know? What did it do? What did it not |
| 19 | do?" |
| 20 | I suggest this satisfies and balances |
| 21 | everybody's interests, as we are bound to do here, and it |
| 22 | will not result in any prejudice. It will neutralize |
| 23 | prejudice and serve your interests, as well as be efficient |
| 24 | from the point of view of economy in time. |
| 25 | Thank you. |

dissemination of this information in a public medium.

| 1 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
|----|--|
| 2 | All right. Anyone else want to wander in? |
| 3 | Mr. Wardle? |
| 4 | Is there any problem with me seeing the list |
| 5 | at this time? |
| 6 | SUBMISSIONS BY/REPRÉSENTATIONS PAR MR. WARDLE: |
| 7 | MR. WARDLE: I was going to suggest that, |
| 8 | Mr. Commissioner. I have a copy which my friend has |
| 9 | provided to me. I don't know if we have extra copies. We |
| 10 | have extra copies. |
| 11 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. M'hm. Go |
| 12 | ahead, sir. |
| 13 | MR. WARDLE: Mr. Commissioner, my client is |
| 14 | opposed to the use of a list, period, whether it's marked |
| 15 | or used as an aide-mémoire, and our primary concern is |
| 16 | about the integrity of the Commission's processes and its |
| 17 | credibility in this community. |
| 18 | If you look at the list, you'll see it |
| 19 | contains, as Mr. Sherriff-Scott alluded to, a number of |
| 20 | categories. For example, one of the names is Father Paul |
| 21 | Lapierre, who we know has been convicted. |
| 22 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. M'hm. |
| 23 | MR. WARDLE: There are names on the list |
| 24 | against whom allegations have been made. For example, when |
| 25 | Mr. Marleau was here, he testified about abuse by some |

| 1 | | _] | ما ب | 7 4 ~ 4 |
|---|----------|--------|------|---------|
| 1 | individu | als on | LIIE | TISC. |

There are names on this list who have been investigated, for example, by Project Truth but never charged.

There are names on this list who I think everyone in the room would say allegations were made against but their names have since been cleared, and you're going to be hearing from one of those individuals shortly, and he apparently -- this is Father Maloney -- will testify about the effect having false allegations against him have had on his reputation and standing in the community.

So there's a melange here, and the primary concern is that if Father "X" is on this list and this list is marked as an exhibit, the public at large will be unable to distinguish Father "X" from Father Lapierre.

And whatever you may say and whatever Mr.

Lee may say and whatever the witness may say, the very fact that this is a list that's been marked as a public exhibit, some people in this community are going to treat those individuals as being on the same page. That's the concern.

And I have a second concern which is related to that and, again, it deals with the integrity of the processes of this Commission. As I understand Mr. Lee's position, he does not have any information today that this witness who is now in the witness box actually knew about

| 1 | any allegations about anybody on this list. He simply |
|----|---|
| 2 | wants to put the list to him, hoping to elicit some |
| 3 | information that may be useful to him. |
| 4 | In other words, having had this Inquiry now |
| 5 | going on for two years of almost two years of testimony, |
| 6 | 68,000 records at last count, Mr. Lee has been here |
| 7 | throughout, as I understand it. Mr. Lee does not have any |
| 8 | information that the current witness has any information |
| 9 | that would be relevant to these names. He simply wants to |
| 10 | put it to him as an open-ended fishing expedition. And I |
| 11 | suggest that that is unseemly, in and of itself, and if you |
| 12 | countenance it once, you're going to be countenancing it |
| 13 | for every witness for the Diocese of Alexandria-Cornwall |
| 14 | and in my submission, it calls your process into disrepute. |
| 15 | Mr. Commissioner, you know my clients have |
| 16 | taken a very strong position throughout this Inquiry about |
| 17 | false allegations that have been repeated in this community |
| 18 | and have led to this cloud which hangs over Cornwall and |
| 19 | which one of the purposes of this Commission is to dispel. |
| 20 | If you allow a process like this one, in my submission, it |
| 21 | will simply ensure that that cloud hangs in the air for a |
| 22 | much longer period of time. |
| 23 | Those are my submissions. |
| 24 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |

Mr. Paul?

---SUBMISSIONS BY/REPRÉSENTATIONS PAR MR. PAUL:

MR. PAUL: Mr. Commissioner, we would support the Victims' Group in our position. Mr. Horn has made some submissions I know and I won't repeat those.

I'll just add that I would suggest that the proposed questions do have relevance to the institutional response or how the institution respond in the sense of what information members on behalf of the institution would have had at the relevant times.

And I think that the -- perhaps the last comments by Mr. Wardle about the absence necessarily of any information that the witness knows of rumours or information about individuals, certainly I would agree that that might bar a suggestive type of questioning where it's suggested that they have knowledge. Certainly that might be inappropriate but I think a non-leading type of series of questions to confirm whether or not they had knowledge I would suggest is not necessarily inappropriate.

So while I would suggest that there does need to be a record of any such questions, I would suggest that the questions, clearly, if asked in a non-leading manner, in an appropriate manner, I would suggest are not evidence and I would suggest it could be made clear that the questions about the individuals on the list are not in any way evidence against them.

| 1 | There's certainly an attempt to explore the |
|----|---|
| 2 | situation to see if there is any evidence in relation to |
| 3 | the individuals and the evidence may well result in |
| 4 | information that is, in some cases, in favour of some of |
| 5 | those individuals in the sense of an absence of information |
| 6 | may be to their credit. |
| 7 | So I would suggest that the questions should |
| 8 | proceed. |
| 9 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 10 | Mr. Ertel, any comments? Mr. Ertel? |
| 11 | MR. ERTEL: Oh, sorry. I'm sorry. I don't |
| 12 | have anything. |
| 13 | THE COMMISSIONER: Do you wish okay. |
| 14 | Mr. Chisholm, any comments? |
| 15 | MR. CHISHOLM: Thank you, sir. Good |
| 16 | morning. |
| 17 | THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning. |
| 18 | SUBMISSIONS BY/REPRÉSENTATIONS PAR MR. CHISHOLM: |
| 19 | MR. CHISHOLM: I would support what Mr. |
| 20 | Sherriff-Scott had to say with respect to the issue. I |
| 21 | support a lot of what Mr. Wardle had to say as well but |
| 22 | there may be some benefit in, as you indicated yesterday, |
| 23 | having the list put to the witness to prompt their |
| 24 | recollection. Without the list without the list, it may |
| 25 | be difficult to hone in on an area that the witness could |

| 1 | otherwise recall. |
|----|--|
| 2 | If the list was put in, I would have a |
| 3 | concern about having the list marked as an exhibit. |
| 4 | THE COMMISSIONER: What about marked as an |
| 5 | exhibit and either with a publication ban or marked |
| 6 | confidential? Would that assuage some of your concerns? |
| 7 | MR. CHISHOLM: It would, sir, yes. |
| 8 | One other concern I have looking at the |
| 9 | list, are we certain that all of these people that are on |
| 10 | the list have been the subject of a complaint to a public |
| 11 | institution? If there are names on there that don't fit |
| 12 | into that category, that would be another area of concern. |
| 13 | Those are my comments, sir. Thank you. |
| 14 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 15 | Mr. Rose, do you wish to comment? |
| 16 | MR. ROSE: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner. |
| 17 | THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning, sir. |
| 18 | submissions by/représentations par mr. rose: |
| 19 | MR. ROSE: As a party with standing who is |
| 20 | not directly affected by this in terms of the evidence but |
| 21 | as someone to gain, as I said yesterday, who sits on the |
| 22 | wings watching what's going on, I completely agree with |
| 23 | what Mr. Sherriff-Scott and Mr. Wardle have said to you |
| 24 | this morning. |
| 25 | And from my clients' perspective, we have |

| 1 | great concerns about the procedure being proposed here and |
|----|--|
| 2 | I ask you, Mr. Commissioner, to exercise great caution. |
| 3 | And I'm asking you to accede to Mr. Sherriff-Scott and Mr. |
| 4 | Wardle's position. |
| 5 | Thank you. |
| 6 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 7 | Mr. Fok, any comments? |
| 8 | MR. FOK: No, sir. |
| 9 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 10 | Ms. Robitaille, any comments? |
| 11 | SUBMISISONS BY/REPRÉSENTATIONS PAR MS. ROBITAILLE: |
| 12 | MS. ROBITAILLE: Good morning, Mr. |
| 13 | Commissioner. |
| 14 | We support the submissions of Mr. David |
| 15 | Sherriff-Scott. We had no submissions to make. |
| 16 | Thank you. |
| 17 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 18 | Ms. Lalji? |
| 19 | SUBMISISONS BY/REPRÉSENTATIONS PAR MS. LALJI : |
| 20 | MS. LALJI: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner. |
| 21 | THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning. |
| 22 | MS. LALJI: We support the position of Mr. |
| 23 | Wardle. Thank you. |
| 24 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| | |

Ms. Lahaie?

| 1 | SUBMISISONS BY/REPRESENTATIONS PAR MS. LAHAIE : |
|----|--|
| 2 | MS. LAHAIE: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner. |
| 3 | THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. |
| 4 | MS. LAHAIE: The Ontario Provincial Police |
| 5 | supports the position taken by Mr. Sherriff-Scott and Mr. |
| 6 | Wardle this morning. |
| 7 | Thank you. |
| 8 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 9 | SUBMISISONS BY/REPRÉSENTATIONS PAR MR. CARROLL: |
| 10 | MR. CARROLL: Good morning. |
| 11 | THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning, Mr. |
| 12 | Carroll. |
| 13 | MR. CARROLL: The Membership of the Ontario |
| 14 | Provincial Police Association supports the position taken |
| 15 | by Mr. Sherriff-Scott and the reasoning advanced by Mr. |
| 16 | Wardle. |
| 17 | I might just add that my clients are the |
| 18 | people on the ground in this community who live and work |
| 19 | here. And they, like everyone else in this community, is |
| 20 | entitled to benefit from this Inquiry and not to suffer as |
| 21 | a result of it. |
| 22 | And to pursue you know, and I hesitate to |
| 23 | use the word McCarthy tactics but and I'm not going to |
| 24 | accuse Mr. Lee of that but every time there is a list, no |
| 25 | good comes of it. And, sir, it may be that your proposal |

| 1 | to mark it with the highest level of confidentiality is |
|----|---|
| 2 | does satisfy all interests, but to simply put the list of |
| 3 | 21 out in the public domain, in my respectful submission, |
| 4 | will go a long way towards defeating one of the goals of |
| 5 | this Inquiry which is to promote healing in this community. |
| 6 | Thank you. |
| 7 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 8 | Who is going to speak; Mr. Engelmann? |
| 9 | SUBMISISONS BY/REPRÉSENTATIONS PAR MR. ENGELMANN: |
| 10 | MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, just a few brief |
| 11 | comments, if I may. |
| 12 | And first of all, just to understand what I |
| 13 | believe Mr. Lee was trying to do and if I get it wrong, |
| 14 | I wasn't here for most of this. As I understand it, he was |
| 15 | asking the witness a question about or about to ask the |
| 16 | witness a question about whether a particular person who |
| 17 | was named if a concern had been brought to this witness' |
| 18 | attention about this individual and/or a concern had been |
| 19 | brought to one of the individual's colleagues. Presumably, |
| 20 | if the answer was yes, how, if at all, the institution |
| 21 | and/or officials responded to that concern. |
| 22 | I don't think there's any question if that |
| 23 | was the intent but the questions are relevant. |
| 24 | The question then becomes how is this |

material best dealt with before this Inquiry. This is a

| public | inquir | y, the | publi | c has | a r | ight | to | know | but | of |
|---------|---------|--------|--------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-----|
| course | we have | e to b | alance | conf | iden | tiali | ty | and | priva | зсу |
| interes | sts and | that | is rig | ht in | our | Orde | er i | in Co | uncil | L. |

You've had to weigh these issues on several occasions; you've had to apply the Dagenais/Mentuk test in several occasions.

As I look at this proposed list and I'm not sure whose idea the list was but in any event, I think the list was helpful, at least to generate some discussion between counsel, albeit no agreement, but some discussion between counsel.

The list is clearly varied. The list contains people who are clearly out there, if I can use that term, in the sense that they were charged, they were involved in criminal proceedings. I think in all of those cases, questions about whether the Diocese and/or this particular official was aware of these concerns before the charge and before the publicity surrounding the charge, perhaps — and how the Diocese responded at that time or even after the charges as to what they did. Those types of questions, again, would be relevant.

The question is how do we deal with those individuals who were not charged, who are not out there or who are out there but not through some mainstream media but out there on a website where we know there were people

| 1 | named who shouldn't have been hamed; and we've had some |
|----|---|
| 2 | evidence on the website in those issues. |
| 3 | So the question then is how do you deal with |
| 4 | those others? And obviously, in dealing with those others |
| 5 | some application of the Dagenais/Mentuk test would be |
| 6 | appropriate. |
| 7 | Sir, looking at this list I don't see how |
| 8 | you could treat the individuals on this list as one and how |
| 9 | you could treat them the same way. |
| 10 | Questions about a number of these |
| 11 | individuals could just be put without without a list |
| 12 | because all of us in this room are aware that these |
| 13 | individuals were charged and there was publicity |
| 14 | surrounding them and people can make submissions as to |
| 15 | whether or not they were convicted, whether they were found |
| 16 | not guilty after a trial, what have you. |
| 17 | There are a number of others though, sir, |
| 18 | who were investigated or not charged and I'm looking at the |
| 19 | list and in a couple of instances I don't even know, sir, |
| 20 | if there were complaints to a public institution. |
| 21 | So obviously, people who were investigated |
| 22 | but not charged and there was no publicity surrounding it |
| 23 | and/or people who may not have been the subject of reports |
| 24 | to public institutions should be treated differently than |
| 25 | those people who have been charged and there has been |

25

| 1 | notoriety, in a mainstream way so to speak. |
|----|---|
| 2 | THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. |
| 3 | MR. ENGELMANN: So I think the use of the |
| 4 | list of all of these names would be inappropriate. I think |
| 5 | there's certainly questions that can be put about a number |
| 6 | of these individuals, presumably without objection, but |
| 7 | with some of them I think you may have to look at some |
| 8 | other form of treatment; whether that is the aide-memoire |
| 9 | suggestion of my friend Mr. Sherriff-Scott or perhaps the |
| 10 | use of an exhibit with confidentiality measures, something |
| 11 | like that might be appropriate but there clearly there's |
| 12 | more than one category of people on this list. |
| 13 | That's my brief submission, sir. |
| 14 | RULING BY THE COMMISSIONER/DÉCISION PAR LE COMMISSAIRE: |
| 15 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 16 | All right, well let me say this, that I am |
| 17 | certainly in the minority when it comes to the position |
| 18 | that I'm going to take, in the sense that I don't see this |
| 19 | list being anything more than asking the witness those |
| 20 | questions which I think are relevant to address his mind to |
| 21 | the people that are on the list and to answer the |
| 22 | questions. |
| 23 | So, what I do understand though is that |
| | |

certainly the people, such as Father Gilles Deslauriers, I

don't think there's any question that -- those questions

should be put to -- can be put about him and without any confidentiality measures.

I am concerned, of course, in balancing the interests that the names of other people that are really not in the public light at this point in time who have perhaps never been investigated, never been charged or anything like that, who have legitimate privacy issues should be protected.

I agree with Mr. Engelmann that the list in itself, as it is, would be a disservice to the community, either if we put it all out or we made it all confidential.

so my ruling will be as follows is that I rule that Mr. Lee will be able to pose those questions; that I will be taking a break, that the list will be changed to exclude those people whom the parties hopefully will agree upon, are names that are out there in the public and can be asked and that the list be reduced and numbered so that the witness can be asked after he's been asked about the individual people that can be mentioned, then he be given the list only -- and only not to indict or to cast any aspersions on the people that are remaining on the list, but simply to have the witness be able to look at those to refresh his memory and to draw his attention particularly to those people and answer the questions appropriately.

| 1 | With respect to the list of those folks that |
|----|---|
| 2 | I will determine, of course with the cooperation and |
| 3 | assistance of counsel, that should not be named, my |
| 4 | suggestion is that that list be put to him but that list be |
| 5 | made confidential. And that way what I think is |
| 6 | important is that the record we'll have a record of who |
| 7 | those names were put and how the question was put but it |
| 8 | will not be in such a way as to two things; first of |
| 9 | all, hurt any of the people that are here that should be on |
| 10 | the list and second, to fuel any further rumours or |
| 11 | innuendoes. |
| 12 | So I'm going to take a short break. What |
| 13 | I'd like you people to do is confer and see if there's any |
| 14 | consensus on who the names of the people that could be put |
| 15 | to this witness publicly and those that should be put on |
| 16 | the list. |
| 17 | And in doing so, I, of course, have |
| 18 | considered the Dagenais/Mentuk test and I figure that's the |
| 19 | best way to balance all of the interests concerned. |
| 20 | So we'll take a short break, let me know |
| 21 | when you're ready to go. |
| 22 | Thank you. |
| 23 | THE REGISTRAR: Order. All rise. À |
| 24 | l'ordre. Veuillez vous lever. |
| 25 | This hearing will resume at 10:20. |

| 1 | Upon recessing at 10:09 a.m./ |
|----|--|
| 2 | L'audience est suspendue à 10h09 |
| 3 | Upon resuming at 10:40 a.m. |
| 4 | L'audience est reprise à 10h40 |
| 5 | THE REGISTRAR: Order. All rise. À |
| 6 | l'ordre. Veuillez vous lever. |
| 7 | This hearing is now resumed; please be |
| 8 | seated. Veuillez vous asseoir. |
| 9 | THE COMMISSIONER: Will we hear ourselves |
| 10 | over the din? Can we carry on with the rain? We stopped |
| 11 | last year. |
| 12 | All right, so listen, this is what I |
| 13 | understand, is I've been given the list. I understand that |
| 14 | parties were able to agree on over half of them, barely, |
| 15 | and so I think there should be some discussion about Mr. |
| 16 | Lee justifying why he wants to hear have the name put |
| 17 | publicly and why others want it to be private and so the |
| 18 | question I have now is can we do this in a public forum or |
| 19 | should we do that in camera? |
| 20 | So for those who will be arguing this, can I |
| 21 | have your thoughts on that? |
| 22 | SUBMISSIONS BY/REPRÉSENTATIONS PAR MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: |
| 23 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: If I can put my oar in |
| 24 | first, I'd suggest we do it privately and if your |
| 25 | disposition is that the matter be public then that's the |

| 1 | end of the matter. So |
|----|---|
| 2 | THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, but why is |
| 3 | there if we numbered all of the people would you be able |
| 4 | to argue and say, "Okay, now we're going to deal with |
| 5 | Number 1 because it's contested and tell me why that person |
| 6 | should not be public or whether it should be |
| 7 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: In the absence of the |
| 8 | person's name I don't have any trouble with that. |
| 9 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. No, no, obviously |
| 10 | obviously |
| 11 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: As long as it's not |
| 12 | sort of attempting to identify the person I'm fine. |
| 13 | THE COMMISSIONER: So you yeah but |
| 14 | m'hm, that's a good principle. Do you think you're able to |
| 15 | make the argument without going into that territory? |
| 16 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: Well, I look at Number |
| 17 | 1 and, for example, that may you know, the problem |
| 18 | the potential problem with that approach as I look at this |
| 19 | list from that point of view is that some will be |
| 20 | identified by complainant who and in connection with |
| 21 | Number 1 there is a very ubiquitous complainant |
| 22 | THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. |
| 23 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: that was the |
| 24 | subject of an investigation which resulted in no charges. |
| 25 | I wonder whether that would be sort of tending to identify. |

| There are others that don't necessarily fall |
|---|
| under that category but I can think that Number 1 would, |
| Number 10 would and some of the others. |
| THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. |
| MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: But not all of them |
| would. So that would be a concern. |
| THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Lee. |
| SUBMISSIONS BY/REPRÉSENTATIONS PAR MR. LEE: |
| MR. LEE: There may be some issue, as Mr. |
| Sherriff-Scott just suggested. As an example, I may say |
| that person "A" testified at this Inquiry and made |
| allegations against three people on the list and |
| immediately there's going to be ties. I may say that |
| person "C" was charged in somewhere that would tend to |
| identify who it's going to be difficult. I mean, I'm in |
| your hands, and I can certainly do it by number but there |
| may be you may get into a little bit of trouble with |
| tending to identify. |
| THE COMMISSIONER: No, I won't get into |
| trouble but you might. |
| Okay. Anyone else have any comments about |
| whether we should be going private or public? |
| Well, I can tell you that given the number, |
| that we have 10 people that we have to discuss, and given |
| |

that I certainly don't want to make any slips, that I think

| 1 | we should go in-camera and I will report to the public once |
|----|---|
| 2 | we finish this exercise of which people will be in public |
| 3 | and which people will be in private, by numbers. |
| 4 | All right? So how long do we need, 10 |
| 5 | minutes? All right, so let's take 10 minutes and we'll |
| 6 | come back. |
| 7 | THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre; |
| 8 | veuillez vous lever. |
| 9 | This hearing will resume at 10:55. |
| 10 | Upon recessing at 10:45 a.m. to resume in camera/ |
| 11 | L'audience est suspendue à 10h45 pour reprendre à huis |
| 12 | clos |
| 13 | Upon resuming in public at 12:28 p.m./ |
| 14 | L'audience est reprise en public à 12h28 |
| 15 | THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre; |
| 16 | veuillez vous lever. |
| 17 | This hearing is now resumed. Please be |
| 18 | seated. Veuillez vous asseoir. |
| 19 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. We're back in |
| 20 | the public eye now with the connection. |
| 21 | What I wanted to do was apprise everyone of |
| 22 | what we have been doing. You will recall that Mr. Lee |
| 23 | wanted to ask the witness certain questions with respect to |
| 24 | the institutional response and whether this witness had |
| 25 | ever heard of any complaints or had been reported that |

PUBLIC HEARING AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE

| 1 | others had received complaints with respect to a number of |
|----|---|
| 2 | people. |
| 3 | When the list was prepared there's some |
| 4 | questions as to whether or not some should be confidential |
| 5 | names and some not. |
| 6 | And so what I did is I heard argument with |
| 7 | respect to that matter and I have determined that some will |
| 8 | be made public and some will not. |
| 9 | The reason for that is simply that some |
| 10 | names have been heard in this Inquiry. I should tell you |
| 11 | that the questions being put are not there to determine |
| 12 | guilt or innocence, that the sole purpose for the question |
| 13 | is to determine whether or not an institutional response |
| 14 | was called for or whether it wasn't. |
| 15 | Accordingly and I will resume this |
| 16 | afternoon when the questioning, or maybe after the |
| 17 | questioning, and reinforce that with the public, that the |
| 18 | question here is dealing with the Diocese's institutional |
| 19 | response. That's it and that's all. |
| 20 | And so one should not look into whether or |
| 21 | not a name has been made confidential or public as a |
| 22 | reflection of anyone's credibility, their reputation or |
| 23 | otherwise. |
| 24 | And I have decided that because as we've |
| 25 | said, I have to balance a person's right to privacy to the |

PUBLIC HEARING AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE

| 1 | right to the public to know what a public inquiry is all |
|----|---|
| 2 | about. |
| 3 | In doing that, I balanced the fact that |
| 4 | whether or not the name had been used or dealt with in this |
| 5 | Inquiry previously and whether or not any confidentiality |
| 6 | measures have been asked at that time. |
| 7 | So that was one of the principles that I |
| 8 | used, but bottom line is the question of balancing, as |
| 9 | we've indicated in what we call the Dagenais/Mentuck test, |
| 10 | whether or not the public's right to know is outweighed by |
| 11 | some privacy interests. |
| 12 | I've reviewed those privacy interests, and |
| 13 | in some parts I've allowed the names to be used publicly; |
| 14 | in others I haven't dealing simply on with that basis |
| 15 | on that basis. |
| 16 | Accordingly, what we're going to do now is |
| 17 | break for lunch and we will come back and hopefully deal |
| 18 | with Father Vaillancourt in short order and get on with the |
| 19 | next witness. |
| 20 | Before I go though, I see that Mr. |
| 21 | Manderville and Mr. Engelmann have a matter to be brought |
| 22 | forward and to be discussed. |
| 23 | MR. MANDERVILLE: That's correct. |
| 24 | Good afternoon, Mr. Commissioner. |
| 25 | THE COMMISSIONER: Good afternoon, sir. |

| 1 | submissions by/représentations par mr. manderville: |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. MANDERVILLE: Very briefly, you issued a |
| 3 | ruling yesterday that has raised some privacy concerns. |
| 4 | THE COMMISSIONER: Right. |
| 5 | MR. MANDERVILLE: And I've spoken about it |
| 6 | with Mr. Engelmann. I understand and with my friends |
| 7 | and we would request that the text of the ruling be amended |
| 8 | to use innocuous terms such as "his doctor," "his medical |
| 9 | specialist" |
| 10 | THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. |
| 11 | MR. MANDERVILLE: without referring to |
| 12 | the doctor by name or the specialty in question. |
| 13 | Secondly, we would request that the entire |
| 14 | motion record, which was made an exhibit, be made |
| 15 | confidential due to the contents of the Aikman Affidavit |
| 16 | and the exhibits attached thereto. |
| 17 | THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. |
| 18 | MR. MANDERVILLE: And I understand Mr. |
| 19 | Engelmann may wish to speak to this briefly. |
| 20 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. |
| 21 | Mr. Engelmann. |
| 22 | SUBMISSIONS BY/REPRÉSENTATIONS PAR MR. ENGELMANN: |
| 23 | MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, Mr. Manderville and I |
| 24 | had discussions about this yesterday evening and this |
| 25 | morning. I am certainly not opposed to that request. I |

28

regrets to any inconvenience it may have caused your

| 1 | client. |
|----|--|
| 2 | As well, I don't know; maybe I'm getting |
| 3 | old, but somehow, I don't know if through the media or |
| 4 | otherwise, it was reported that your client would be |
| 5 | testifying, and that's simply not correct at this point in |
| 6 | time. |
| 7 | What we've done is simply adjourned the |
| 8 | matter to permit you to consider your position and to come |
| 9 | back with further evidence. |
| 10 | And so again, that wasn't my doing, so I |
| 11 | just wanted to make it very clear that that's where we |
| 12 | stand with that matter. |
| 13 | MR. MANDERVILLE: Thank you, Mr. |
| 14 | Commissioner. |
| 15 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right? |
| 16 | MR. MANDERVILLE: I appreciate your |
| 17 | comments. |
| 18 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 19 | We'll come back at 2:00. |
| 20 | THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre; |
| 21 | veuillez vous lever. |
| 22 | This hearing will resume at 2:00 p.m. |
| 23 | Upon recessing at 12:34 p.m./ |
| 24 | L'audience est suspendue à 12h34 |
| 25 | Upon resuming at 2:02 p.m./ |

| 1 | L'audience est reprise à 14h02 |
|----|---|
| 2 | THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre; |
| 3 | veuillez vous lever. |
| 4 | This hearing is now resumed. Please be |
| 5 | seated. Veuillez vous asseoir. |
| 6 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Merci |
| 7 | beaucoup. |
| 8 | Re-bonjour, Père Vaillancourt. |
| 9 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Bonjour. |
| 10 | LE COMMISSAIRE: Vous allez nous pardonner |
| 11 | pour le délai. Il semblerait que nous avions des |
| 12 | discussions afin de pouvoir simplifier votre témoignage ici |
| 13 | cet après-midi. |
| 14 | Donc, encore une fois, mes excuses. |
| 15 | Donc, nous avons déterminé que nous allons |
| 16 | avoir deux listes. |
| 17 | So can we make those exhibits now, Mr. Lee? |
| 18 | MR. LEE: Yes. |
| 19 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. |
| 20 | MR. LEE: I don't have either list. I |
| 21 | believe they were prepared by the clerk. |
| 22 | THE COMMISSIONER: That's my surprise. |
| 23 | LE COMMISSAIRE: Donc, nous avons deux |
| 24 | listes, Père Vaillancourt, une liste que les noms, on va |
| 25 | pouvoir utiliser en public et puis une autre liste qu'on va |

| 1 | vous demander de simplement, si vous avez à vous référer à |
|----|--|
| 2 | cette liste, d'utiliser les numéros sur la liste. Compris? |
| 3 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: O.k. |
| 4 | LE COMMISSAIRE: O.k. Merci. |
| 5 | Donc, 1855 on devrait, Madame la |
| 6 | greffière, les donner aux gens aussi pour qu'ils puissent |
| 7 | confirmer. |
| 8 | Donc, 1855 c'est la pièce des noms des gens |
| 9 | qu'on peut mentionner en public et C-1856 c'est la liste |
| 10 | des gens qu'on ne doit pas mentionner. |
| 11 | EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-1855: |
| 12 | Public list of names of priests for which |
| 13 | questions may be asked |
| 14 | EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. C-1856: |
| 15 | Confidential list of names of priests for |
| 16 | which questions may be asked |
| 17 | LE COMMISSAIRE: Maintenant, avant de |
| 18 | commencer, je voudrais vérifier avec tous et ceux qui sont |
| 19 | ici, m'assurer que les deux listes sont belles et bien |
| 20 | correctes? Est-ce que c'est bien? |
| 21 | (SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE) |
| 22 | THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Lee, does it accord |
| 23 | with your |
| 24 | MR. LEE: It does, sir. |
| 25 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |

| 1 | Bon, o.k., nous pouvons procéder. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Monsieur Lee. |
| 3 | MR. LEE: Mr. Commissioner, if I can just |
| 4 | Mr. Sherriff-Scott made a suggestion to you relating to |
| 5 | Exhibit 1855 |
| 6 | THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. |
| 7 | MR. LEE: which is the public list, if |
| 8 | you will. |
| 9 | THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. |
| 10 | MR. LEE: And he suggested that rather than |
| 11 | having me put these names individually to the witness, that |
| 12 | it may be preferable to put the list to him. I wasn't |
| 13 | clear. You seemed to be in agreement with Mr. Sherriff- |
| 14 | Scott. I wasn't clear on whether or not that was part of |
| 15 | your ruling or whether or not that was your preference. |
| 16 | THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, no, I think for |
| 17 | ease of reference, I've got this Document 1855, which is a |
| 18 | public document. |
| 19 | MR. LEE: Yes. |
| 20 | THE COMMISSIONER: It's your cross- |
| 21 | examination. I'm going to leave it in your discretion at |
| 22 | this point on how you want to use it. |
| 23 | If at some point there's some objection that |
| 24 | you may be doing things improperly, then we'll face them, |
| 25 | but I thought it best to have two lists and deal with them |

noms.

1 as you want. 2 MR. LEE: Perhaps what I'll do is ask the witness to review -- we'll start with Exhibit 1855, which 3 4 is the longer list, and perhaps I'll ask the witness to 5 take a moment to review the names on that list. I'll ask 6 him generally the questions I had intended to ask him and I 7 may take him to just a couple of names on it and ask some 8 specific questions. 9 THE COMMISSIONER: Fine. 10 MR. LEE: But we'll start that way and see 11 how that goes. 12 THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah. --- PÈRE DENIS VAILLANCOURT, Resumed/Sous le même serment: 13 14 --- CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR. LEE 15 (cont'd/suite): 16 MR. LEE: So, Father Vaillancourt, if you 17 can look at the longer list, 1855, and read through that 18 list of names, and please take as much time as you need to 19 do that, and I have a number of questions I'd like to ask 20 you. One of the first questions I'll ask you is whether or 21 not you recognize all of the names on this list or if there 22 are any that don't mean anything to you at all, okay? So 23 please let me know when you're finished reading that. 24 PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Je reconnais tous les

| I | MR. LEE: Okay. So the first question I |
|----|---|
| 2 | have is whether or not you personally have ever received a |
| 3 | complaint of abuse relating to any of the persons listed or |
| 4 | Exhibit 1855? |
| 5 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: À l'exception du Père |
| 6 | Deslauriers et du Père Charlie MacDonald, les autres, je |
| 7 | n'ai jamais reçu de plaintes. |
| 8 | MR. LEE: And the second question I have for |
| 9 | you is you've told us that you have never received a |
| 10 | complaint of abuse in relation to any of those persons. |
| 11 | Do you have any knowledge of the Diocese |
| 12 | ever having received a complaint of abuse relating to any |
| 13 | of the persons on Exhibit 1855? |
| 14 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 15 | MR. LEE: We talked a little bit yesterday |
| 16 | about the difference between a complaint of abuse from a |
| 17 | victim or from a member of the victim's family and |
| 18 | information generally that there may have been some sexual |
| 19 | impropriety on the part of a person. Have you ever |
| 20 | received information suggesting possible sexual misconduct |
| 21 | at the hands of any of these persons on Exhibit 1855? |
| 22 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: I object to the |
| 23 | question as framed. I think that the question should be |
| 24 | cast in the jurisdiction of the Tribunal, which is "Have |
| 25 | you information which shows or tends to show an allegation |

| 1 | of abuse an historical allegation of abuse of a young |
|----|---|
| 2 | person by someone at the Diocese?" as opposed to sexual |
| 3 | misconduct. I don't know what that means, but it seems a |
| 4 | lot broader than what's in the mandate, I would submit. |
| 5 | Thank you. |
| 6 | MR. LEE: I think that's fair. |
| 7 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. |
| 8 | MR. LEE: Let me rephrase the question, |
| 9 | Father Vaillancourt. |
| 10 | Have you ever received information |
| 11 | suggesting have you ever received information suggesting |
| 12 | that any of the persons listed on Exhibit 1855 may have |
| 13 | sexually abused minors at some point in the past? |
| 14 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 15 | MR. LEE: Do you have any knowledge of the |
| 16 | Diocese ever having received such information in relation |
| 17 | to any of the persons on this list? |
| 18 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 19 | MR. LEE: Are you satisfied that you've had |
| 20 | enough time to review this list and to turn your mind to |
| 21 | these questions at this point? |
| 22 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 23 | MR. LEE: Are there any other priests of the |
| 24 | Diocese not listed on Exhibit 1855 or 1856 for which you |
| 25 | have received an allegation of abuse? |

| 1 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. LEE: Are there any other priests of the |
| 3 | Diocese not listed on one of these two exhibits for which |
| 4 | you are aware the Diocese has received information or an |
| 5 | allegation of abuse? |
| 6 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Je le sais pas. |
| 7 | MR. LEE: You when I asked you initially |
| 8 | about Exhibit 1855, you pointed out that other than Father |
| 9 | Deslauriers and Father MacDonald your answers were no. |
| 10 | In relation to Father Deslauriers, we know |
| 11 | that once Benoît Brisson came forward, there were several |
| 12 | complaints of abuse alleged. Is that correct? |
| 13 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 14 | MR. LEE: Did you at any point receive an |
| 15 | allegation of abuse relating to Father Deslauriers prior to |
| 16 | Benoît Brisson coming to the Diocese? |
| 17 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 18 | MR. LEE: One of the other names on the list |
| 19 | 1855 is Father Paul Lapierre. Do you see that name, sir? |
| 20 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 21 | MR. LEE: Are you aware that Father Lapierre |
| 22 | was tried on charges in Ontario and also tried on charges |
| 23 | in Quebec and that he was convicted in Quebec? |
| 24 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 25 | MR. LEE: Are you aware that at his trial, |

| 1 | Father Lapierre testified about possible misconduct by |
|----|--|
| 2 | other priests of the Diocese? |
| 3 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 4 | MR. LEE: You're not aware of that? |
| 5 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 6 | MR. LEE: And the one other name I would |
| 7 | like to put to you on 1855 specifically is Father Lucien |
| 8 | Lussier. You will see him at Number 9 sir. |
| 9 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 10 | MR. LEE: Do you have any knowledge of a |
| 11 | victim of Father Lussier having met with Bishop Larocque |
| 12 | around the time of the Project Truth investigation? |
| 13 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 14 | MR. LEE: You were not involved in any such |
| 15 | meeting? |
| 16 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 17 | MR. LEE: And you do not have any |
| 18 | discussions with Bishop Larocque at any time about such a |
| 19 | meeting? |
| 20 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 21 | MR. LEE: Can you pull up the shorter |
| 22 | list is Exhibit C-1856. You'll see there are five names on |
| 23 | that list sir. Do you recognize all of those names? |
| 24 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Je reconnais pas numéro |
| 25 | cinq. |

| 1 | MR. LEE: You don't recognize Number 5 at |
|----|--|
| 2 | all? |
| 3 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 4 | MR. LEE: Okay. In relation to the other |
| 5 | men on that list, numbers one through four, did you |
| 6 | personally ever receive a complaint of abuse relating to |
| 7 | any of them? |
| 8 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 9 | MR. LEE: Do you have any knowledge of the |
| 10 | Diocese ever having received a complaint of abuse relating |
| 11 | to any of these men? |
| 12 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 13 | MR. LEE: Did you receive any information |
| 14 | suggesting that any of these men may have sexually abused |
| 15 | minors in the past? |
| 16 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 17 | MR. LEE: And do you have any knowledge of |
| 18 | the Diocese having received such information? |
| 19 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 20 | MR. LEE: You were ordained in 1974 by |
| 21 | Bishop Larocque, sir? |
| 22 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: En '74. |
| 23 | MR. LEE: Seventy four ('74), yes. And |
| 24 | you've spent you entire career in this Diocese? |
| 25 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Sauf pour deux ans, je |

| 1 | suis allé aux études en Droit canonique à Ottawa. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. LEE: And at the completion of those |
| 3 | studies, you earned a licentiate in Canon Law; is that |
| 4 | correct? |
| 5 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: C'est ça. |
| 6 | MR. LEE: And you've been the Chancellor of |
| 7 | the Diocese since 1985? |
| 8 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 9 | MR. LEE: And you were involved at the time |
| 10 | of the Gilles Deslauriers complaints received by the |
| 11 | Diocese as well as at the time of the Father Charles |
| 12 | MacDonald allegations received by the Diocese? |
| 13 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: J'ai reçu les plaintes |
| 14 | directement des victimes. |
| 15 | Dans l'affaire du Père MacDonald comme vous |
| 16 | le savez, on m'a demandé d'être témoin pour entendre le |
| 17 | plaignant qui désirait une lettre d'excuses. C'est le seul |
| 18 | rôle que j'ai joué dans l'affaire du Père MacDonald. |
| 19 | MR. LEE: I understand that, sir. My |
| 20 | question was whether or not you will agree that you were at |
| 21 | least involved in some way in the Diocese's institutional |
| 22 | response to allegations received against Gilles Deslauriers |
| 23 | and Father MacDonald? |
| 24 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 25 | MR. LEE: And you were tasked with drafting |

| 1 | the sex abuse guidelines for the diocese in the early '90s? |
|----|---|
| 2 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 3 | MR. LEE: And your evidence here, in |
| 4 | relation to the questions I've just asked you relating to |
| 5 | Exhibits 1855 and 1856 is that you have no further |
| 6 | information for us whatsoever relating to allegations of |
| 7 | historic sexual abuse at the Diocese; is that correct? |
| 8 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: C'est exact. |
| 9 | MR. LEE: Mr. Commissioner, those are my |
| 10 | questions. |
| 11 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 12 | Mr. Chisholm? |
| 13 | CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR. |
| 14 | CHISHOLM: |
| 15 | MR. CHISHOLM: Good afternoon, sir. |
| 16 | THE COMMISSIONER: Good afternoon, sir. |
| 17 | MR. CHISHOLM: Father Vaillancourt, my name |
| 18 | is Peter Chisholm. I'm counsel for the local Children's |
| 19 | Aid Society. If I could have your attention for a few |
| 20 | minutes, just a couple of questions that I want to put to |
| 21 | you. |
| 22 | Last Friday, you spoke of a meeting that you |
| 23 | attended with CAS personnel. Do you recall that? |
| 24 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 25 | MR. CHISHOLM: And am I correct that your |

| 1 | recollection is that you only attended the one meeting with |
|----|---|
| 2 | the CAS personnel? |
| 3 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 4 | MR. CHISHOLM: And would I be correct that |
| 5 | you have no independent recollection of the names of the |
| 6 | CAS personnel that you attended the meeting with? |
| 7 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: C'est exact. |
| 8 | MR. CHISHOLM: And it's my understanding |
| 9 | that you attended the meeting that that was the meeting |
| 10 | that you attended on October the $26^{\rm th}$, 1993 and that Greg |
| 11 | Bell and Pina DeBellis met with you and Jacques Leduc; does |
| 12 | that fit with your recollection? |
| 13 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 14 | MR. CHISHOLM: And on Friday, you made |
| 15 | reference to meeting with Rick Abell of the CAS; do you |
| 16 | recall that evidence? |
| 17 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 18 | MR. CHISHOLM: Do you know Rick Abell? |
| 19 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: J'l'ai rencontré à |
| 20 | quelques reprises. |
| 21 | MR. CHISHOLM: And it's your recollection |
| 22 | that you met with Rick Abell as well as the two individuals |
| 23 | that I mentioned, Greg Bell and Pina DeBellis? |
| 24 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Je ne suis pas certain |
| 25 | de ça. |

| 1 | MR. CHISHOLM: So it's possible you only met |
|----|--|
| 2 | with Mr. Bell and Ms. DeBellis; is that fair? |
| 3 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 4 | MR. CHISHOLM: Thank you, sir. |
| 5 | Those are my questions. |
| 6 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 7 | I don't have my list. Mr. Fok, do you have |
| 8 | any questions? |
| 9 | MR. FOK: No questions. |
| 10 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr. Ertel? |
| 11 | MR. ERTEL: No sir. |
| 12 | THE COMMISSIONER: Where do we go now? Ms. |
| 13 | Lalji? |
| 14 | MS. LALJI: No questions. |
| 15 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 16 | Mr. Rose. |
| 17 | MR. ROSE: No questions. |
| 18 | LE COMMISSAIRE: Madame Lahaie? |
| 19 | MS. LAHAIE: Bonjour Père Vaillancourt. |
| 20 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Bonjour. |
| 21 | Me LAHAIE: Diane Lahaie, avocate pour la |
| 22 | Police provinciale de l'Ontario. Merci de votre |
| 23 | témoignage. J'ai aucune question pour vous cet après-midi. |
| 24 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Merci. |
| 25 | THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, I'm sorry, of course. |

| 1 | Mr. Carroll isn't here. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MS. ROBITAILLE: Good afternoon, Mr. |
| 3 | Commissioner. |
| 4 | THE COMMISSIONER: Good afternoon. |
| 5 | CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MS. |
| 6 | ROBITAILLE: |
| 7 | Me ROBITAILLE: Bonjour, Père Vaillancourt. |
| 8 | Je m'appelle Danielle Robitaille. Puis je suis avocate |
| 9 | pour monsieur Jacques Leduc. Mais je vais demander mes |
| 10 | questions en anglais. Je m'excuse. |
| 11 | In-chief, you described your role as the |
| 12 | Chancellor of the Diocese as an administrative role; is |
| 13 | that right? |
| 14 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: C'est exact. |
| 15 | MS. ROBITAILLE: And as Chancellor, your co- |
| 16 | signature is required on certain documents, for example the |
| 17 | incardination, excardination correspondence for Father |
| 18 | Deslauriers; right? |
| 19 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 20 | MS. ROBITAILLE: But this co-signature is an |
| 21 | administrative step and does not reflect any joint |
| 22 | decision-making power that you share with the Bishop; is |
| 23 | that right? |
| 24 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: C'est exact. |
| 25 | MS. ROBITAILLE: In all aspects of Diocese |

| 1 | business, it's the Bishop that makes the final decision; |
|----|---|
| 2 | right? |
| 3 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 4 | MS. ROBITAILLE: And the Bishop doesn't have |
| 5 | to go through the Senate for approval before he makes |
| 6 | decisions about incardination, excardination, buying or |
| 7 | selling property for example? |
| 8 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Pour la vente de |
| 9 | propriété, il doit passer par le Conseil de finances. Pour |
| 10 | des montants excédant selon spécifiés selon le code du |
| 11 | Droit canonique. Et pour la transaction comme telle, |
| 12 | l'évêque signe avec le vicaire général et le chancelier sur |
| 13 | les documents légaux pour le transfert de propriété, vente |
| 14 | ou achat de propriété. |
| 15 | MS. ROBITAILLE: But for incardination or |
| 16 | excardination, it's his sole decision; there is no |
| 17 | committee that he has to go through? |
| 18 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: C'est exact. |
| 19 | MS. ROBITAILLE: Thank you. Yesterday, you |
| 20 | gave us a good example of Bishop's final decision-making |
| 21 | power when you told us that, in essence, the Deslauriers ad |
| 22 | hoc committee could make recommendations to the Bishop on |
| 23 | how to deal with Father Deslauriers. But that the ultimate |
| 24 | decision was the Bishop's to make; right? |
| 25 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |

| 1 | MS. ROBITAILLE: And so bodies like the Ad |
|----|---|
| 2 | Hoc Committee or the Senate of Priests or even yourself can |
| 3 | give advice to the Bishop or make recommendations but |
| 4 | they're in no way binding. |
| 5 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: C'est ça; ne lient pas. |
| 6 | MS. ROBITAILLE: I just want to turn to the |
| 7 | Silmser matter briefly. You've told us that you were not |
| 8 | the Bishop's designate to receive complaints about sexual |
| 9 | abuse. Is that right? |
| 10 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 11 | MS. ROBITAILLE: And that was Monseigneur |
| 12 | McDougald's role. |
| 13 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 14 | MS. ROBITAILLE: And so you've described |
| 15 | yourself in several instances as a witness in the meeting |
| 16 | with Mr. Silmser, Mr. Leduc and Mr. McDougald. Is that |
| 17 | right? |
| 18 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 19 | MS. ROBITAILLE: And Mr. Leduc wasn't the |
| 20 | Bishop's designate either; was he? |
| 21 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 22 | MS. ROBITAILLE: In fact, Monseigneur |
| 23 | McDougald described himself in an OPP statement as the one |
| 24 | in charge. Would you agree with that characterization? |
| 25 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |

| 1 | MS. ROBITAILLE: And so even though as you |
|----|--|
| 2 | say Mr. Leduc did much of the questioning of Mr. Silmser, |
| 3 | he was not the person who was in charge of the meeting. |
| 4 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: C'est ça. |
| 5 | MS. ROBITAILLE: Now, both in yours and Mr. |
| 6 | Leduc's statements from 1994, both of you say in those |
| 7 | statements that Mr. Leduc asked Mr. McDougald and yourself |
| 8 | to prepare a report after the meeting and to submit it to |
| 9 | the Bishop. |
| 10 | Do you recall that? |
| 11 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Je me souviens pas si |
| 12 | c'est Monsieur Leduc directement qui m'a demandé de |
| 13 | préparer un rapport. |
| 14 | MS. ROBITAILLE: Let me just see if I can |
| 15 | refresh your memory. If we turn to Exhibit 317, à la page |
| 16 | 7. |
| 17 | LE COMMISSAIRE: Donc, vous comprenez, Père |
| 18 | Vaillancourt, que c'est une transcription de l'interview |
| 19 | que vous auriez eu avec Mike Fagan et Chris MacDonnell au |
| 20 | détachement de Long Sault, le 29 septembre 1994. |
| 21 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 22 | LE COMMISSAIRE: O.k. |
| 23 | MS. ROBITAILLE: It's just down a little bit |
| 24 | further than half the page. It's your response. Je vais |
| 25 | le lire en anglais là. |

| 1 | "After that, I think after the |
|----|--|
| 2 | meeting, it was suggested I think by |
| 3 | Jacques that I write down a report." |
| 4 | Si tu veux lire plus d'avance pour |
| 5 | comprendre le contexte. |
| 6 | THE COMMISSIONER: He goes on later on: |
| 7 | "I might be wrong but I believe that |
| 8 | was the situation. So I did and |
| 9 | Monseigneur McDougald was aware I |
| 10 | think." |
| 11 | MS. ROBITAILLE: So it is your evidence |
| 12 | today that you're still unsure if it was Jacques or who |
| 13 | exactly suggested that a report be written? |
| 14 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Oui. |
| 15 | MS. ROBITAILLE: Monseigneur McDougald told |
| 16 | the OPP in 1994 that he recalled Mr. Silmser saying during |
| 17 | the meeting that he was going to go to the police with his |
| 18 | allegations and that no one in the meeting tried to |
| 19 | dissuade him from doing that. |
| 20 | Do you recall that? |
| 21 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 22 | MS. ROBITAILLE: You don't recall? |
| 23 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Non. |
| 24 | MS. ROBITAILLE: Thank you. Those are my |
| 25 | questions. |

| 1 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Mr. Sherriff-Scott? |
| 3 | CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR. |
| 4 | SHERRIFF-SCOTT: |
| 5 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: Does that complete the |
| 6 | queue except for Commission counsel? |
| 7 | I just Father Vaillancourt, I just have |
| 8 | one short question. |
| 9 | Do you actually know what the Pierrefonds |
| 10 | facility is and what it's about? |
| 11 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Je ne suis pas certain à |
| 12 | quoi vous faites référence. |
| 13 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: Well, you'll recall the |
| 14 | evidence was and there was a reference to you attending |
| 15 | with Bishop Larocque at Pierrefonds where Gilles |
| 16 | Deslauriers was staying. |
| 17 | And my question is, do you know what that |
| 18 | facility is designed to do? What it's about and so forth? |
| 19 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Le Père Deslauriers |
| 20 | était en résidence avec Monseigneur Charbonneau à une des |
| 21 | maisons qui appartient aux Sœurs de Sainte-Croix à |
| 22 | Pierrefonds. C'est tout ce que je peux vous dire. |
| 23 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: That's fine, sir. |
| 24 | That's just what I wanted to clarify. Thank you. |
| 25 | The other question I had was my friend Mr. |

| 1 | Wardle asked you about the communication of information |
|----|---|
| 2 | from Father Aimée Leduc and Brother Laflamme in the context |
| 3 | of the Deslauriers matter. Do you remember that? |
| 4 | And my question to you is, do you know or do |
| 5 | you have any knowledge whether the Bishop, that is Bishop |
| 6 | Larocque, communicated with those individuals? |
| 7 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Premièrement, quand |
| 8 | l'information au sujet du Père Leduc nous est parvenue, |
| 9 | c'était dans la cause Deslauriers qui était qui a |
| 10 | commencé en janvier '86 et le Père Leduc est décédé en |
| 11 | novembre '85. |
| 12 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: Do you know whether or |
| 13 | not these individuals ever met with the Bishop to discuss |
| 14 | these issues? |
| 15 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Je le sais pas. |
| 16 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: Okay. Thank you, sir. |
| 17 | Those are my questions. |
| 18 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Sherriff- |
| 19 | Scott. |
| 20 | Madame Hamou? |
| 21 | Me HAMOU: Père Vaillancourt, j'ai pas de |
| 22 | question pour vous mais je vous remercie de votre patience |
| 23 | et je vous remercie de votre présence devant la Commission. |
| 24 | LE COMMISSAIRE: Et bien, Père Vaillancourt, |
| 25 | vous êtes libre de partir sachant que j'ai apprécié votre |

| 1 | témoignage et certainement je prendrai en considération |
|----|---|
| 2 | votre témoignage dans la préparation du rapport. |
| 3 | PÈRE VAILLANCOURT: Merci. |
| 4 | LE COMMISSAIRE: Merci beaucoup. |
| 5 | Donc, on devrait prendre une courte pause |
| 6 | pour changer de témoin. A short break. |
| 7 | THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre; |
| 8 | veuillez vous lever. |
| 9 | This hearing will resume at 2:40. |
| 10 | Upon recessing at 2:29 p.m. / |
| 11 | L'audience est suspendue à 14h29 |
| 12 | Upon resuming at 2:43 p.m. / |
| 13 | L'audience est reprise à 14h43 |
| 14 | THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre; |
| 15 | veuillez vous lever. |
| 16 | This hearing is now resumed. Please be |
| 17 | seated. Veuillez vous asseoir. |
| 18 | MR. RUEL: Good afternoon, Mr. Commissioner. |
| 19 | THE COMMISSIONER: Maître Ruel, how are you |
| 20 | doing today? Welcome back. |
| 21 | MR. RUEL: Thank you. |
| 22 | THE COMMISSIONER: If only for a Cameo, |
| 23 | you're always welcome. |
| 24 | MR. RUEL: We have today the next witness |
| 25 | is Father Kevin Maloney. |

| 1 | THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you. |
|----|--|
| 2 | FATHER KEVIN MALONEY: Sworn/Assermenté |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: Thank you. |
| 4 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 5 | Welcome, Father Maloney. |
| 6 | FATHER MALONEY: Thank you. |
| 7 | THE COMMISSIONER: A few preliminary |
| 8 | matters. You have some fresh water. I see you found that |
| 9 | already. |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, thank you. |
| 11 | THE COMMISSIONER: Great. There is a |
| 12 | microphone, I'd like you to speak into it as much as |
| 13 | possible so as you get older, you can't hear very well. |
| 14 | There's a speaker in front of you and I |
| 15 | think it's up to the maximum, but if ever you want to turn |
| 16 | it down a little bit, you can always turn it down if you |
| 17 | want. |
| 18 | There will be a screen. If there are any |
| 19 | documents to be shown, you'll either be given a hard copy |
| 20 | or you can follow on the screen. |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: Okay. |
| 22 | THE COMMISSIONER: If at any time you need a |
| 23 | break, just let me know. In the meantime, I'd ask you to |
| 24 | listen to the questions and give me your best answer. If |
| 25 | you don't remember, that's fine. If you don't understand |

| l | the question, please stop the lawyer and we'll go over it |
|----|---|
| 2 | and we'll see what comes up. |
| 3 | All right? Do you have any questions at |
| 4 | this point? |
| 5 | FATHER MALONEY: No. Thank you. |
| 6 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 7 | Maître Ruel? |
| 8 | EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR. |
| 9 | RUEL: |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: Father Maloney, good afternoon. |
| 11 | FATHER MALONEY: Good afternoon. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: So my name is Simon Ruel and I |
| 13 | will go over some issues with you that are of interest to |
| 14 | the Commission. |
| 15 | So the way I will proceed is we will cover |
| 16 | your professional background first and then I have four or |
| 17 | five topics, specific topics I'd like to cover with you, if |
| 18 | that's okay. |
| 19 | The first thing I'd like to do, Mr. |
| 20 | Commissioner, this would be a new exhibit. This is the |
| 21 | résumé of Father Maloney which is Document number 702976. |
| 22 | (SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE) |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: Two nine seven six (2976), yes. |
| 24 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 25 | So Exhibit 1857 is a document entitled Kevin |

| 1 | Joseph Maloney and it seems to be a CV. |
|----|--|
| 2 | EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-1857: |
| 3 | CV - Father Kevin Maloney |
| 4 | MR. RUEL: So, Father Maloney, is this your |
| 5 | CV? |
| 6 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 7 | MR. RUEL: So we'll go through it. The |
| 8 | first point is that you are a priest with the Diocese of |
| 9 | Alexandria-Cornwall. |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: Correct. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: And you've been with the Diocese |
| 12 | since your ordination in 1972. |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: So you're a Catholic priest? |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: So you were ordained on February |
| 17 | 11, 1972 in at St. Columban's Church in Cornwall by |
| 18 | Bishop Adolphe Proulx. Is that accurate? |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 20 | MR. RUEL: And then your studies, it's at |
| 21 | the first page of the CV. I'm going to go right to |
| 22 | college. So you went to St. Francis Xavier. Is that |
| 23 | correct? |
| 24 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| | |

MR. RUEL: And you obtained a -- which

| 1 | diploma? |
|----|---|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: Bachelor of Arts. |
| 3 | MR. RUEL: And following that? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: I went to St. Paul's |
| 5 | Seminary in Ottawa and received my degree in theology. |
| 6 | MR. RUEL: And following your ordination in |
| 7 | 1972, where did you start working? |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: Initially at Ste-Thérèse |
| 9 | Parish in Cornwall from February till June and then I moved |
| 10 | to St. Columban's Parish. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: Okay. So February till June of |
| 12 | 1972? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: At St. Columban's. |
| 15 | St. Columban's you were there for how long? |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: I was there for a year and |
| 17 | then I went to do post-graduate studies. |
| 18 | MR. RUEL: So at St. Columban's, you were |
| 19 | there in what capacity? |
| 20 | FATHER MALONEY: As an assistant priest, an |
| 21 | associate. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: So you were not the only priest |
| 23 | there I gather? |
| 24 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 25 | MR. RUEL: How many priests were there? |

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: Four. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: And following that, you went for |
| 3 | graduate studies. I believe this was in London, Ontario. |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: And you've obtained what diploma |
| 6 | there? |
| 7 | FATHER MALONEY: Through that, I worked on |
| 8 | my Masters of religious education. |
| 9 | MR. RUEL: Okay. For what purpose? |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: To be able to work in the |
| 11 | area of catechetics or catechism for young people. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: So that's between '73-'74? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: Okay. And you returned to |
| 15 | Cornwall after that? |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I did. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: So when was that? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: I believe '74. I can't see |
| 19 | it on this sheet here. |
| 20 | THE COMMISSIONER: Could you flip the I |
| 21 | don't think flipping it will do. Yeah, there you go. |
| 22 | Will that help you, sir? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, thank you. |
| 24 | I came back in '74. You're correct. |
| 25 | MR. RUEL: Okay. And where did you go when |

| 1 | you came back? |
|----|--|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: I lived in residence at St. |
| 3 | Columban's and I worked for the SD&G School Board. |
| 4 | MR. RUEL: Okay. And what did you do at the |
| 5 | school board? |
| 6 | FATHER MALONEY: I was Director of Religious |
| 7 | Education on the English side. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: And did you have any role at St. |
| 9 | Columban's as well? |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I did weekend ministry |
| 11 | there and usually I celebrated daily mass. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: Okay. So your assignment at the |
| 13 | SD&G School Board, that was until when? |
| 14 | FATHER MALONEY: Nineteen seventy-eight |
| 15 | (1978). |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: And what happened then? |
| 17 | FATHER MALONEY: Nineteen seventy-eight |
| 18 | (1978), I went to be an assistant at St. Columban's again. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: Full time? |
| 20 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 21 | MR. RUEL: Okay. And in 1979, you moved |
| 22 | parish to another parish? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I became pastor of |
| 24 | Blessed Sacrament Parish in Cornwall. |
| 25 | MR. RUEL: A pastor is essentially the |

| 1 | leader of that parish, if I can say? |
|----|---|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 3 | MR. RUEL: And you stayed there |
| 4 | approximately? |
| 5 | FATHER MALONEY: Nine years. |
| 6 | MR. RUEL: Nine years. And in 1988, you |
| 7 | moved to another parish. Is that correct? |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 9 | MR. RUEL: And which one was that? |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: Our Lady of Grace, St. Pius |
| 11 | х. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: That's in Long Sault? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: St. Pius X is in Long |
| 14 | Sault. Our Lady of Grace is in Ingleside. |
| 15 | MR. RUEL: So you had two parishes? |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: No, it's one parish, two |
| 17 | churches. |
| 18 | MR. RUEL: Oh, I see. Okay. |
| 19 | I gather that at the same time, you became |
| 20 | chaplain at the St. Joseph Catholic Secondary School? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: That's in Cornwall? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, it is. |
| 24 | MR. RUEL: So what did you what did that |
| 25 | involve? |

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: It involved two days a |
|----|---|
| 2 | week, I would make myself available for the students or for |
| 3 | the teachers, sometimes in counselling, sometimes in |
| 4 | celebrating mass. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: So that role as chaplain, that |
| 6 | was until when? |
| 7 | FATHER MALONEY: Nineteen ninety-three |
| 8 | (1993). |
| 9 | MR. RUEL: Okay. And what happened in 1993; |
| 10 | you moved to other functions? |
| 11 | FATHER MALONEY: I became pastor of St. |
| 12 | Columban's Parish in that year. |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: And are you still at St. |
| 14 | Columban's? |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: No, now I'm at St. Peter's |
| 16 | Parish |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: I see. So |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: in the east end of |
| 19 | Cornwall. |
| 20 | MR. RUEL: so how long did you stay at |
| 21 | St. Columban's as pastor? |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: Twelve (12) years. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: So until when? |
| 24 | THE COMMISSIONER: Two thousand and five |
| 25 | (2005)? |

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: Two thousand and five |
|----|--|
| 2 | (2005). |
| 3 | MR. RUEL: You also, I believe, in 1996, |
| 4 | became a chaplain at the Cornwall jail. Is that correct? |
| 5 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, that's correct. |
| 6 | MR. RUEL: Part time chaplain? |
| 7 | FATHER MALONEY: Part time, yes. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: And can you just describe briefly |
| 9 | what that involved as what type of work did that |
| 10 | involve? |
| 11 | FATHER MALONEY: It involved making myself |
| 12 | available for any of the inmates or any of the guards who |
| 13 | needed to talk on a basis. It was also to make sure that |
| 14 | volunteer program in the jail was going on, in particular |
| 15 | the AA program and bingos. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: And throughout your career in the |
| 17 | Diocese, I gather you also had some involvement in |
| 18 | volunteer activities. Is that correct? |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 20 | MR. RUEL: For example? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: I worked on the board for |
| 22 | the Cornwall General Hospital when it existed. I worked on |
| 23 | the board at the Children's Aid Society. I worked on the |
| 24 | board at Big Brothers Association and am presently on the |
| 25 | board of Agape in Cornwall. |

| 1 | THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry; of what? |
|----|--|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: Agape. |
| 3 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Right. |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: Sorry. |
| 5 | THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, it's me. |
| 6 | MR. RUEL: Is there anything you wanted to |
| 7 | add with respect to your CV or your career? |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 9 | MR. RUEL: Thank you. |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: Thank you. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: The next topic I'd like to talk |
| 12 | with you is your involvement with the Council of Priests, |
| 13 | the Senate, as it's called in Cornwall, for the Diocese of |
| 14 | Alexandria-Cornwall. So you've been a member of the |
| 15 | Senate. Is that correct? |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: When was that? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: Those dates vary because |
| 19 | I've been on for several terms. |
| 20 | MR. RUEL: Okay. What is the this may |
| 21 | have been covered before, but briefly, what is the Senate |
| 22 | exactly? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: The Senate or the Council |
| 24 | of Priests is an advisory council that advises the Bishop |
| 25 | on pastoral concerns in the Diocese. |

| 1 | MR. RUEL: And what is it the members |
|----|---|
| 2 | on the Senate, are they appointed, elected; how does it |
| 3 | work? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: Some are elected and some |
| 5 | are appointed. The elections are either through deans or |
| 6 | they're elected by age groups to make sure that clergy is |
| 7 | totally represented. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: So for you, were you elected to |
| 9 | the Senate? |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: So as a representative of some |
| 12 | entity within the Diocese? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: I was the representative or |
| 14 | am right now the representative of the English Deanery of |
| 15 | the City of Cornwall. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: So I gather the Diocese is |
| 17 | composed of a number of deaneries? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, there are four |
| 19 | deaneries; two French, two English. |
| 20 | MR. RUEL: And this is varied through times? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, depending on the |
| 22 | complexity. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: And it's essentially an area |
| 24 | within the Diocese for administrative purposes, I guess? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: That's right. |

| 1 | MR. RUEL: Okay. So I'd like to go to, Mr. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Commissioner, Exhibit 58, which is the corporate |
| 3 | presentation documents of the Diocese, Tab 5. |
| 4 | And, Madam Clerk, do you need the document |
| 5 | number? |
| 6 | And it's those are minutes, I gather of |
| 7 | the Senate of September 25, in 1986; is that correct? |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, that's correct. |
| 9 | MR. RUEL: So just pausing here, I just want |
| 10 | to clarify one point. There is a priest within the Diocese |
| 11 | whose name is Kelvin Maloney; is that correct? |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: That's not to be confused with |
| 14 | you? |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: Definitely not confused |
| 16 | with me, thank you. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: And you're related; I believe |
| 18 | he's your cousin? |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: He's a cousin of mine, yes. |
| 20 | MR. RUEL: Okay. But he's |
| 21 | THE COMMISSIONER: I've lost there's |
| 22 | Kevin Maloney and there's Kelvin? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: K-E-L-V-I-N. |
| 24 | THE COMMISSIONER: Kelvin? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: Right. |

| 1 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: The purpose of this, Mr. |
| 3 | Commissioner, is that in some documents and especially |
| 4 | minutes of the Senate, during some period, Kelvin Father |
| 5 | Kelvin Maloney is a member and some other period is Kevin |
| 6 | Maloney. |
| 7 | So we're dealing here with well, this |
| 8 | one, I guess you were a member of the Senate at that time |
| 9 | so, Kevin Maloney, you were a member in 1986; that's |
| 10 | correct? |
| 11 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: Okay. And how would it work in |
| 13 | terms of the agenda? Who would set the agenda? |
| 14 | FATHER MALONEY: Usually the Bishop with the |
| 15 | executive. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: So you're listed here as a Dean? |
| 17 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 18 | MR. RUEL: What's a Dean? |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: The Dean would be when |
| 20 | the Diocese divided into four deaneries, the Dean would be |
| 21 | the head of that deanerie to call meetings and to |
| 22 | coordinate the activities within that region. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: So it seems that at that time |
| 24 | there were five deaneries? |
| 25 | THE COMMISSIONER: Five Deans, in any event. |

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: Five Deans. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: Five Deans, one for each |
| 3 | deanerie? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. That's what it says |
| 5 | but |
| 6 | MR. RUEL: Okay. |
| 7 | THE COMMISSIONER: But you only but you |
| 8 | figured there's only four? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: That's what I figured but |
| 10 | I've been known to be wrong before. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: Okay. At the last page of the |
| 12 | document, there is an item at point ii and I'll read it in |
| 13 | French, if you understand French; is that okay with you? |
| 14 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 15 | MR. RUEL: And it reads: |
| 16 | « L'affaire du Père Deslauriers, |
| 17 | qu'est-ce qu'on aurait pu faire? Peut- |
| 18 | on avoir un comité pour nous dire quoi |
| 19 | faire, nous donner une ligne de |
| 20 | conduite devant une situation |
| 21 | semblable? » |
| 22 | And switching to English: |
| 23 | "According to the Canadian law we have |
| 24 | no privilege." |
| 25 | So do you recall that discussion at the |

| 1 | Senate on September 25, 1986? |
|----|---|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I don't recall what the |
| 3 | context was. |
| 4 | MR. RUEL: And do you recall the matter of |
| 5 | Father Deslauriers? |
| 6 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 7 | MR. RUEL: So what did it involve, what do |
| 8 | you recall of the situation? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: Father Deslauriers had been |
| 10 | charged with and pleaded guilty to sexual misconduct. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: On the on a young person or |
| 12 | young persons? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: Is that correct? |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: So did you recall there seemed |
| 17 | to have been a discussion there; you don't recall the |
| 18 | nature of the discussion that's what you indicate? |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't recall the nature |
| 20 | of it. No, not at all. |
| 21 | MR. RUEL: And do you know the follow-up, if |
| 22 | any follow-up was if there was any follow-up to this |
| 23 | discussion here with respect to Father Deslauriers? |
| 24 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I don't remember what |
| 25 | happened after that. |

| 1 | MR. RUEL: Were you involved in any way |
|----|---|
| 2 | concerning the matters that dealt with Father Deslauriers? |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 4 | MR. RUEL: Did you know Father Deslauriers? |
| 5 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 6 | MR. RUEL: How did you know him? |
| 7 | FATHER MALONEY: He was ordained, I believe, |
| 8 | probably a year or two before I was. He worked in the |
| 9 | Diocese for a few years. He worked primarily in French |
| 10 | language parishes. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Had you heard any |
| 12 | complaint or any did you obtain any information prior to |
| 13 | this situation occurring with respect to allegations |
| 14 | against concerning well, involving Father |
| 15 | Deslauriers? |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: No, not at all. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: Never heard anything? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: The next document I'd like to |
| 20 | cover with you, Father Maloney, is the same exhibit, Tab 7, |
| 21 | so Exhibit 58, Tab 7. |
| 22 | THE COMMISSIONER: So this is about a year |
| 23 | later? |
| 24 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't have a date on Tab |
| 25 | 7, unless I'm in the wrong tab. Oh, sorry. |

| 1 | MR. RUEL: Yes. |
|----|---|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I do have a date. |
| 3 | Thank you. |
| 4 | MR. RUEL: Sorry to interrupt. |
| 5 | This is those are minutes of a meeting of |
| 6 | the Senate, I believe; is that correct? |
| 7 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. Yes. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: Of March 17, 1987. |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: And again, you were a member of |
| 11 | the Senate? |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: And there's at the second |
| 14 | page, there's Item 5, there's an item and it reads: |
| 15 | "Criteria for Accepting Candidates and |
| 16 | Priests to the Diocese. Father Kevin |
| 17 | presented the criteria." |
| 18 | Do you recall that? |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 20 | MR. RUEL: So what was that about? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: It was a policy put in |
| 22 | place that if a priest from another Diocese was applying to |
| 23 | come into our Diocese to work in our Diocese, there would |
| 24 | be a policy set up on interviewing and what we would do to |
| 25 | make sure that the person was established. |

| 1 | MR. RUEL: So were you tasked to develop |
|----|--|
| 2 | that policy? |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: Could you explain that, |
| 4 | please? |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: Well did you have the role of |
| 6 | developing the policy? Did you draft it? |
| 7 | FATHER MALONEY: I was on the drafting |
| 8 | committee, yes. |
| 9 | MR. RUEL: So there was a committee? |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: And do you know the reason why |
| 12 | that committee was set up? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't remember why it was |
| 14 | set up. |
| 15 | MR. RUEL: Did it have anything to do with |
| 16 | the situation of Father Deslauriers? |
| 17 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't know. |
| 18 | MR. RUEL: Is it not accurate that Father |
| 19 | Deslauriers was a priest that came from another diocese? |
| 20 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, it is. |
| 21 | MR. RUEL: Is it possible that there's a |
| 22 | link between the two? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 24 | MR. RUEL: So was there any criteria before |
| 25 | this before this item was discussed at the Senate for |

| 1 | screening priests or that came from another diocese? |
|----|---|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't know what the |
| 3 | policy was before. I think we just wanted it more |
| 4 | formalized. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: Okay. |
| 6 | Mr. Commissioner, there's another document |
| 7 | I'd like to go through. It's in the grey binder, so it's |
| 8 | in the cross documents I should say; Document Number |
| 9 | 129779. |
| 10 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 11 | Exhibit 1858 will be a copy of the meeting |
| 12 | of the Council of Priests dated September 13 th , 1989 at 1:00 |
| 13 | p.m. at the Diocesan Centre. |
| 14 | EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-1858: |
| 15 | (129779) - Meeting of the Council of Priests |
| 16 | dated 13 Sep 89 |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: So, Father Maloney, this those |
| 18 | are minutes of the Senate again; is that accurate? |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: They are but do you have |
| 20 | the right Maloney? |
| 21 | MR. RUEL: Okay, you were not on that? |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: No, my name is not there. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: Okay, I just want to |
| 24 | THE COMMISSIONER: So who's George? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: George is the third one of |

| 1 | us; he's the brother of Kelvin. |
|----|---|
| 2 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. |
| 3 | MR. RUEL: Okay. And I just wanted to show |
| 4 | you a document which is at the fourth page of this |
| 5 | document, which is and there's a criteria for accepting |
| 6 | ordained priests to the Diocese. Do you see that? |
| 7 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I do. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: So those were adopted by the |
| 9 | Council of Priests, so adopted by the Senate |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: in September on September |
| 12 | 13 th , 1989. That's what it says? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: And are those the criteria that |
| 15 | you've drafted? |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: So they were adopted what you |
| 18 | presented to the meeting of the Senate in 1987 were |
| 19 | essentially a draft? |
| 20 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 21 | MR. RUEL: And they were subsequently |
| 22 | adopted? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 24 | MR. RUEL: And can you say if there was any |
| 25 | change between those the criteria or the draft criteria |

| 1 | that you presented and those here? |
|----|---|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: I can't say whether there |
| 3 | was any change. |
| 4 | MR. RUEL: So the thrust of those criteria |
| 5 | is that if a priest from another diocese was coming to the |
| 6 | Diocese of Alexandria-Cornwall, he had to provide |
| 7 | references and a check had to be made by the Diocese, |
| 8 | essentially, a verification as to the background of the |
| 9 | priest. Is that |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: essentially it? |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: That's it. |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: Thank you. |
| 14 | And coming back to the minutes of the Senate |
| 15 | of March $17^{\rm th}$, 1987, there's an item under that's Exhibit |
| 16 | 58, Tab 7. We just went through that. |
| 17 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 18 | MR. RUEL: And it's at the second page, Item |
| 19 | 6. The item reads "Diocesan procedures in case of |
| 20 | indictable offences". Do you read that? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I do. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: And Bishop Monsignor Larocque |
| 23 | was the Bishop at the time; that's correct? |
| 24 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 25 | MR. RUEL: And he read some notes concerning |

| 1 | this issue. That's what you read there? |
|----|---|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 3 | MR. RUEL: Do you recall that discussion? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: The next subject I'd like to |
| 6 | cover with you is a letter you received from a person named |
| 7 | John MacDonald. Do you recall that, receiving a letter |
| 8 | from John MacDonald? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I do. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: So the letter is it's already |
| 11 | been filed as an exhibit. So it's been covered here. It's |
| 12 | been reviewed here by the Commission. So it's Exhibit 202. |
| 13 | Madam Clerk, I don't know if you have the |
| 14 | letter or I should give you the Bates pages? Yes, that's |
| 15 | the first page. |
| 16 | So in 19 this letter is dated August $11^{\rm th}$, |
| 17 | 1995 and it's signed by John MacDonald. So you recall |
| 18 | receiving that letter? |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I do. |
| 20 | MR. RUEL: So at the time, you were a pastor |
| 21 | at St. Columban's? |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: Did you know Mr. MacDonald at the |
| 24 | time? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I did not. |

| 1 | MR. RUEL: I don't intend to read the |
|----|--|
| 2 | letter, but my just to summarize what I understand of |
| 3 | it, I gather in this letter Mr. MacDonald describes |
| 4 | incidents of abuse he suffered at the hands of Father |
| 5 | Charles MacDonald when he was an altar boy. Is that your |
| 6 | understanding too? |
| 7 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: So what was your the letter |
| 9 | speaks for itself, but what did you understand this man |
| 10 | wanted from you? |
| 11 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't know. He wanted |
| 12 | action. |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: Going to the second-to-last page |
| 14 | of the letter, the last paragraph, it reads: |
| 15 | "I want something done, but I don't |
| 16 | want to go through what I can imagine |
| 17 | Dave is going through." |
| 18 | Pausing there, do you know did you know |
| 19 | at the time who "Dave" was? |
| 20 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 21 | MR. RUEL: And who was that? |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: David Silmser. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: And how did you know David |
| 24 | Silmser? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: Because David Silmser's |

| 1 | case had already appeared before this letter came. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Appeared, you mean it was |
| 3 | public? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: And the rest of the paragraph |
| 6 | reads: |
| 7 | "I don't want any of my family, my |
| 8 | wife, my children, lawyers, police, |
| 9 | CAS, nobody involved." |
| 10 | That's what it says? |
| 11 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: "I want and expect a reply from |
| 13 | you very soon." |
| 14 | That's what it says. And this man describes |
| 15 | the emotional state he was in at the time. Is it fair to |
| 16 | say he was describing himself as a disturbed person as a |
| 17 | result of the events? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: So this letter, was it did you |
| 20 | meet Mr. MacDonald when he how did you get it? How did |
| 21 | you get the letter? |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: It was in the mailbox. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: So you never met you didn't |
| 24 | meet Mr. MacDonald when he |

74

FATHER MALONEY: No, I didn't.

| 1 | MR. RUEL: What did you do with this letter? |
|----|--|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: I brought it to the police |
| 3 | department and to the Children's Aid Society. |
| 4 | MR. RUEL: I gather you answered you |
| 5 | responded to Mr. MacDonald; is that correct? |
| 6 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I did. |
| 7 | MR. RUEL: And that's the same Mr. |
| 8 | Commissioner, it's Exhibit 203. |
| 9 | THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: And this is your response, Father |
| 11 | Maloney? |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, it is. |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: Do you recall sending it? |
| 14 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I do. |
| 15 | MR. RUEL: So essentially, you referred to |
| 16 | the applicable Diocesan policy and indicating that it |
| 17 | requires that the complaint be forwarded to the police for |
| 18 | investigation, and you talk about healing process as well? |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 20 | MR. RUEL: And you attached the applicable |
| 21 | Diocesan policy; is that correct? |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: Did you ever think of contacting |
| 24 | directly Mr. MacDonald to inquire further as to why he was |
| 25 | sending this letter or what he wanted? |

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: Why is that? |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: Because the policy said |
| 4 | that the police would do the investigation. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: What prevents you or the Diocese |
| 6 | from contacting this person in any event to find out what |
| 7 | happened? |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: The policy made it clear |
| 9 | that the Diocese or the individual priest would allow the |
| 10 | police or the Children's Aid to do the investigation and |
| 11 | then we would do something, but we would have no contact. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: Were you involved in the |
| 13 | development of the Diocesan policies dealing with those |
| 14 | matters? |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I was not. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: And how did that work? Did you |
| 17 | get a briefing on those policies when they came into |
| 18 | effect? |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: We each received a copy and |
| 20 | a copy was put in the local Freeholder, our newspaper |
| 21 | sorry so that the community would be aware of what the |
| 22 | policy was. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: The second page of your letter, |
| 24 | there's the policy is attached and it's dated June $21^{\rm st}$, |
| 25 | 1995. That's correct? |

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: So you were sent a copy of the |
| 3 | policy, but just asking you again, was there some training |
| 4 | with respect to this policy or briefing by Diocesan |
| 5 | authorities? |
| 6 | FATHER MALONEY: I can't say for sure. |
| 7 | MR. RUEL: Were you familiar with the |
| 8 | previous policies that policy that was applicable with |
| 9 | respect to this type of situation? |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: I was aware of some of the |
| 11 | parts of it, but not the complete part. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: It's my understanding, and we can |
| 13 | go in the policy, that the previous policy was different in |
| 14 | that a designated Diocesan person was to meet with both the |
| 15 | complainant and the person subject of the complaint and |
| 16 | essentially get the facts. Is that your understanding? |
| 17 | FATHER MALONEY: That's what I understood, |
| 18 | yes. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: And do you know what that was |
| 20 | changed? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I don't. |
| 22 | THE COMMISSIONER: Did you contact the |
| 23 | Bishop? |
| 24 | FATHER MALONEY: You mean after I received |
| 25 | the letter? |

| 1 | THE COMMISSIONER: Once you received the |
|----|---|
| 2 | letter, you said you phoned the CAS or |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I brought a copy of the |
| 4 | letter to the Childrens' Aid, to the police and to the |
| 5 | Bishop's office as well. |
| 6 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you. |
| 7 | MR. RUEL: So you sent it to the Bishop's |
| 8 | office? |
| 9 | THE COMMISSIONER: No, he walked it over. |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: I walked it to the Bishop's |
| 11 | office. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: You didn't discuss with the |
| 13 | Bishop? |
| 14 | FATHER MALONEY: Not that I can remember. |
| 15 | MR. RUEL: So in terms of meeting with the |
| 16 | police and the Childrens' Aid Society, I gather that you |
| 17 | had meetings with them to discuss the matter; is that |
| 18 | correct? |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: I the police came to my |
| 20 | residence to take my statement. And when I brought the |
| 21 | letter to the Childrens' Aid, I gave it to a Mr. Rick |
| 22 | Abell. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Just to when you say |
| 24 | taking your statement, you gave the letter to the police; |
| 25 | correct? |

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. Oh, most definitely. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: And you gave the letter to the |
| 3 | CAS as well? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: There's record of that. I just |
| 6 | want to go through the document. Not for you to confirm |
| 7 | the document because they were not written by you but just |
| 8 | to see if this what's written is consistent with your |
| 9 | memory. |
| 10 | So the first one is Exhibit 1553. This is |
| 11 | an Occurrence Report by the Cornwall Police Service. |
| 12 | The date of the document is on August 15, |
| 13 | 1995. |
| 14 | You have that, Father? |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: I believe yes. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: So the author is R. Trew. We |
| 17 | know it's Rick Trew. |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: Do you remember meeting with Mr. |
| 20 | Trew? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: He was the police officer you |
| 23 | spoke with? |
| 24 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 25 | MR. RUEL: And here I'm just going to read |

| 1 | you this first paragraph, second well, middle of the |
|----|--|
| 2 | sentence: |
| 3 | "I met with Father Kevin Maloney in my |
| 4 | office, the Cornwall Police Service. |
| 5 | We went over a letter that he received |
| 6 | at his residence on August 14, 1995. |
| 7 | This letter is from the victim and |
| 8 | states that he was sexually assaulted |
| 9 | as an alter boy while under the care of |
| 10 | a Roman Catholic priest named Father |
| 11 | Charlie." |
| 12 | Is that consistent with your memory? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: Then at the bottom of the second |
| 15 | paragraph: |
| 16 | "I advised Father Maloney that we would |
| 17 | be assigning an investigator and that |
| 18 | the officer would be speaking with John |
| 19 | MacDonald and himself at a later date. |
| 20 | I assured Father Maloney that we would |
| 21 | also be in contact with the CAS with |
| 22 | CAS as of this date." |
| 23 | Is that consistent with what happened? |
| | |
| 24 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |

| 1 | contact with the Cornwall police with respect to this |
|----|--|
| 2 | matter? |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: Other than the fact that I |
| 4 | brought the letter to them? |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: Yes. |
| 6 | FATHER MALONEY: And then they came and did |
| 7 | an interview. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: That's it? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: That's it. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: Just coming back to the letter, |
| 11 | do you have any idea why John MacDonald went to you? |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: I was at St. Columban's. |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: And the briefly I just want to |
| 14 | go over the CAS meeting. And the document is already an |
| 15 | exhibit. It's Exhibit 230. It's in the cross-examination |
| 16 | documents. |
| 17 | So I don't know if everybody yes, this is |
| 18 | it. So this document is dated August 15. It's a note |
| 19 | drafted by R. Abell. We know it's Rick Abell from the CAS. |
| 20 | And it refers to an office visit from Kevin Maloney. And |
| 21 | referring to in the second paragraph: |
| 22 | "Came to inform me he had received a |
| 23 | letter yesterday from a 30-year old |
| 24 | about claiming to be an abused victim |
| 25 | of Father Charlie MacDonald." |

| 1 | Is that what happened? |
|----|--|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 3 | MR. RUEL: The bottom of the paragraph, it |
| 4 | reads: |
| 5 | "Also spoke to Bishop Naomi, now me." |
| 6 | So he seems to say that you spoke to the |
| 7 | Bishop. But is it possible you spoke to the Bishop about |
| 8 | this? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: Anything is possible. I |
| 10 | don't remember that far back. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: You don't recall? |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: So can you explain to Mr. |
| 14 | Commissioner what happened after this those events. You |
| 15 | went to the CAS; you went to the police. Did you have to |
| 16 | deal with this matter, this complaint by made by John |
| 17 | MacDonald after those events? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: No, the police and the |
| 19 | Childrens' Aid took over. |
| 20 | THE COMMISSIONER: Did you speak with Father |
| 21 | MacDonald yeah, Charlie MacDonald about this during that |
| 22 | period of time? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I did not. |
| 24 | MR. RUEL: Did you know Father MacDonald? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I did. |

| 1 | MR. RUEL: How did you know him? |
|----|---|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: I lived with him for the |
| 3 | brief period of time when I was first ordained and at St. |
| 4 | Columban's. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: So that was for a year |
| 6 | essentially? |
| 7 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: And is there anything during that |
| 9 | period that you either witnessed or any complaint of |
| 10 | with respect to his behaviour vis-à-vis young persons? |
| 11 | FATHER MALONEY: Nothing. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: Nothing of that nature? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: Nothing. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: Rumours? |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: No, nothing at all. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: Is it accurate to say that after |
| 17 | you visited the CAS and the Cornwall police, you received |
| 18 | phone calls from John MacDonald and David Silmser? |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: That is accurate. |
| 20 | MR. RUEL: So how many phone calls did you |
| 21 | receive? |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: A couple. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: From whom? |
| 24 | FATHER MALONEY: Both. Both John MacDonald |
| 25 | and David Silmser. |

| 1 | MR. RUEL: And how does it work? Did you |
|----|---|
| 2 | have an answering your own answering machine at the |
| 3 | parish? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: We had an answering |
| 5 | exchange if you will that picked up most messages. The |
| 6 | ones from John MacDonald had gone through the answering |
| 7 | system. The one from David Silmser I picked up myself. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: So you spoke to Mr. Silmser? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I did. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: And what do you recall what |
| 11 | was discussed? |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: Do not remember what was |
| 13 | discussed. I do remember that he was angry, agitated. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: Did you feel threatened in any |
| 15 | way? |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: He was definitely |
| 17 | aggressive. |
| 18 | MR. RUEL: Did he threaten you? Did he use |
| 19 | a word that you know, would involve did you fear for |
| 20 | your safety in any way? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: No. No. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: So one call one message was |
| 23 | left and the other you spoke directly to David Silmser, |
| 24 | that's correct? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: I spoke directly to David |

| 1 | Silmser. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: And you left another you left |
| 3 | a message not |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: I can't remember right now. |
| 5 | But I do remember that there was messages left by John |
| 6 | MacDonald on the answering system. |
| 7 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Do you know what Mr. |
| 8 | MacDonald said? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: It was just a phone number |
| 10 | to return a call. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Did you call him back? |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I did not. |
| 13 | THE COMMISSIONER: How was his message? Was |
| 14 | it how was his voice during that conversation? |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: We don't have that. The |
| 16 | it was Canpage. So it would just give you the message, |
| 17 | John MacDonald called and the number. |
| 18 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: I'd like to show you a document |
| 20 | which is in the cross-examination documents. It's just |
| 21 | a second, Mr. Commissioner. |
| 22 | This is Document 119913. |
| 23 | THE COMMISSIONER: Sir |
| 24 | MR. RUEL: And that's a document dated |
| 25 | October 18, 1995. |

| 1 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Exhibit 1859 is a document signed by |
| 3 | Reverend Kevin Maloney, dated October 18 th , 1995 and |
| 4 | entitled "To Whom it May Concern". |
| 5 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: Mr. Commissioner, I |
| 6 | think this might already be an Exhibit, 408. |
| 7 | THE COMMISSIONER: That's helpful. |
| 8 | Madam Clerk, could you verify? |
| 9 | MR. RUEL: Sorry, Mr. Commissioner, I didn't |
| 10 | have the number. |
| 11 | THE COMMISSIONER: So we are going to |
| 12 | we're trying to cut down on paper here, Father Maloney, so |
| 13 | we're going to take back Exhibit 1859, and it is found at |
| 14 | Exhibit 408. |
| 15 | All right. Thank you. |
| 16 | Just leave it there, that's fine. |
| 17 | All right. So here's the letter. |
| 18 | MR. RUEL: Did you recall this seems to |
| 19 | be a document originating from you. Is that is that the |
| 20 | case? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: That's my signature, yes. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: And it mentions a call received |
| 23 | on Monday, October 16, 1995, at 10:30 approximately: |
| 24 | "Phone answered by Father Rory |
| 25 | MacDonald and caller identified himself |

| 1 | as David Silmser. He informed Father |
|----|---|
| 2 | Rory that he would be picketing at St. |
| 3 | Columban's Church on the following |
| 4 | weekends. David was polite and non- |
| 5 | confrontational. He stated he just |
| 6 | wanted us to know what would be |
| 7 | happening." |
| 8 | Do you recall that? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: So this is not the message you |
| 11 | were referring to? |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: Definitely not. |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: This is a second message? |
| 14 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 15 | THE COMMISSIONER: Some months later? |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: So you didn't call back? I mean, |
| 18 | you spoke with David Silmser; you didn't speak with Mr. |
| 19 | MacDonald; that's accurate? |
| 20 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 21 | MR. RUEL: And what did you do with this |
| 22 | after receiving those messages? |
| 23 | THE COMMISSIONER: Wait a minute, which one |
| 24 | are we talking about, the one on October 18 th or the ones |
| 25 | before? |

| 1 | MR. RUEL: All the messages. |
|----|--|
| 2 | THE COMMISSIONER: Well, we might want to |
| 3 | break it down and go with the two the phone messages |
| 4 | that occurred shortly after you received |
| 5 | FATHER MALONEY: Okay. |
| 6 | THE COMMISSIONER: the letter of |
| 7 | complaint; is that correct? |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: Right. |
| 9 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: When I received the first |
| 11 | phone calls I reported them to the police and then I left |
| 12 | the matter with them. |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: Why did you report that to the |
| 14 | police? |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: Because I didn't want to |
| 16 | get involved with talking to them and interfering in the |
| 17 | investigation because the protocol said that they were to |
| 18 | look after the investigation. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: Okay. |
| 20 | THE COMMISSIONER: Was it your intention to |
| 21 | lay a complaint |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 23 | THE COMMISSIONER: against these two? |
| 24 | FATHER MALONEY: No. It's just to let them |
| 25 | know that I wasn't supposed to be communicating with them. |

| 1 | THE COMMISSIONER: Right. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: Did you do that on your own or |
| 3 | you acted on the basis of advice you received? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: I received advice. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: From whom? |
| 6 | FATHER MALONEY: I received advice from a |
| 7 | lawyer. |
| 8 | THE COMMISSIONER: And we can ask you the |
| 9 | name of the lawyer? |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: Sean Adams. |
| 11 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: So was that name referred to you |
| 13 | by someone, the lawyer, I mean? |
| 14 | FATHER MALONEY: Was the name referred to |
| 15 | me? |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: Yes. |
| 17 | FATHER MALONEY: No. I had used Sean as a |
| 18 | lawyer myself. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Did you know he had |
| 20 | represented David Silmser previously? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: He didn't tell you that? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: I did not know. |
| 24 | MR. RUEL: Sorry? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: I did not know. |

| 1 | MR. RUEL: Okay. So I'd like to show you |
|----|---|
| 2 | - |
| 3 | THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry; where are you |
| 4 | going now? |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: The discussion with the Cornwall |
| 6 | Police. |
| 7 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, fine. So we'll do |
| 8 | that and then we'll come back to the October memo then. |
| 9 | All right. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: This is Document 120890. |
| 11 | THE COMMISSIONER: Whenever he says a |
| 12 | document number, "Document" means we haven't seen it yet. |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: Thank you. |
| 14 | THE COMMISSIONER: Stay with us long enough |
| 15 | and you'll know the ropes. |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't want to stay with |
| 17 | you that long, thank you. |
| 18 | (LAUGHTER/RIRES) |
| 19 | THE COMMISSIONER: I have that effect on |
| 20 | people. I'm sorry. |
| 21 | Exhibit 1859 is an archive occurrence report |
| 22 | and the occurrence phone calls 08/19/1995 at 2:15. |
| 23 | EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-1859: |
| 24 | (120890) - Archive Occurrence Report by CPS |
| 25 | MR. RUEL: Again, Father, this is not your |

| 1 | document so I can't ask you to identify it in any way, but |
|----|---|
| 2 | this seems to be an occurrence report from the Cornwall |
| 3 | Police regarding the phone calls or some calls you've |
| 4 | received. So it's listed here as "Complainant Father |
| 5 | Maloney, Kevin" but you indicated that you didn't file this |
| 6 | as a complaint? |
| 7 | FATHER MALONEY: Not as a complaint, no. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: And "Remarks", it says "Harassing |
| 9 | phone calls". Is that what you said to the police? |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't know what |
| 11 | terminology I used. That's many years ago. I don't know |
| 12 | what terminology that I |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: The next document is already an |
| 14 | exhibit. It's Exhibit 235. |
| 15 | THE COMMISSIONER: Just a minute. Just a |
| 16 | minute. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: Sorry. |
| 18 | THE COMMISSIONER: Before we go away from |
| 19 | that one, they've marked it as harassing phone calls and |
| 20 | it's classified under "indecent harass threat phone calls", |
| 21 | at the bottom line. |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: Okay. |
| 23 | THE COMMISSIONER: So let's cover that off a |
| 24 | little bit. You know, what was your tone of voice? What |
| 25 | did you want done? |

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: What was my tone of voice? |
|----|--|
| 2 | THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah. |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: My tone of voice was I just |
| 4 | wanted them to talk to these gentlemen so that they would |
| 5 | not call me. |
| 6 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. And did you say |
| 7 | why? |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: Because I couldn't get |
| 9 | involved with them during |
| 10 | THE COMMISSIONER: Did you say that to them, |
| 11 | to the police? |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: I can't say. I don't know. |
| 13 | THE COMMISSIONER: I just want you to |
| 14 | understand |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: Yeah. |
| 16 | THE COMMISSIONER: you're giving me your |
| 17 | |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: Recollection. |
| 19 | THE COMMISSIONER: recollection and it's |
| 20 | like, "Okay. Just tell them not to call me because I can't |
| 21 | get involved." |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: Right. |
| 23 | THE COMMISSIONER: And here it turns into |
| 24 | harassing phone call. |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |

| 1 | THE COMMISSIONER: And then we've got an |
|----|--|
| 2 | indecent harass threat phone calls classification. |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 4 | THE COMMISSIONER: So what I want to |
| 5 | understand a little bit, as much as I can, is how would |
| 6 | that have occurred? Were you angry when you phoned them? |
| 7 | Were you angry with the two fellows? Were you threatened? |
| 8 | How did you feel when you phoned these people and what did |
| 9 | you communicate to them? |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: Was I threatened? No. |
| 11 | THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: Did I give the impression I |
| 13 | was threatened? I hope not. |
| 14 | THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't know what |
| 16 | impression they picked up. |
| 17 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: Okay? |
| 19 | THE COMMISSIONER: Fair enough. |
| 20 | Yes? |
| 21 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: If my friend turns up |
| 22 | the actual occurrence report, which might be more |
| 23 | productive of understanding what information it's fully |
| 24 | described as |
| 25 | THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. |

| 1 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: All the information he |
|----|--|
| 2 | gave is right there and |
| 3 | THE COMMISSIONER: What exhibit, please? |
| 4 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: It is Document Number |
| 5 | 120888. |
| 6 | MR. RUEL: It's Exhibit 235. I was going |
| 7 | there. |
| 8 | THE COMMISSIONER: There you go. Thank you. |
| 9 | All right. Let's go to Exhibit 235, sir. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: So again, this is a document from |
| 11 | the Cornwall Police and it's filed, as it appears on this |
| 12 | document, by a police officer, her name is Wilson-King. We |
| 13 | know her name is Emma Wilson-King. |
| 14 | So do you recall meeting with this police |
| 15 | officer on August 19, 1995? |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 17 | THE COMMISSIONER: Did you meet with her or |
| 18 | phone her? |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: I met with her. |
| 20 | THE COMMISSIONER: Oh right, right. I'm |
| 21 | sorry; yes, you did. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: So it reads here, and I just want |
| 23 | you to confirm if this is accurate: |
| 24 | "Writer attended 36 4^{th} Street West, the |
| 25 | residence of Father Kevin Maloney. |

| 1 | Father Maloney, in the presence of his |
|----|---|
| 2 | lawyer, Sean Adams, advised writer that |
| 3 | he has received two phone calls through |
| 4 | his answering service from a David |
| 5 | Silmser as well as one from John |
| 6 | MacDonald due to an investigation being |
| 7 | done by our department. Father |
| 8 | Maloney, on the advice of his lawyer, |
| 9 | wished to have these two advised to |
| 10 | stop calling until the investigation is |
| 11 | complete." |
| 12 | Is that essentially what was discussed? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: Did you mention during this |
| 15 | discussion anything about the tone of the message of Mr. |
| 16 | Silmser that you referred to earlier? |
| 17 | FATHER MALONEY: Not that I can recall. I |
| 18 | don't know. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: There's no mention of that here, |
| 20 | of some type of aggressive tone or anything of that nature? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: Is it possible you didn't tell |
| 23 | them that? |
| 24 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't remember what I |
| 25 | told them other than what I see written. |

| 1 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Do you know what they did |
|----|---|
| 2 | with this what Police Officer Wilson-King did with the |
| 3 | information you sorry, I'll rephrase. |
| 4 | Do you know what she did with the |
| 5 | information you provided? |
| 6 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I don't. |
| 7 | MR. RUEL: The actions she took, if she |
| 8 | called the two individuals? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't know what she did. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: Those phone calls you got, did |
| 11 | you discuss that with the Bishop or other members of the |
| 12 | Diocese? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: Not that I can recall. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: Is it accurate to say and we'll |
| 15 | go there, that you got a letter shortly after from a lawyer |
| 16 | representing John MacDonald concerning counselling or |
| 17 | support he wanted to get from the Diocese? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, that's accurate. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: The letter is it's already an |
| 20 | exhibit. It's Exhibit 249. So this is a week or so after |
| 21 | the meeting with the Cornwall Police. And the second |
| 22 | paragraph, the lawyer's name is Walter MacLean, the second |
| 23 | paragraph, second phrase: |
| 24 | "I have discussed various options with |
| 25 | John and he has asked me to write to |

| 1 | you with a view of determining, if |
|----|--|
| 2 | possible, what help and support is |
| 3 | available by way of the Diocese in |
| 4 | accordance with Phase 5 of the Diocesan |
| 5 | Guidelines on Sexual Abuse, a copy of |
| 6 | which you were kind enough to provide |
| 7 | him. I expect that you will refer this |
| 8 | correspondence to the Bishop's office |
| 9 | and look forward to receiving your |
| 10 | reply or a reply from the Bishop's |
| 11 | office as soon as possible." |
| 12 | So you recall getting that? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I do. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: So what did you do with this |
| 15 | letter? |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: I gave it to the Bishop's |
| 17 | office. |
| 18 | MR. RUEL: Did you discuss it with the |
| 19 | Bishop? |
| 20 | FATHER MALONEY: I can't remember whether I |
| 21 | did or not. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Do you know if the request |
| 23 | or do you know if support was offered to Mr. MacDonald |
| 24 | following this letter? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: Do I personally know? |

| 1 | MR. RUEL: Yes. |
|----|--|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: No, but I know in preparing |
| 3 | for this, in the materials given to me, yes, that help was |
| 4 | given. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: So was that the extent of your |
| 6 | involvement with respect to this matter? |
| 7 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, it was. |
| 8 | THE COMMISSIONER: So if you're going to |
| 9 | change topics |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: Very soon. |
| 11 | THE COMMISSIONER: Whenever you do, after |
| 12 | that, I'd like to take a break. |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Sure. I have just two or |
| 14 | three minutes. |
| 15 | THE COMMISSIONER: That's fine. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: So would it be fair to say that |
| 17 | this matter, or the way you handled it, was under the |
| 18 | jurisdiction or the responsibility of the Bishop to deal |
| 19 | with? |
| 20 | FATHER MALONEY: No, the investigation was |
| 21 | under the jurisdiction of the police force and the |
| 22 | Children's Aid, and the counselling would have been under |
| 23 | the jurisdiction of the Bishop. |
| 24 | MR. RUEL: I see. Okay. |
| 25 | And the responsibility for investigating, |

| 1 | that's under the that's in accordance with the policy |
|----|---|
| 2 | that was in existence? |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 4 | MR. RUEL: Do you know if an internal review |
| 5 | was done of the allegations within the Diocese? |
| 6 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I do not know. |
| 7 | MR. RUEL: I would move to another topic at |
| 8 | this point. |
| 9 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. |
| 10 | Let's take the afternoon break, sir. Thank |
| 11 | you. |
| 12 | THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre; |
| 13 | veuillez vous lever. |
| 14 | This hearing will resume at four o'clock. |
| 15 | Upon recessing at 3:43 p.m./ |
| 16 | L'audience est suspendue à 15h43 |
| 17 | Upon resuming at 3:42 p.m. / |
| 18 | L'audience est reprise à 15h42 |
| 19 | THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre; |
| 20 | veuillez vous lever. |
| 21 | This hearing is now resumed. Please be |
| 22 | seated. Veuillez vous asseoir. |
| 23 | THE COMMISSIONER: I guess Father Maloney |
| 24 | didn't want to come back. |
| 25 | He did say he didn't want to stay here very |

| 1 | long. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: Why don't I go and find |
| 3 | out what's going on. |
| 4 | (SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE) |
| 5 | THE COMMISSIONER: Who would have thought to |
| 6 | look for a witness in the witness room? |
| 7 | (LAUGHTER/RIRES) |
| 8 | THE COMMISSIONER: Father Maloney. |
| 9 | So it's my intention to sit until about |
| 10 | 5:00-5:15. Is that okay with you? |
| 11 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, it is. Thank you. |
| 12 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. And then |
| 13 | tomorrow we can talk about either I don't know how long |
| 14 | well, I can sit until 2:00 tomorrow. And I just want to |
| 15 | make sure we can accommodate everybody's travel patterns |
| 16 | and try to get this witness done by then. So we'll give |
| 17 | that a try. |
| 18 | Does that sit well with everyone? |
| 19 | Mr. Wardle, you look confused. |
| 20 | MR. WARDLE: (Off mic). We're just getting |
| 21 | some English translation |
| 22 | (LAUGHTER/RIRES) |
| 23 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. |
| 24 | Maître Ruel? |

KEVIN MALONEY: Resumed/Sous le même serment

| 1 | EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR. |
|----|---|
| 2 | RUEL: (Continued/Suite) |
| 3 | MR. RUEL: Just coming back briefly on |
| 4 | Exhibit 408 which is the phone call of David Silmser of |
| 5 | October 18, 1995, just to clarify finish that off. |
| 6 | Do you have the document, Exhibit 408? |
| 7 | THE COMMISSIONER: I don't think so. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: Yes. |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: Okay. |
| 10 | THE COMMISSIONER: It's up there. Okay, |
| 11 | good. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: So we established that you wrote |
| 13 | that note about the phone call. What did you do with this |
| 14 | information? It seems to be it's "To whom it may |
| 15 | concern". So who was that? Was that internally at the |
| 16 | parish? |
| 17 | FATHER MALONEY: It was to keep it on file |
| 18 | in case there was any incident. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Was it sent to the Bishop |
| 20 | or to the Diocese's office? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: I can't remember what was |
| 22 | done with it. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: Okay. |
| 24 | THE COMMISSIONER: Was it sent to the |
| 25 | police? |

25

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't I don't know. |
|----|---|
| 2 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. |
| 3 | MR. RUEL: Father Maloney, I'd like to move |
| 4 | to another subject and we're now going to it's 1997 and |
| 5 | I'd like to refer to Exhibit 728. |
| 6 | Mr. Commissioner, I don't believe this |
| 7 | document was subject to a publication ban but maybe Madam |
| 8 | Clerk can just confirm that, if possible, for the record. |
| 9 | THE COMMISSIONER: Seven two eight (728) is |
| 10 | a response to demand for particulars? |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: Yes. I don't believe so. |
| 12 | THE COMMISSIONER: I don't think it would |
| 13 | but it's a public document, so okay. So this is the |
| 14 | statement of claim; is that what you're looking at? Or |
| 15 | statement response to demand for particulars, sorry? |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: Yes. |
| 17 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. |
| 18 | MR. RUEL: Father Maloney, you have the |
| 19 | document? |
| 20 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I do. |
| 21 | MR. RUEL: Did you recall do you recall |
| 22 | receiving that document at some point? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| | |

civil action brought by Perry Dunlop against various

MR. RUEL: Did you know that there was a

| 1 | people, including the Chief former Chief of Police of |
|----|--|
| 2 | the Cornwall Police, the Cornwall Police Service and the |
| 3 | Diocese and other people? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: Not until I received the |
| 5 | document. |
| 6 | MR. RUEL: Did you know Perry Dunlop? |
| 7 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I did. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: And how did you know him? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: Perry was a member of St. |
| 10 | Columban's Parish. |
| 11 | THE COMMISSIONER: And had you known him on |
| 12 | a personal level, sir? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 14 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. |
| 15 | MR. RUEL: So in this document, even though |
| 16 | you're not mentioned as a defendant, a number of |
| 17 | allegations are made against you. I don't intend to repeat |
| 18 | all of them or even to read them before the Commission but |
| 19 | allegations of a sexual nature made against you personally |
| 20 | in this document. So there's a number of allegations. |
| 21 | How did you react to this information being |
| 22 | brought to your attention? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: I was angry and then I |
| 24 | discussed it with other men that were on this list and we |

brought it to the Children's Aid Society.

| 1 | MR. RUEL: So when you said "other men that |
|----|---|
| 2 | were on this list" you're talking about |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: Clergy. |
| 4 | MR. RUEL: clergy members? |
| 5 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 6 | MR. RUEL: So what was the context; who was |
| 7 | part of that discussion? |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: Most of the men that are |
| 9 | listed in there that are actively involved as clergy in the |
| 10 | Diocese. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Was the Bishop involved in |
| 12 | that discussion? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, he was. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: And what was was a decision |
| 15 | made with respect to what would be done? |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: The decision was unanimous, |
| 17 | that according to the policy we should turn it over to the |
| 18 | Children's Aid Society. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Why to the Children's Aid |
| 20 | Society and not the police or both? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: Because the police already |
| 22 | had it. They are the ones who got they're being sued. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: I'm talking about the OPP, for |
| 24 | example. The Cornwall Police was there but the OPP was |
| 25 | it never came up? |

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: No, the OPP were not |
|----|---|
| 2 | involved at this stage. |
| 3 | MR. RUEL: Okay. There were some other |
| 4 | documents you received as well, along with this response to |
| 5 | demand for particulars; is that right? |
| 6 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 7 | MR. RUEL: So there was an Affidavit from |
| 8 | Ron Leroux? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: A statement from Ron Leroux, I |
| 11 | believe? |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: And a statement from a person |
| 14 | named Gerald Renshaw? |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: All making allegations against |
| 17 | you? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: Of a sexual nature? |
| 20 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 21 | THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I'm concerned about |
| 22 | or interested in finding out about on if you look on |
| 23 | the top left-hand corner of that document, there are some |
| 24 | numbers. |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |

| 1 | THE COMMISSIONER: Top left-hand. |
|----|---|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: Okay, yes. |
| 3 | THE COMMISSIONER: No, the other left. So |
| 4 | if you look at the last numbers, you see 709 and then 2572 |
| 5 | and go to 2577, please. |
| 6 | No, that's the same document. |
| 7 | FATHER MALONEY: Okay. |
| 8 | THE COMMISSIONER: Just flip the page and |
| 9 | you'll see then you start seeing them numerically. Do |
| 10 | you see what I mean? |
| 11 | FATHER MALONEY: Five seven, okay. |
| 12 | MEMBER: Two five seven (257). |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 14 | THE COMMISSIONER: In that statement of |
| 15 | claim it says that right at the bottom, it says: |
| 16 | "Further, Kevin Maloney showed up |
| 17 | uninvited at the plaintiff's home on |
| 18 | different occasions." |
| 19 | Have you ever visited Mr. Dunlop at his |
| 20 | home? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I did. |
| 22 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. And when was that? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: It was I don't know the |
| 24 | exact date but I phoned up and asked for an appointment and |
| 25 | I went in the evening. |

| 1 | THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. |
|----|---|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: And I visited with him and |
| 3 | his wife and his children. |
| 4 | THE COMMISSIONER: And the purpose? |
| 5 | FATHER MALONEY: He had stopped coming to |
| 6 | church and I wanted him to know that he was welcome to come |
| 7 | back anytime he chose. |
| 8 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. All right, well |
| 9 | we'll leave that for others then. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: Yeah, I was intending to cover |
| 11 | that. |
| 12 | THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, I'm very sorry; it's |
| 13 | just that I thought you were moving documents. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: No, no, it's fine. Why don't we |
| 15 | review that here. |
| 16 | So there was one meeting with Mr. Dunlop and |
| 17 | his wife at their home; is that |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: That's right and another |
| 19 | time I saw him in front of his home and I talked to him for |
| 20 | a few moments. |
| 21 | MR. RUEL: So is that something you do |
| 22 | frequently; meet with parishioners who stop going to church |
| 23 | and go to their home and discuss the matter with them? |
| 24 | FATHER MALONEY: It wouldn't be something I |
| 25 | would do frequently because something like this doesn't |

| 1 | nappen frequently, thank God. So it was something because |
|----|---|
| 2 | of the public nature of this I wanted him to know that he |
| 3 | was welcome back at church. |
| 4 | MR. RUEL: Why? Was it your understanding |
| 5 | that he was ostracized in any way in the public? |
| 6 | FATHER MALONEY: No. I had no idea what he |
| 7 | was feeling. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: No, no, no, but I mean you heard |
| 9 | his name, I guess, through the media or the papers at the |
| 10 | time? |
| 11 | FATHER MALONEY: I heard his name but he was |
| 12 | never ostracized as far as the parish was concerned. |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: Not the parish but in the public. |
| 14 | FATHER MALONEY: No. I don't believe he was |
| 15 | ostracized. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: So at paragraph 7 and this is, |
| 17 | Father we must assume that Mr. Dunlop approved this |
| 18 | because it came as the context of it's a document that |
| 19 | came in the context of his lawsuit. |
| 20 | He mentions at paragraph 7 that the |
| 21 | paragraph at the bottom of the page, second sentence: |
| 22 | "Father Maloney overtly advised the |
| 23 | Plaintiff that he was no longer wanted |
| 24 | with the Cornwall Police Service and |
| 25 | should resign. Father Maloney inquired |

FATHER MALONEY: I reacted by shock; I could

| 1 | not understand how my visit would be misinterpreted. |
|----|--|
| 2 | (SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE) |
| 3 | MR. RUEL: I'm sorry, Mr. Commissioner. |
| 4 | THE COMMISSIONER: No, that's fine. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: Just give me a second. |
| 6 | I'd like to take you now to a document which |
| 7 | is document 721620. It's in the you can find it in the |
| 8 | cross-examination documents. |
| 9 | THE REGISTRAR: Can you repeat that number, |
| 10 | please? |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: It's 721620. It's an excerpt of |
| 12 | that document starting at Bates page 7080511. |
| 13 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 14 | Exhibit 1860 is a case documentation system |
| 15 | service record and it looks like the date is the 22^{nd} of the |
| 16 | fifth month of 1997. And it's Children's Aid Society case |
| 17 | document system service record. |
| 18 | EXHIBIT NO./PIECE NO. P-1860 |
| 19 | (721620) Case Notes of CAS Richard Abell |
| 20 | dated 22 May 97 |
| 21 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Go ahead. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: It's already an exhibit. I'm |
| 23 | sorry. It seems again that this document was already filed |
| 24 | as Exhibit 281. |
| 25 | THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, we'll take that |

FATHER MALONEY: The first meeting Mr. Abell

thanked me for it, said he would look through it and he

would arrange for a meeting that would take place at a

INTERNATIONAL REPORTING INC.

later date.

22

23

24

25

| 1 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Those are notes from Mr. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Abell from the Childrens' Aid Society. And there's an |
| 3 | entry here on May 15, 1997. You see that? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: And it reads: |
| 6 | "Office visit from Father Kevin |
| 7 | Maloney, Monsignor Donald McDougald. |
| 8 | They have material arising from the |
| 9 | civil suit. Contains allegation |
| 10 | against numerous clergy including |
| 11 | themselves. They want to cooperate. |
| 12 | Will make the material available if we |
| 13 | want it. Told them I'd get back to |
| 14 | them." |
| 15 | Is that essentially what happened? |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: And down at the bottom of the |
| 18 | page, second to last paragraph, 20 May, 1997: |
| 19 | "Father Kevin brings in his material." |
| 20 | FATHER MALONEY: Okay. |
| 21 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: That's possible? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 24 | MR. RUEL: You don't remember the dates but |
| 25 | that's |

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: It's not inconsistent with your |
| 3 | memory? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: That's right. |
| 5 | THE COMMISSIONER: So as I understand from |
| 6 | Madame Registrar, that Exhibit 1860 should stand on its own |
| 7 | because Exhibit 281 is a different Bates page. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: Okay. |
| 9 | THE COMMISSIONER: So we'll leave it there. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: I'm just going through the |
| 11 | documents to establish the chain of events. |
| 12 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: Mr. Commissioner, is |
| 13 | that all 48 pages of that document? |
| 14 | THE COMMISSIONER: What's that? No. |
| 15 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: Exhibit 1860 is the 48- |
| 16 | page document? |
| 17 | THE COMMISSIONER: No, just the one page |
| 18 | document. |
| 19 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: Oh, just the one page. |
| 20 | Thank you. |
| 21 | THE COMMISSIONER: Just the one page. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: And the other document Mr. |
| 23 | Commissioner, I hope hasn't been filed already. I have no |
| 24 | mention of it. It's document 721626. It's an excerpt |
| 25 | again of a larger document. |

| 1 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
|----|--|
| 2 | This is a letter delivered to on May $20^{\rm th}$ |
| 3 | 1997 delivered by hand to the Children's Aid Society from |
| 4 | Father Kevin Maloney. And that will be Exhibit 1861. |
| 5 | EXHIBIT NO./PIECE NO. P-1861 |
| 6 | (721626) Letter from Father Kevin Maloney |
| 7 | to Richard Abell dated 20 May, 1997 |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: Do you recall that it's this |
| 9 | letter that you signed, Father? |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, it is. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: And it refers to the meeting of - |
| 12 | - it says here May 13 but the Mr. Abell's note referred |
| 13 | to May 15. I don't know if you can clarify that or not. |
| 14 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I can't. |
| 15 | MR. RUEL: So this is the same meeting |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: you're referring to? And |
| 18 | you're producing essentially the documents I referred to |
| 19 | earlier, so the response to demand for particulars, an |
| 20 | affidavit from Ron Leroux, a statement from Ron Leroux and |
| 21 | a statement from Gerald Renshaw. |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: So what was your intention in |
| 24 | delivering those documents to the CAS? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: To follow the policy and if |

| 1 | there's an accusation to allow the CAS to investigate. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: And I gather that you were |
| 3 | were you represented by counsel during that period? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: Not at the initial meeting |
| 5 | but when Mr. Abell met with Mr. Carriere and myself there |
| 6 | was a counsel there at that time, Mr. Swabey. |
| 7 | MR. RUEL: Okay. That meeting is it |
| 8 | possible it would have been June 20th of 1997? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't know the exact |
| 10 | date. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: So what happened at the second |
| 12 | meeting? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: At the second meeting, we |
| 14 | were asked some questions and then we were told or asked, |
| 15 | sorry to make our own statement and to forward those to the |
| 16 | Children's Aid Society. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: So questions on the allegations? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: So you responded to those? |
| 20 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I did. |
| 21 | MR. RUEL: Did you cooperate with the CAS? |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I did. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: There's another document again to |
| 24 | establish the chain of events. It's document 721686. I'm |
| 25 | not sure if it's the same it's the same document than |

| 1 | the previous one but it's an excerpt. And it's page |
|----|--|
| 2 | 7082439. |
| 3 | THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 1862 is a letter |
| 4 | from to the Children's Aid Society dated June $27^{\rm th}$, 1997 |
| 5 | and signed Thomas well, support staff signing for Thomas |
| 6 | Swabey. |
| 7 | EXHIBIT NO./PIECE NO. P-1862 |
| 8 | (721686) Letter from Thomas Swabey to |
| 9 | Richard Abell dated 27 June '97 |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: Father, Thomas Swabey was your |
| 11 | counsel; is that correct? |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, he was. |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: And he's referring here to a |
| 14 | meeting at his office on June $20^{\rm th}$. And he's writing |
| 15 | Children's Aid Society, Richard Abell. So is it would |
| 16 | it be fair to say that the meeting the second meeting |
| 17 | you referred to was June 20 th ? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: And he provided some additional |
| 20 | documents to the CAS on your behalf? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: Correct. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: Did you represent only yourself |
| 23 | or the other members of your some of your colleagues as |
| 24 | well? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: We were there just to |

| 1 | address the accusations against Monsignor McDougald and |
|----|--|
| 2 | myself. |
| 3 | MR. RUEL: Oh, I see. So he represented |
| 4 | both of you? |
| 5 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 6 | MR. RUEL: And attached to this document |
| 7 | here, this particular document, is what would be the |
| 8 | response to the allegations made by Mr. Dunlop in his legal |
| 9 | document. Is that correct? |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: Where you essentially, if I read |
| 12 | this correctly, deny all the allegations? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: Then you read it correctly. |
| 14 | THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry, there's no |
| 15 | reference to this |
| 16 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: Can I sequence this for |
| 17 | you? It's pretty straightforward. This refers to |
| 18 | incorporating three things, the McDougald response, which |
| 19 | is actually attached, Commissioner |
| 20 | THE COMMISSIONER: Right. |
| 21 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: the Amended |
| 22 | Statement of Claim, which I guess was enclosed but is not |
| 23 | here at this tab, and then a letter addressed to Mr. Rudden |
| 24 | dated the 25^{th} , which is actually another document which my |
| 25 | friend can take the witness to. I think he has the |

| 1 | document reference. |
|----|---|
| 2 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. So this the |
| 3 | memo does not refer to Mr. Maloney Father Maloney. |
| 4 | MR. RUEL: I'm sorry, but was there a |
| 5 | similar memo provided to the CAS |
| 6 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 7 | MR. RUEL: with respect to your answers |
| 8 | to the |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. Both of us Mr. |
| 10 | Swabey was representing both of us and he sent an answer to |
| 11 | CAS, one in my name and one in Monsignor McDougald's name. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: Mr. Commissioner, I'll try to |
| 13 | locate the I'm sorry about the mistake, but I have the |
| 14 | document concerning dealing with Father Maloney. I'll |
| 15 | find it and enter it into the record. |
| 16 | THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: So as you indicated, the |
| 18 | expectation would be that the CAS would review the facts |
| 19 | and investigate the matter neutrally, I suspect? |
| 20 | FATHER MALONEY: Mutually? |
| 21 | MR. RUEL: Neutrally. |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: Neutrally. Yes, sorry. |
| 23 | Yes. |
| 24 | MR. RUEL: Did they do that? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: As far as I know they did. |

| 1 | They also told us that they would be turning the documents |
|----|--|
| 2 | over to the OPP at that time. |
| 3 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Was that done; do you |
| 4 | know? |
| 5 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't know. |
| 6 | MR. RUEL: When those allegations were made |
| 7 | against you, was that made public? Was it made available |
| 8 | to the general public at that time? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: Not at that time, no, sir. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: Were you removed from first of |
| 11 | all, you were still at you were at St. Columban's at the |
| 12 | time? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I was. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: As a pastor? |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: Were you removed from duties as a |
| 17 | result of those allegations? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I was not. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: Was that discussed in any way |
| 20 | with the Bishop, the possibility of removing yourself |
| 21 | pending the investigation? |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: It wasn't discussed. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: Did you think of removing |
| 24 | yourself? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: Did I think of doing it? |

| 1 | No, I didn't. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: Do you have any concern with the |
| 3 | way the matter was handled by the CAS? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: So subject to this document being |
| 6 | entered, I would move to another subject. |
| 7 | Later more than a year later, you had an |
| 8 | interview with the Ontario Provincial Police. Do you |
| 9 | recall that? |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I do. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: So we're going to go to the |
| 12 | document, but the interview was September $17^{\rm th}$, 1998. |
| 13 | So did anything happen between the moment of |
| 14 | the second meeting with the CAS on June $20^{\rm th}$, 1997 and |
| 15 | September 17 th , 1998? |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: Project Truth was born. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: Okay. But did you have any other |
| 18 | meetings with the CAS |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I did not. |
| 20 | MR. RUEL: the OPP or anyone |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: regarding those allegations? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: Not that I can recall, no. |
| 24 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: Mr. Commissioner, I |
| 25 | think maybe before he goes further, the document referred |

| to in the letter of the 25th of June, it is Document 721685 |
|--|
| Perhaps the witness could be referred to it. It might |
| complete the |
| THE COMMISSIONER: Right. No, that's fine. |
| MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: package and it does |
| refer to these discussions, OPP, CAS, et cetera. |
| FATHER MALONEY: Seven-two-five (725)? |
| THE COMMISSIONER: No, that's not in there. |
| It's a new document. |
| FATHER MALONEY: Oh. |
| (SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE) |
| THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: I never noticed that |
| before. |
| THE COMMISSIONER: Right. Well, we'll leave |
| that behind. But in any event, on June 25 th , 1997, a letter |
| was sent to lawyers Rudden, Stevenson and Levesque from Mr. |
| Thomas Swabey. Did I give the date? Yeah. So that's |
| Exhibit 1863. |
| EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-1863: |
| Letter from Thomas Swabey to Patrick Rudden, |
| dated June 25, 1997 |
| MR. RUEL: Are you aware of this document, |
| |
| |

FATHER MALONEY: Yes.

| 1 | MR. RUEL: Okay. And who is Mr. Rudden? |
|----|--|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: Mr. Rudden is |
| 3 | MR. RUEL: Rudden, sorry. |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: He's another lawyer in |
| 5 | Cornwall. |
| 6 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Representing I guess he |
| 7 | was representing |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: He was representing some of |
| 9 | the other names on that list. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: Okay. There's a mention here at |
| 11 | the second page that the investigation of the CAS will be |
| 12 | carried out in cooperation with the OPP. Do you recall |
| 13 | that being said at the meeting? |
| 14 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I do. |
| 15 | MR. RUEL: Okay. So the OPP interview |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: can you explain what |
| 18 | happened? Who contacted you? Was it were you contacted |
| 19 | by the OPP or did you contact them? What happened exactly? |
| 20 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't know if his name is |
| 21 | Constable, but the police officer named Seguin phoned, |
| 22 | asked for an interview, and I gave him a time and we met |
| 23 | together. |
| 24 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Did he explain to you why |
| 25 | he wanted to meet with you? |

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, he did. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: What did he say? |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: He said that they were |
| 4 | working on Project Truth and he wanted to have an |
| 5 | interview. |
| 6 | MR. RUEL: Did he tell you that you were a |
| 7 | suspect? |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: No, he never used the word |
| 9 | suspect. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: He never told you that you had |
| 11 | the right to be there with a lawyer or something of that |
| 12 | nature, or to be represented by counsel? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: Not that I can remember. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: So he interviewed you as a |
| 15 | witness to get information. Is that |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: your understanding? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: So the interview took place at |
| 20 | the where did that take place? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: It took place in the parish |
| 22 | hall at St. Columban's. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: Okay. Were you alone during the |
| 24 | interview? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: No, there was another |

| 1 | Constable Gernier (sic) or Gemnier (sic). |
|----|---|
| 2 | THE COMMISSIONER: Genier? |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: Genier, yes. |
| 4 | MR. RUEL: But you were not represented by |
| 5 | counsel for this |
| 6 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I wasn't. |
| 7 | MR. RUEL: interview? |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I wasn't. I was alone |
| 9 | MR. RUEL: You were alone. |
| 10 | So it's Document the Document is Exhibit |
| 11 | 678. |
| 12 | THE COMMISSIONER: Six-seven-eight (678). |
| 13 | No, you won't have that, sir. |
| 14 | (SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE) |
| 15 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. What page? |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: Father, this is an interview |
| 17 | report dated September 17, 1998. Present were Detective |
| 18 | Constable Seguin and Genier from the OPP and it's the |
| 19 | interview the witness is yourself. |
| 20 | Did you read this document in preparing for |
| 21 | this testimony? |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I did. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: Is the interview consistent with |
| 24 | is the interview report consistent with your memory of |
| 25 | what happened or what was said during the interview? |

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, it is. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: So I did not intend to read the |
| 3 | whole document, but they went through the facts that were |
| 4 | raised by Mr. Leroux, or the allegations, I should say, by |
| 5 | Mr. Leroux and others in the materials that you were |
| 6 | that you were that you obtained earlier. Is that |
| 7 | correct? |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 9 | MR. RUEL: So, for example, at there's |
| 10 | some page numbers here, or I should use the Bates page. |
| 11 | For example, at page 1059427, we can use the last three |
| 12 | numbers. So 427, there's a question about whether you |
| 13 | attended dinner parties at St. Andrew's Parish. |
| 14 | THE COMMISSIONER: Hold it. Let's make sure |
| 15 | he's there. |
| 16 | Are you at page 427? |
| 17 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 18 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: And your answer was that you went |
| 20 | to dinner there but, no, you did not attend to any dinner |
| 21 | parties? |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 23 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: Commissioner, I might |
| 24 | just interject for a moment |
| 25 | THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. |

| 1 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: by way of |
|----|---|
| 2 | expression of a concern. |
| 3 | On September $17^{\rm th}$, '07, you ruled that people |
| 4 | will not be asked about the facts underlying allegations of |
| 5 | investigations of charges. |
| 6 | THE COMMISSIONER: Absolutely. |
| 7 | MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: And I worry that we're |
| 8 | getting into that zone. Thank you. |
| 9 | MR. RUEL: The only thing I wanted to |
| 10 | establish is that the OPP went through the facts, the |
| 11 | allegations that were made by some people against you and |
| 12 | others. It's essentially what was discussed during this |
| 13 | <pre>interview; correct?</pre> |
| 14 | FATHER MALONEY: What was discussed is on |
| 15 | this interview sheet, yes. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: Okay. |
| 17 | THE COMMISSIONER: Right. But what he's |
| 18 | trying to do is summarize a little bit and put it into |
| 19 | context in that and subject to Mr. Sherriff-Scott's |
| 20 | objection was without going through all of that, the police |
| 21 | officer asked you about the allegations |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 23 | THE COMMISSIONER: that were outstanding |
| 24 | out there against you. |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |

| 1 | THE COMMISSIONER: And you gave answers to |
|----|---|
| 2 | those questions. |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 4 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: So another example, just to |
| 6 | I'm not intending to go into details. You were asked about |
| 7 | Ken Seguin, whether you knew him or not and whether you had |
| 8 | attended to his place, and the answer was "no". |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: Okay. And at the end of the |
| 11 | interview, it's at the page Bates page, the last three |
| 12 | digits would be 438, the last paragraph. |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: Four three eight (438)? I |
| 14 | have 437 to finish. |
| 15 | THE COMMISSIONER: Then maybe if you can |
| 16 | look at the screen, sir? |
| 17 | FATHER MALONEY: Okay. |
| 18 | THE COMMISSIONER: So is this where you want |
| 19 | him to be? |
| 20 | MR. RUEL: I think we may be confused with |
| 21 | the Bates pages which are on the top-left corner of the |
| 22 | page. |
| 23 | THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. And what page do |
| 24 | you want to bring him to? |
| 25 | MR. RUEL: It's 438. |

| 1 | THE COMMISSIONER: Right. No, but I think |
|----|---|
| 2 | he's |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: No, it's on different |
| 4 | numbering. If you say 437, this is 435 here. Is it not? |
| 5 | Oh, sorry. Sorry, I'm not computer literate. Thank you. |
| 6 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. So we're on the |
| 7 | right page. |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 9 | MR. RUEL: So you were asked if there was |
| 10 | something you wanted to add and you mentioned that the |
| 11 | rumour mill in the town had been really active since the |
| 12 | summer. Is that your recollection? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: Rumours involving yourself? |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: Involving a lot of people. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: Then at the bottom of the |
| 17 | paragraph, you mention, and I'll read it. It would be the |
| 18 | last sentence of that paragraph: |
| 19 | "I just hope that at one point or |
| 20 | another when this investigation is |
| 21 | over, that those responsible either |
| 22 | through Crown Attorneys or through the |
| 23 | OPP will issue the statement that a |
| 24 | complete investigation has been done |
| 25 | and that those who have been charged |

| 1 | were all that's involved." |
|----|--|
| 2 | Do you recall saying that? |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 4 | MR. RUEL: So what was your concern there? |
| 5 | FATHER MALONEY: The names were out there, |
| 6 | but there was never any there was never any sense of |
| 7 | closure. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: Ever? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: Is that your I mean, do you |
| 11 | know if the OPP published some type of or the Crown |
| 12 | some type of statement saying that, that the investigation |
| 13 | was over and that those that were charged were the only |
| 14 | ones? |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't know. I know that |
| 16 | what I was referring to is that there are those who were |
| 17 | accused and they were never charged, but they will wear |
| 18 | that stamp the rest of their lives. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: Is that the feeling that you |
| 20 | still believe that today? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I believe that, yes. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: At the following page, you |
| 23 | mention something about the Big Brothers and that you were |
| 24 | asked to speak at the banquet, and I gather you were |
| 25 | hesitant to go. |

| 1 | So can you explain this I'd rather ask |
|----|---|
| 2 | you to explain the situation rather than read the document, |
| 3 | if I can. |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: I was nominated for an |
| 5 | award for the Honorary Big Brother of the Year. I was |
| 6 | hesitant. Then I decided to accept it on the advice of the |
| 7 | police officers. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: So you went and accepted it |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I did. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: ultimately? |
| 11 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I did. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: And what's the reason I guess |
| 13 | it's obvious, but what's the reason why you were hesitant |
| 14 | to attend? |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: I did not want to bring bad |
| 16 | publicity to the organization. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: Did you have any other interview |
| 18 | or meeting or discussion with the OPP? |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: Not to my recollection. |
| 20 | MR. RUEL: In relation to those allegations? |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: No, not to my recollection. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: Did they ever confirm to you that |
| 23 | you were not a suspect and that you wouldn't be charged in |
| 24 | relation to the allegations that were made? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |

| 1 | MR. RUEL: Is it something you would have |
|----|---|
| 2 | wanted to happen? |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 4 | MR. RUEL: You were never charged? |
| 5 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I wasn't. |
| 6 | (SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE) |
| 7 | MR. RUEL: So I'd like to show you a |
| 8 | document which is not already an exhibit. It's Document |
| 9 | number 700931, so 700931. |
| 10 | And, Mr. Commissioner, this is a letter. |
| 11 | I'm just going to ask the witness if I guess he's given |
| 12 | the answer already, but if he ever was even given this |
| 13 | letter or the information contained in it, and I just want |
| 14 | to mention that there's at least one name of a person here |
| 15 | who is the subject of a moniker. |
| 16 | THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. So we'll stamp it |
| 17 | with a publication ban. |
| 18 | All right. So Exhibit number 1864 is the |
| 19 | letter to Detective Inspector Hall dated August 15 th , 2001 |
| 20 | from Lorne McConnery who is an Assistant Crown Attorney, |
| 21 | Project Truth. |
| 22 | EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-1864: |
| 23 | (700931) - (SUBJECT TO PUBLICATION BAN) |
| 24 | Letter from Lorne McConnery to Pat Hall |
| 25 | dated 15 Aug 01 |

| 1 | MR. RUEL: Father, maybe you want to take a |
|----|--|
| 2 | second or two just to take a look at the document? |
| 3 | FATHER MALONEY: Thank you. |
| 4 | (SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE) |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: Father, are you |
| 6 | THE COMMISSIONER: He's on the last page |
| 7 | now. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: I'm sorry. |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: Okay. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: Father, did you ever see this |
| 11 | document? |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: It was in some of the |
| 13 | materials that I had to prepare. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: So essentially what this is it's |
| 15 | an opinion from the Crown attorney's office as to whether |
| 16 | charges could be laid against certain individuals. |
| 17 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 18 | MR. RUEL: And there's a mention here of an |
| 19 | investigation of yourself regarding certain allegations. |
| 20 | Did you know that you were under investigation by the OPP, |
| 21 | or that the I'll rephrase that the allegations |
| 22 | against you were investigated by the OPP? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: Did I know? Only from the |
| 24 | interview that I had with Constable Seguin. |
| 25 | MR. RUEL: What this document says |

| 1 | essentially is that the Crown attorney shares the view of |
|----|---|
| 2 | the OPP police officer with respect to the credibility of |
| 3 | the allegations, essentially saying that there is a |
| 4 | credibility problem and that charges won't and on that |
| 5 | basis that charges won't be laid against you and others. |
| 6 | So you indicated earlier you were not I |
| 7 | mean, you were never given confirmation of that by the OPP |
| 8 | or the Crown attorney's office. |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: Okay. |
| 11 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, I may be a little |
| 12 | off here but the interview with the OPP, Exhibit 678, makes |
| 13 | no mention of the allegations contained in the letter from |
| 14 | the Crown. |
| 15 | So you said you knew you were under |
| 16 | investigation because the officers came and interviewed |
| 17 | you. Is that what you mean? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: With this interview that we |
| 19 | just looked at I knew that they had questioned me about |
| 20 | that. |
| 21 | THE COMMISSIONER: Right. But and I |
| 22 | don't want to use I think the moniker is for subsection |
| 23 | E; right? |
| 24 | So I guess if you look at E, the last |
| 25 | page, paragraph E |

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: Last page, yes, okay. |
|----|--|
| 2 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. And we can't |
| 3 | mention the name of the person in there. |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: Okay. |
| 5 | THE COMMISSIONER: Did you know that that |
| 6 | person had laid a complaint against you for allegations of |
| 7 | sexual assault? |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 9 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. So how did you |
| 10 | become aware of that? |
| 11 | FATHER MALONEY: Through the Criminal |
| 12 | Compensation Board. |
| 13 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Pardon? |
| 14 | Okay. |
| 15 | MR. RUEL: That allegation, if I'm not |
| 16 | mistaken, did appear but not in details in the response to |
| 17 | demand for particulars. Is that correct? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 19 | MR. RUEL: There was mention of that but |
| 20 | without details. |
| 21 | FATHER MALONEY: That's right. |
| 22 | MR. RUEL: You learned about the details |
| 23 | later. |
| 24 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 25 | MR. RUEL: Before the Criminal Injuries |

| 1 | Compensation Board. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Now I'd like to move to another subject. In |
| 3 | the year of 2000, is it accurate to say that some website - |
| 4 | - internet websites appeared on which information |
| 5 | concerning or allegation concerning abuse of young people |
| 6 | were made; are you aware of that? |
| 7 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I am aware. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: Are you computer savvy? Do you |
| 9 | have a computer yourself? |
| 10 | FATHER MALONEY: The parish has a computer; |
| 11 | I don't. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: Are you using a computer? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: I can play Free Cell and I |
| 14 | can go and get email. |
| 15 | THE COMMISSIONER: Was that the case in |
| 16 | 2000? |
| 17 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes well, no. I knew |
| 18 | less in 2000 than I do now. |
| 19 | THE COMMISSIONER: That's good. Always |
| 20 | learning. |
| 21 | So were you in 2000 did you go on a |
| 22 | computer and see what those websites were all about? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I didn't. |
| 24 | MR. RUEL: Were you informed of what the |
| 25 | websites were saying? |

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: So there was some allegations |
| 3 | directly made against you; is that correct? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: Were they the same allegations as |
| 6 | those that were that you've obtained through Mr. |
| 7 | Dunlop's lawsuit before? |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: Substantially, but I think |
| 9 | the one the name we're not supposed to mention, that was |
| 10 | also on the website. |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: There was more information, is |
| 12 | that correct, concerning this complaint? |
| 13 | FATHER MALONEY: I believe so. |
| 14 | MR. RUEL: More details? |
| 15 | FATHER MALONEY: As far as I know. |
| 16 | THE COMMISSIONER: Did you ever see any |
| 17 | printed pages or were you just told of these things? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: I saw the printed pages |
| 19 | later but I initially I was just told. |
| 20 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. |
| 21 | And when did you see the pages? |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: Different people would run |
| 23 | off |
| 24 | THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah. So was that during |
| 25 | the course of this thing or months later or |

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: Months later. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: Again, the same question as I |
| 3 | asked you before. How did you react to those allegations |
| 4 | being made on the internet against you? |
| 5 | FATHER MALONEY: I was even more angry with |
| 6 | them because there was no way to fight them. I could not |
| 7 | rely on the judicial system or anything. I felt that there |
| 8 | was nothing I could do. |
| 9 | MR. RUEL: Do you recall if there was for |
| 10 | how long the website was active? |
| 11 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't know. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: Do you recall if there was one or |
| 13 | two websites or if |
| 14 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't recall. But I was |
| 15 | told that there was more than one. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: So there were allegations against |
| 17 | you. But were there allegations against other people as |
| 18 | well on the website? |
| 19 | FATHER MALONEY: Oh, yes. |
| 20 | MR. RUEL: Okay. |
| 21 | I'd like to show you Exhibit 799. |
| 22 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. |
| 23 | (SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE) |
| 24 | THE COMMISSIONER: So do you have it, sir? |
| 25 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |

| 1 | THE COMMISSIONER: We all have it. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: Yes. Do you recognize this |
| 3 | document, Father? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, I do. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: This is a Statement of Claim |
| 6 | filed by your counsel on September $19^{\rm th}$, 2000. And the |
| 7 | plaintiffs are all clergy members. |
| 8 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 9 | MR. RUEL: And you're a member one of |
| 10 | those plaintiff's; correct? |
| 11 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: Another plaintiff is Eugene |
| 13 | Philippe Larocque. Is that Bishop Larocque? |
| 14 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, it is. |
| 15 | MR. RUEL: And you're suing a number of |
| 16 | individuals. |
| 17 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 18 | MR. RUEL: Who are those people, the |
| 19 | defendants? |
| 20 | FATHER MALONEY: Who are they; pardon me? |
| 21 | MR. RUEL: Who are those people, who are |
| 22 | they? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: They are they were |
| 24 | responsible for the website. |
| 25 | MR. RUEL: Okay. So what was the purpose of |

25

| 1 | this lawsuit? |
|----|--|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: To stop the website. |
| 3 | MR. RUEL: So the decision to take legal |
| 4 | action against the website operators, was that a common |
| 5 | decision made by those the plaintiffs mentioned here? |
| 6 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, it was. |
| 7 | MR. RUEL: Did you initiate that? How did |
| 8 | that happen? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: Did I personally initiate |
| 10 | it? |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: Yes. |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 13 | MR. RUEL: Who initiated that? |
| 14 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't know. There was a |
| 15 | discussion, there was an agreement and we went forward. |
| 16 | MR. RUEL: How what was the Bishop's |
| 17 | involvement in that decision? |
| 18 | FATHER MALONEY: The Bishop was involved in |
| 19 | all of the discussions that we had on this matter and he |
| 20 | concurred with us. |
| 21 | THE COMMISSIONER: So this is a discussion |
| 22 | you had with the plaintiffs? |
| 23 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. Yes, sir. sorry. |
| | |

damages against those defendants; is that correct?

MR. RUEL: So essentially you were seeking

| 1 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RUEL: And an injunction against those |
| 3 | defendants from publishing the information on the website? |
| 4 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: There's a mention here of two |
| 6 | websites being published; one was in July of 2000, the |
| 7 | second was in August, I believe, of 2000; is that your |
| 8 | recollection? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't remember. Sorry. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: Do you know what was the result |
| 11 | of that lawsuit? |
| 12 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, there was an agreement |
| 13 | and the website was pulled, closed down, whatever the |
| 14 | proper terminology is. |
| 15 | MR. RUEL: Was that to your satisfaction? |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: There's a document here which has |
| 18 | already been filed as an exhibit which is Exhibit 802. |
| 19 | THE COMMISSIONER: Same book, yeah. |
| 20 | Okay, we're there. |
| 21 | MR. RUEL: Yes. Did you this is a |
| 22 | consent to dismissal of an action against one of the |
| 23 | defendant, Dick Nadeau. And the second document, I |
| 24 | believe, which is part of this exhibit is a notice of |
| 25 | discontinuance of the action against Dick Nadeau without |

| 1 | cost. Do you recall that? |
|----|--|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 3 | MR. RUEL: So is this the settlement you're |
| 4 | referring to? |
| 5 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes, it is. |
| 6 | MR. RUEL: So it's against Dick Nadeau? |
| 7 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 8 | MR. RUEL: That's dated August 23, 2001? |
| 9 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 10 | MR. RUEL: So about a year later? |
| 11 | FATHER MALONEY: Yes. |
| 12 | MR. RUEL: And do you know if the case was |
| 13 | settled against the other defendants? |
| 14 | FATHER MALONEY: No, I don't remember. |
| 15 | MR. RUEL: You don't recall? |
| 16 | FATHER MALONEY: No. |
| 17 | MR. RUEL: A witness before this Commission, |
| 18 | Mr. Guzzo indicated that he had obtained information that |
| 19 | the case was settled following payment of costs to some of |
| 20 | the defendants in the United States. Have you ever heard |
| 21 | of anything of that nature? |
| 22 | FATHER MALONEY: I don't remember that. |
| 23 | MR. RUEL: So as far as you're concerned, |
| 24 | the case was settled to your satisfaction. And that |
| 25 | settlement involved that the website wouldn't be would |

| 1 | be shut down essentially? |
|----|--|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: That's correct. |
| 3 | THE COMMISSIONER: Might we are you |
| 4 | finished with that document |
| 5 | MR. RUEL: Yes. |
| 6 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, what I'd like to do |
| 7 | is stop for the day and canvass people as to how we're |
| 8 | going to organize tomorrow. |
| 9 | So do you have an idea Maître Ruel, how long |
| 10 | you're going to be to finish this? |
| 11 | MR. RUEL: I should be less than an hour. |
| 12 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. And cross- |
| 13 | examination; do people have an idea. |
| 14 | Mr. Wardle? |
| 15 | MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: I don't expect to be long |
| 16 | at all, 15 minutes. |
| 17 | THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry? |
| 18 | MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Fifteen (15) minutes. |
| 19 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. And Mr. Paul? |
| 20 | MR. PAUL: Half an hour. |
| 21 | THE COMMISSIONER: Half an hour. |
| 22 | All right, Mr. Lee? |
| 23 | MR. LEE: I'm guessing at this point but I |
| 24 | would think around half an hour. |
| 25 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Where else do |

| 1 | I go? Mr. Chisholm? |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. CHISHOLM: Five or less, sir. |
| 3 | THE COMMISSIONER: Five hours? |
| 4 | (LAUGHTER/RIRES) |
| 5 | MR. CHISHOLM: Five minutes, sir. |
| 6 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right, Mr. Fok? |
| 7 | MR.FOK: No questions. |
| 8 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. |
| 9 | MS. ROBITAILLE: No examination anticipated. |
| 10 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right and then where |
| 11 | do we go? We go over to Mr. Ertle? |
| 12 | MR. ERTLE: I don't expect anything. |
| 13 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. |
| 14 | Mr. Rose? |
| 15 | MR. ROSE: It will be five or less, sir. |
| 16 | THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Mr. Kozloff? |
| 17 | MR. KOZLOFF: No. |
| 18 | THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Carroll? |
| 19 | MR. CARROLL: About the same, five. |
| 20 | MEMBER: All right, so I guess we can |
| 21 | yes? |
| 22 | MS. LALJI: Five minutes or less. |
| 23 | THE COMMISSIONER: All right. So we can |
| 24 | start tomorrow morning at 9:30 and we should be able to |
| 25 | finish in good time tomorrow morning. |

| 1 | So you okay? |
|----|---|
| 2 | FATHER MALONEY: Oh yeah. Yes, sir. |
| 3 | THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Nine-thirty |
| 4 | tomorrow morning. Thank you. |
| 5 | FATHER MALONEY: Thank you. |
| 6 | THE REGISTRAR: Order, all rise. À l'ordre |
| 7 | veuillez vous lever. |
| 8 | This hearing is adjourned till tomorrow |
| 9 | morning at 9:30 a.m. |
| 10 | Upon adjourning at 5:02 p.m./ |
| 11 | L'audience est ajournée à 17h02 |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

| 1 | |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | CERTIFICATION |
| 6 | |
| 7 | I, Dale Waterman a certified court reporter in the Province |
| 8 | of Ontario, hereby certify the foregoing pages to be an |
| 9 | accurate transcription of my notes/records to the best of |
| 10 | my skill and ability, and I so swear. |
| 11 | |
| 12 | Je, Dale Waterman, un sténographe officiel dans la province |
| 13 | de l'Ontario, certifie que les pages ci-hautes sont une |
| 14 | transcription conforme de mes notes/enregistrements au |
| 15 | meilleur de mes capacités, et je le jure. |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | ed a wd |
| 19 | |
| 20 | Dale Waterman, CM |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |