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 327** 

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

Friday, December 19, 2008

Vendredi, le 19 décembre 2008

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

#### ii

#### Appearances/Comparutions

${\tt Ms.}$	Brigitte	Beaulne	Registrar
-------------	----------	---------	-----------

Ms. Karen Jones Commission Counsel

Mr. Peter Manderville Cornwall Community Police

Service and Cornwall Police

Service Board

Mr. Neil Kozloff Ontario Provincial Police

Ms. Leslie McIntosh Attorney General for Ontario

Mr. Stephen Scharbach

Mr. Peter Chisholm The Children's Aid Society of

the United Counties

Mr. Dallas Lee Victims' Group

M<sup>e</sup> Gisèle Levesque Diocese of Alexandria-Cornwall

and Bishop Eugene LaRocque

Mr. Michael Neville 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

Mr. Frank T. Horn Coalition for Action

Mr. Murray MacDonald

### Table of Contents / Table des matières

Table of concens, Table act macres	Page
List of Exhibits :	iv
MURRAY MacDONALD, Resumed/Sous le même serment	1
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Dallas Lee	1
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Michael Neville	142
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Peter Chisholm	188
Statement by the Commissioner/Déclaration par le Commissaire	196
Statement by/Déclaration par Ms. Karen Jones	198
Statement by/Déclaration par Mr. Peter Manderville	199
Statement by/Déclaration par Mr. Stephen Scharbach	200
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Ms. Gisèle Levesque	201
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Peter Manderville	220
Statement by/Déclaration par Mr. Neil Kozloff	244
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Ms. Leslie McIntosh	245
Statement by/Déclaration par Mr. Frank Horn	276

### LIST OF EXHIBITS/LISTE D'EXHIBITS

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO
P-2937	(129777) - Diocese Alexandria-Cornwall Report and Recommendations of Commission 3: Co-Responsibility in the Ministering Role of the Clergy dated 2000	208
P-2938	(129705) - E-Mail from Kevin Malloy to SGT. Snyder re: C-54 dated 09 Jul 98	253
P-2939	(114209) - Handwritten Notes of Malcolm MacDonald re: Sabourin	264

1	Upon commencing at 9:34 a.m./
2	L'audience débute à 9h34
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.
10	Good morning all. Good morning, Mr.
11	MacDonald.
12	Mr. Lee?
13	MURRAY MacDONALD, Resumed/Sous le même serment:
14	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR. LEE:
14 15	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR. LEE: MR. LEE: Good morning, sir.
15	MR. LEE: Good morning, sir.
15 16	MR. LEE: Good morning, sir. Mr. MacDonald.
15 16 17	<pre>MR. LEE: Good morning, sir. Mr. MacDonald. MR. MacDONALD: Hi.</pre>
15 16 17 18	MR. LEE: Good morning, sir.  Mr. MacDonald.  MR. MacDONALD: Hi.  MR. LEE: You know that I act for the
15 16 17 18 19	MR. LEE: Good morning, sir.  Mr. MacDonald.  MR. MacDONALD: Hi.  MR. LEE: You know that I act for the  Victims Group here?
15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. LEE: Good morning, sir.  Mr. MacDonald.  MR. MacDONALD: Hi.  MR. LEE: You know that I act for the  Victims Group here?  MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. LEE: Good morning, sir.  Mr. MacDonald.  MR. MacDONALD: Hi.  MR. LEE: You know that I act for the  Victims Group here?  MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.  MR. LEE: I have a number of areas that I'd
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. LEE: Good morning, sir.  Mr. MacDonald.  MR. MacDONALD: Hi.  MR. LEE: You know that I act for the  Victims Group here?  MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.  MR. LEE: I have a number of areas that I'd  like to deal with you on some of them I'm just looking

1	You spoke during your examination in-chief
2	of your work with the Children's Aid Society in your
3	capacity as a Crown?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
5	MR. LEE: And you spoke specifically of
6	giving a couple of seminars?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
8	MR. LEE: And you worked with Elizabeth
9	MacLennan on those?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
11	MR. LEE: And did I understand that those
12	were earlier in your career, prior to 1993?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
14	MR. LEE: And can I presume that part of the
15	reason you were doing that was an attempt to foster some
16	cooperation between the CAS, the Crown, the police, the
17	justice institutions generally?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
19	MR. LEE: And I take it you recognized at
20	the time the role that the CAS plays and that there is some
21	link there?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
23	MR. LEE: The roles aren't identical but the
24	CAS plays a role?
25	MR. MacDONALD: What I'd identified in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

particular was that the means of evidence collection without a connection would result in evidence that the CAS took often -- taken in a manner that would be inadmissible or exposed to problems in criminal trials, so I tried to find ways and means that -- of having statements taken in contexts that would be admissible to both criminal and family court proceedings. We recognized as well that there were instances when, you know, you couldn't use the criminal -for instance, a common one was leading questions and repeat interviews when the social workers had cause to believe that the youth or the child was unable to disclose. And so those were the areas where it was identified that there's no point in fighting between police and CAS at that point over who's right and who's wrong in terms of the procedure applied. If, at the bottom line, between the two, the child protection would trump -- child protection would act with trump criminal code. MR. LEE: And I think you explained yesterday you appreciated the fact that they were -- there were different goals between the police and the CAS? CAS is solely focused on the protection of children? MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir. MR. LEE: And the police obviously are very

much concerned with the protection of children but they

1	have some other things they need to consider as well?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I'd agree.
3	MR. LEE: And I take it you've had a good
4	relationship with the CAS throughout your career?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, always good with
6	certainly with Liz and her legal staff and the gentleman on
7	behalf of the CAS that's been monitoring these proceedings,
8	he and I throughout have always even during that even
9	during the colder uncomfortable periods '94 to '96 or 7, we
10	always had a good rapport at that level.
11	MR. LEE: Do you mean Mr. Carriere?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Bill, yes, Bill Carriere.
13	Bill's his first name?
14	MR. LEE: Yes. Yes. And what about Rick
15	Abell?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Abell and I kept our
17	distance from one another for during those years I
18	think.
19	MR. LEE: After '93 you mean?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. Near the end of his
21	regime, however, you know, all of that was starting to
22	melt; the chill was starting to thaw.
23	MR. LEE: You told us that you learned of
24	the Silmser allegations in February of '93?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

1	MR. LEE: And you spoke to us of having
2	actually physically read the statement yourself on either
3	the first or second meeting with Ms. Sebalj?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
5	MR. LEE: And that was the Silmer's eight-
6	page handwritten statement?
7	MR. MacDONALD: I believe it was.
8	MR. LEE: And you've told us here that you
9	understood, in that statement, on the face of the statement
10	anyways, abuse being alleged against two persons, on of
11	them Charles MacDonald and the other one, Ken Seguin?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Second one alluded to, the
13	first one described.
14	MR. LEE: It certainly alleged sexual abuse
15	by Ken Seguin, it just didn't provide details.
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
17	MR. LEE: And you weren't you had no
18	you understood clearly upon reading that statement that was
19	the allegation against Seguin, sexual abuse?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
21	MR. LEE: And then you've told us about
22	allegations about a judge?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
24	MR. LEE: I'm going to leave that. I
25	understand that you've told us about it but I am on the

1	face of the statement, we have Seguin and we have
2	MacDonald.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
4	MR. LEE: And you told us that you had dealt
5	with Seguin in his capacity as a probation officer?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, for years.
7	MR. LEE: By '93, you knew who he was?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Oh, for sure. And saw him
9	once a week.
10	MR. LEE: And I believe you told us you knew
11	he was a probation officer at that time but you thought
12	that he was working with adults?
13	MR. MacDONALD: I believe he was, yeah.
14	MR. LEE: And do you remember turning your
15	mind to that at the time? Or is that something you've
16	considered since?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Something I've fair to
18	say, I considered since. I mean, I knew it; I may have
19	thought about it. But I don't recall.
20	MR. LEE: And you knew Charles MacDonald
21	you didn't know Charles MacDonald
22	MR. MacDONALD: No.
23	MR. LEE: but you knew generally he was
24	a priest and you knew he was still working?
25	MR. MacDONALD: I knew only when Heidi told

1	me about the case. I didn't know I'd never heard of his
2	name before that day.
3	MR. LEE: But you understood from her that
4	he was an active priest?
5	MR. MacDONALD: That he was an active
6	priest, yes. At that time, yes.
7	MR. LEE: And Mr. Engelmann asked you a
8	little bit about the duty to report to the CAS. And you've
9	told us obviously (a) that you didn't report to the CAS
10	pursuant to any kind of duty?
11	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.
12	MR. LEE: And what I want to ask you is were
13	you aware, whether you thought it applied or not, were you
14	aware of the statutory duty to report
15	MR. MacDONALD: I knew
16	MR. LEE: under the Child and Family
17	Services Act?
18	MR. MacDONALD: I well knew about it.
19	MR. LEE: In '93?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
21	MR. LEE: And had you ever had occasion to
22	report pursuant to that duty, prior to '93?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Only never prior and only
24	once since.
25	MR. LEE: Had you ever had any dealings with

1	the duty to report at all in terms of training and terms of
2	giving a legal opinion in relation of the duty or anything
3	along those lines?
4	MR. MacDONALD: I believe that that was a
5	separate conference that I spoke at which I spoke that
6	was hosted by put on by the CAS. Aside from those two
7	training
8	MR. LEE: Right.
9	MR. MacDONALD: programs.
10	MR. LEE: Prior to '93?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
12	MR. LEE: And so you would you at the
13	very least knew there was a duty and you understood what
14	the duty was; is that fair to say?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I thought I understood
16	it well.
17	MR. LEE: With the benefit of hindsight and
18	looking back on things, is it your opinion now that you
19	did, in fact, have a duty to report?
20	Let me be more specific. After having read
21	the Silmser statement for the first time and only after
22	having read the Silmser statement, do you say now you had a
23	duty to report, in hindsight?
24	MR. MacDONALD: I think that in hindsight,
25	I'd agree with you. At the time, my focus was more so on

1	alerting the Church and the probation authorities and
2	via the police and then-Chief Shaver said he was going to
3	do that. I believe we touched upon CAS as number three on
4	the list of important persons to contact.
5	I think you've heard me explain earlier why
6	that was but I will have to concede, sir, that I would have
7	put the CAS third on the list.
8	MR. LEE: And I take it you didn't have any
9	concerns with reporting to the CAS at that point?
10	MR. MacDONALD: A concern about?
11	MR. LEE: You did not you didn't
12	intentionally not report to the CAS because of some
13	concerns
14	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
15	MR. LEE: you had with providing them
16	with the information?
17	MR. MacDONALD: That's fair.
18	MR. LEE: There was no issue there. There
19	was no problem, it simply you didn't think you needed to
20	report?
21	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't think I had I
22	didn't know how I could articulate a report at that point.
23	MR. LEE: Can we turn up, Madam Clerk,
24	Exhibit 228, please?
25	Should the witness have that report?

1	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know. It depends
2	might as well just give it to him, just in case.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes I have it up; it's
4	okay.
5	MR. LEE: You're okay with the screen?
6	MR. MacDONALD: I'm okay here, sir, if you
7	
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. No, that fine.
9	MR. LEE: Please let me know if you want a
10	hard copy of anything. We can stop and get that in front
11	of you.
12	This is the April $2^{nd}$ , '97 memo that was
13	the April $2^{nd}$ so this is the memo from Pelletier to
14	Griffiths dated April 2 <sup>nd</sup> , '97.
15	And if you look, please, Madam Clerk, at the
16	second page, second paragraph?
17	MR. MacDONALD: "The matter did not enter?"
18	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
19	MR. LEE: Yeah. That's the one. Mr.
20	Pelletier is giving Mr. Griffiths a run-down. The subject
21	matter is Regina v. Charles MacDonald's recent developments
22	and it he begins his letter by essentially running
23	through the history of what's happened, not in full detail
24	obviously, but he is giving some idea what's happened.
25	And he speaks in the previous paragraph

1	about Malcolm MacDonald having been charged, prosecuted and
2	receiving an absolute discharge. And he says:
3	"The matter did not end there. Silmser
4	was now intent on proceeding criminally
5	against Father MacDonald in relation to
6	his earlier complaints of sexual abuse.
7	The matter was further investigated by
8	OPP CIB by Detective Inspector Tim
9	Smith of Kingston CIB."
10	Then he writes:
11	"All prior investigations were
12	considered and the complainant Silmser
13	was interviewed again with a view to
14	determining whether there presently
15	existed reasonable prospects of
16	conviction."
17	And here's the part I'm interested in:
18	"Silmser's credibility was questioned,
19	bearing in mind the suspicious nature
20	of certain of the allegations, the lack
21	of corroboration, and Silmser's
22	criminal record, including dozens of
23	convictions involving dishonesty."
24	Do you see that?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

1	MR. LEE: And you told us you would have
2	received this around the time that it was sent, and Mr.
3	Engelmann showed you a fax cover sheet yesterday. You
4	recall that?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
6	MR. LEE: And I'm wondering whether or not
7	you ever took a look at Mr. Silmser's criminal record.
8	MR. MacDONALD: I believe it was reported to
9	me. I don't recall if I looked at it or not.
10	MR. LEE: I just want to
11	MR. MacDONALD: Heidi may have showed it to
12	me but I don't recall.
13	MR. LEE: I want to just take a quick look
14	to clear something up.
15	Exhibit 1296, Madam Clerk.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: That's okay, Madam Clerk.
17	It will go on the screen.
18	MR. LEE: And if we can start, please, with
19	the last page there are only two pages at the very
20	bottom. You'll see there, Mr. MacDonald:
21	"and the police information,
22	12 March, '93."
23	The very last thing on the page.
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
25	MR. LEE: And I think we can presume that

1	means that the criminal record was check was run on the
2	12 <sup>th</sup> of March, '93 in the afternoon; okay?
3	MR. MacDONALD: I suppose, right.
4	MR. LEE: And if we look back at the first
5	page, please, Madam Clerk, we have Mr. Silmser's criminal
6	record and it begins under the redaction in 1978. We have
7	theft over 200.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
9	MR. LEE: Nineteen-eighty (1980) a couple of
10	possession of stolen property charges, parole violation in
11	'81, B&E in '81, B&E with intent in '81, theft over 200,
12	theft over 200, unlawfully at large, prison breach you
13	see all that?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
15	MR. LEE: Eighty-six ('86) we hit fraud, a
16	couple of uttering forged documents and a failure to attend
17	court. You see that?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	MR. LEE: Can we scroll down, Madam Clerk?
20	Eighty-seven ('87) possession of property
21	obtained by crime, '87 attempted fraud and a fraud, and in
22	'87 we have parole and we have end of convictions and
23	discharges. Do you see that?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
25	MR. LEE: So a couple of things here.

1	We have no by 1993, we have no criminal
2	convictions since 1987. You see that?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
4	MR. LEE: And I take it you understood,
5	certainly by 1997 when Mr. Pelletier is writing to
6	Mr. Griffiths, that one of the allegations made by David
7	Silmser is that he had been abused by Ken Seguin while on
8	probation.
9	MR. MacDONALD: By the time that Bob
10	Pelletier wrote this letter I knew that. I think I knew it
11	shortly you know, in the days or weeks prior to the
12	letter being written, but
13	MR. LEE: And the allegation was that
14	Mr. Silmser had been abused as a young person
15	MR. MacDONALD: By that time, yes.
16	MR. LEE: while on probation.
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
18	MR. LEE: Meaning, presumably, that we need
19	to be looking at the start of his criminal record and his
20	criminal history for when he alleges abuse by his probation
21	officer.
22	MR. MacDONALD: I presume, yeah.
23	MR. LEE: And you obviously, being a Crown
24	Attorney, understand the role of a probation officer
25	MR. MacDONALD: M'hm.

1	MR. LEE: not only to manage the terms
2	of probation but also to assist the young person.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
4	MR. LEE: And you, I take it, would have
5	understood by this time that there could be very serious
6	harm caused by any abuses by a probation officer.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Breach of trust.
8	MR. LEE: And you'll notice the early the
9	early offences that Mr. Silmser is convicted of theft
10	over, possession of stolen property, parole violations,
11	things of those nature those aren't traditionally what
12	we would refer to as crimes involving dishonesty, are they?
13	MR. MacDONALD: All property offences and
14	offences against the administration of justice well, not
15	all offences against the administration of justice but all
16	property offences are defined as offences of dishonesty.
17	MR. LEE: So you understood the crime of
18	theft over to be a crime of dishonesty as a Crown Attorney
19	would define it?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Every Crown Attorney in
21	Ontario would feel the same way, yeah.
22	MR. LEE: And we have Mr. Pelletier writing
23	of dozens
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
25	MR. LEE: dozens of convictions. Having

1	looked at this, you'll agree that we don't have dozens of
2	convictions here?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I haven't counted
4	them, but you have to realize that one entry could relate
5	to eight convictions, right?
6	MR. LEE: Sorry, say that again.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Well, if you look at, for
8	example, in 1986, offences that occurred after this man's
9	victimization
10	MR. LEE: Yeah.
11	MR. MacDONALD: Alleged victimization.
12	MR. LEE: Yeah.
13	MR. MacDONALD: There were 10 counts of
14	MR. LEE: I see - oh, I see what you're
15	saying.
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
17	MR. LEE: In the December 3 <sup>rd</sup> , '86 entry. Is
18	that right?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, each is a separate
20	so just in that alone you've almost got a dozen.
21	MR. LEE: How many prosecutions would you
22	have dealt with at Alfred, do you recall?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Two.
24	MR. LEE: Two?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.

1	MR. LEE: And you would have worked with Tim
2	Smith
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
4	MR. LEE: during that?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I did.
6	MR. LEE: And when Mr. Smith was here,
7	having been asked about Mr. Silmser's criminal history, he
8	told us that Mr. Silmser was like an angel compared to many
9	of the victims that he worked with at Alfred.
10	MR. MacDONALD: One of the two victims that
11	I dealt with at Alfred was as close to an innocent human
12	lamb that I've ever met.
13	MR. LEE: Sorry, I missed the
14	MR. MacDONALD: An innocent human being that
15	I've ever met.
16	MR. LEE: Right.
17	MR. MacDONALD: And the second one was
18	his criminal record would show he was a monster. So I saw
19	in my two complainants I saw both extremes, and
20	Mr. Silmser's record would or at least the nature of his
21	convictions would have paled in comparison to the
21 22	convictions would have paled in comparison to the convictions of the one man that I'm referring to.
22	convictions of the one man that I'm referring to.

1	know, swearing on a Bible and
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah. No. I'm not I
3	don't know if there's any I haven't paid close attention
4	to especially to page 2, but the case law says that
5	crimes of dishonesty are property offences, theft-related
6	offences.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
8	MR. MacDONALD: We classify them into the
9	same category, but it's also fair to say that if you see a
10	perjury in someone's record that's evidence of the most
11	egregious form of dishonesty, I would say. I see a
12	difference between them both, for sure, if that's what Your
13	Honour was
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
15	MR. LEE: Moving on, you Mr. Engelmann
16	asked you during your examination in-chief about the
17	September, 1993 letter that you wrote to Luc Brunet
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	MR. LEE: about this matter.
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
21	MR. LEE: And you confirmed, obviously, that
22	there'd been you hadn't received a Crown brief at that
23	point, nor had you reviewed any officer notes or occurrence
24	reports or anything along those lines?
25	MR. MacDONALD: No.

1	MR. LEE: I'm correct?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Right. You know, I may have
3	seen the record. I don't recall. I saw the statement.
4	MR. LEE: Right. And you told us in-chief
5	that providing an opinion without a Crown brief was
6	consistent the words you used "with our practice at
7	the time", meaning in 1993.
8	MR. MacDONALD: What I meant by that in
9	analogous terms is we operated an emergency medical clinic-
10	style you know, if I can analogize it to the medical
11	model.
12	Whereas now with the personnel services and
13	policy in place, we operate more of a critical care unit.
14	Well, maybe that's being a little bit too generous to
15	myself, but certainly a med surg floor as opposed to an
16	emerg department.
17	MR. LEE: Then let me put it this way.
18	Are you telling us it was the practice of
19	the Crown here in '93 to provide legal opinions to the
20	police without having reviewed a Crown brief, or at least a
21	work product of an investigation in advance?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Well, most of the contact we
23	had with the officers although we had a significant
24	minority of contact on evidentiary direction questions
25	most of the contact was post-charge.

1	MR. LEE: But the contact you had in the
2	Silmser case was this was about the decision to proceed
3	or not to proceed?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
5	MR. LEE: This was going to conclude things
6	or he's going to have things continue. You understood I
7	mean that's
8	MR. MacDONALD: Sir, the practice that I
9	applied then was not the best practice. It was what I
10	thought to be the only option, but I will certainly concede
11	to you that our practice today, personally as a result of
12	what we've learned from this case, is the best practice.
13	MR. LEE: And as a Crown, when providing
14	legal advice or an opinion, whether it be on RPG or on
15	something else near the conclusion of an investigation, so
16	not on an evidentiary point or providing direction but
17	something substantive on
18	MR. MacDONALD: Conclusion.
19	MR. LEE: is this thing going to go or
20	is it not going to go
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
22	MR. LEE: would you agree with me it's
23	important to fully review Crown brief materials, notes,
24	whatever it may be, to in part assess the adequacy of the
25	investigation?

25

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, and that's what Bob 1 2 Pelletier was going to do with the file and with, you know, 3 whatever Heidi had produced by the time it reached that 4 point. 5 MR. LEE: Because presumably, generally 6 speaking, if you are dealing with an officer who is coming 7 to the Crown and saying, "I don't have RPG" and you are 8 relying on the verbal report of that officer it would be 9 virtually impossible to conclude that he is wrong because 10 you are receiving the Information and you have nothing to 11 look at. You have no independent assessment of anything; 12 right? MR. MacDONALD: Right, and my sense then, 13 14 and I think the sense of a number of my colleagues across 15 the province was that the officer had to swear the Information. So it had to be the officer who was satisfied 16 17 as to, you know, the contents of the evidence collected so far on the RPG's piece. 18 19 You know, it's fair to say that if Heidi 20 Sebalj didn't tell me everything chronologically or in detail as she should have I think part of that 21 22 responsibility should be on my shoulders for giving her the 23 impression that this was just an RPG exercise and not my 24 full review of the case, you know what I mean? I think

that that's an important distinction that you just brought

1	up.
2	MR. LEE: You appreciate it, I take it, by
3	the time of your September $14^{\mathrm{th}}$ '93 letter to Officer Brunet
4	that this was going to be the end of the investigation of
5	Charles MacDonald?
6	MR. MacDONALD: No, I think Chief Shaver
7	would have had he had anything else to work with would
8	have insisted on continuing. You know, I think that when
9	the complainant it's fair to say that when the
10	complainant insisted on his disinclination or so we thought
11	so we thought
12	MR. LEE: Right.
13	MR. MacDONALD: to proceed, I thought it
14	had hit a dead end. I don't know if we could say the file
15	was closed but the file was certainly in abeyance.
16	MR. LEE: And for practical purposes there's
17	not much of a difference between the two, is there?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I think that the
19	appearance of a closed file is something we should be
20	cautioned against here because a closed file means no one
21	is going to give it a second thought. And everybody in
22	that Service was going to be thinking about that priest and
23	any other evidence that may come up in the future that file
24	would have been drawn out of abeyance very quickly. I have
25	no doubt about that. The Chief would have seen to that and

1	Luc Brunet, as I know him, would likewise have done so.
2	MR. LEE: Any concerns about Mr. Silmser
3	aside, by September of 1993 you told us that the Cornwall
4	Police had moved from a weak suspicion to a strong
5	suspicion as it related to Charles MacDonald. Remember
6	that?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, and it was because of
8	that one witness in particular.
9	MR. LEE: Right.
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
11	MR. LEE: And I take it by September of 1993
12	you would at least consider the possibility that there were
13	other potential victims out there that had not yet been
14	identified?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, and Heidi had been
16	endeavouring to find them.
17	MR. LEE: And I take it you had had some
18	experience at Alfred, I would imagine, dealing with
19	perpetrators who had abused more than one victim?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Both my one of my
21	perpetrators in Alfred only abused one victim and the other
22	one abused three.
23	MR. LEE: Okay. And you appreciated,
24	obviously, that it was not terribly uncommon in cases of
25	sexual abuse of young persons to have more than one victim?

25

1	MR. MacDONALD: I would say I knew it then
2	and I'm more of an education and anecdotatal experience
3	has shown me much more evidently. But I knew it then that
4	if a predator will could have large numbers of victims,
5	many of whom never have the wherewithal to make it to
6	criminal court as complainants because they're not you
7	know, well, you've heard in the first year of testimony why
8	they sometimes can't do it.
9	MR. LEE: Regardless of the numbers that
10	don't make it to criminal court you also appreciate there
11	is a certain percentage that don't make it to the police at
12	all?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
14	MR. LEE: And I suppose one of the things
15	that I'm still confused about is that at the end of the
16	day, in relation to the Charles MacDonald investigation or
17	possible prosecution, by September of '93 all appears to be
18	lost. There doesn't appear to be anywhere else to go. You
19	don't have a complainant as far as you're concerned. There
20	are problems with Silmser in your own mind. The police
21	don't have RPG. This thing is dead in the water
22	essentially. Is that a fair way of putting your thought at
23	the time?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Right.

MR. LEE: At that point why not bring

1	Charles MacDonald for questioning?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I'd have to go back to a
3	comment I made, I think, yesterday. He'd already offered
4	to come in. We had nothing to work with, didn't even have
5	a complainant to make reference to and I don't I shared
6	Luc Brunet and the Chief's impression that the more
7	vigorous stance should be now to get this priest out of
8	practice, out of harms way in the church.
9	MR. LEE: The police had C-56 by this point.
10	You referred to him a moment ago.
11	MR. MacDONALD: One of the guys, one of the
12	names I recognize? Yeah.
13	MR. LEE: It's the other it was the other
14	one you were concerned about.
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
16	MR. LEE: Did you see any harm to bringing
17	Charles MacDonald at that point? As I understood it, you
18	had said earlier you don't bring him in mid-investigation
19	if you don't have enough
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
21	MR. LEE: because you're only going to
22	get one shot.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
24	MR. LEE: Dead in the water what's the harm
25	in bringing him I mean, was there a conversation on

1	that? Was it considered and dismissed or was it just not
2	considered?
3	MR. MacDONALD: It wasn't considered.
4	MR. LEE: And I take it you'd agree with me
5	there's no need to publicly identify him in any way in
6	order to interview him?
7	MR. MacDONALD: No.
8	MR. LEE: If you're going to lay a charge
9	you'd better be pretty sure because the paper is going to
10	print it; right?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, but he could be
12	interviewed without even his employers knowing about it.
13	MR. LEE: Right. It's not going to harm his
14	reputation or out him in any way to the community to bring
15	him in?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
17	MR. LEE: You would agree with me it's at
18	least possible that in the course of such an interview the
19	police could come across helpful information?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Possible, yes.
21	MR. LEE: It's possible the result of that
22	interview could be that the police receive information
23	which tends to exonerate Father MacDonald?
24	MR. MacDONALD: That's what I expect that
25	they would have found.

1	MR. LEE: It's at least possible there could
2	have been a confession?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Anything's possible when we
4	start, you know, to that point.
5	MR. LEE: Do you think in hindsight it was
6	worth a shot, sir?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Well, you know, he was
8	confronted by his supervisor and his employer, moral
9	supervisor, and he said that there was sexual homosexual
10	contact but no crime. That's what he would have told the
11	police, I'm sure or I expect. I don't know why he would
12	have broken down otherwise. He hasn't to date.
13	MR. LEE: You certainly didn't know what he
14	would do with any certainty in 1993.
15	MR. MacDONALD: No, I had the impression
16	when I got the offer from his counsel as to what he would
17	do. We never get offers from counsel, you know, that
18	counsel has a concern that the fellow may be inclined to
19	make an admission.
20	MR. LEE: I don't mean to be flippant here
21	at all but you've been interviewed by the police in a
22	situation where you're a person of interest.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
24	MR. LEE: And you'll agree with me it's not
25	an easy process?

1	MR. MacDONALD: No.
2	MR. LEE: It's not something somebody
3	typically goes through.
4	MR. MacDONALD: No, it's an emotionally
5	traumatic experience.
6	MR. LEE: It's difficult?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, and I'm a trained
8	lawyer. It's, I think, more difficult for folks who are
9	less comfortable or, you know, unfamiliar with the process.
10	MR. LEE: Just a minor point, you told us
11	that Ms. Sebalj told you in March of '93 that Silmser was
12	seeking or would seek a civil settlement from the Diocese.
13	MR. MacDONALD: That was my impression, yes.
14	MR. LEE: That was your understanding of it.
15	And you also told us that you were not told that Silmser
16	had a lawyer but that you presumed that he did.
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
18	MR. LEE: Did you at any point ask who that
19	lawyer was?
20	MR. MacDONALD: No, no. I knew at one time
21	Don Johnson was being considered. I think Heidi told me
22	that.
23	MR. LEE: We know from other material that
24	Ms. Sebalj had some information from Ms. Silmser or from
25	Mr. Silmser about

1	MR. MacDONALD: I see. I remember
2	MR. LEE: having spoken to Don Johnson.
3	MR. MacDONALD: I remember learning that at
4	some point but I didn't have the impression that Johnson
5	was on for him by the time that the settlement was reached
6	MR. LEE: You never spoke to Johnson, I take
7	it, about that?
8	MR. MacDONALD: I think it seems to me
9	that Don Johnson told me prior to all of this going in
10	probably, you know, springtime of that year, that he had
11	been approached and wasn't interested. That was at a time
12	when there was Mr. Johnson knew that I knew that
13	investigation was ongoing.
14	MR. LEE: Right. Can you flesh that out a
15	little bit, given we're going to hear from Mr. Johnson?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
17	MR. LEE: Can you flesh out a little bit
18	that conversation with him, please?
19	MR. MacDONALD: It seems to me he said that
20	he had been approached and wasn't interested and I don't
21	recall why, but he didn't seem to be inclined to take on
22	the case. I can't frankly, can't remember why.
23	MR. LEE: Do you recall if he had any words
24	about Mr. Silmser, either positive or negative?
25	MR. MacDONALD: He was very it was very

1	prief. I took it I took it to by implication, it was
2	negative, but he didn't I don't recall him saying
3	you know, I don't recall, but I took by
4	implication it was as brief conversation and it was that
5	he wasn't interested.
6	I may be wrong. Maybe it's because the man
7	didn't have enough retainer but, you know, I
8	MR. LEE: Right. What was your relationship
9	with Mr. Johnson like in the spring of '93? Colleagues, at
10	the very least, in the sense that you're both lawyers in
11	Cornwall?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
13	MR. LEE: Friends?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Don and I have never been
15	friends. We've been colleagues, and we've been members of
16	the Bar, co-members of the Bar. When we were colleagues,
17	we would socialize occasionally in a group, but I would say
18	it was more of a professional form of contact.
19	So by that time that you're asking in '93,
20	we were had a professional form of relationship that
21	sometimes was more than cordial and sometimes a little less
22	than cordial, as adversaries can be. Don and I get along,
23	I would say, 95 percent of the time.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: You don't invite him over
25	to your place for Christmas supper or anything

1	MR. MacDONALD: No, but I wouldn't turn him
2	away if he was hungry.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: No.
4	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
5	THE COMMISSIONER: That's really good of
6	you.
7	But your families didn't socialize together
8	or anything like that, did they?
9	MR. LEE: I recall my spouse and I going to
10	parties whenever I was a member of Don's legal staff with
11	the L'Orignal Crown Attorney's office. Mel Massé and Bob
12	Pelletier were Crowns there, and Guy Simard and I and Don,
13	and the five couples would get together and and paint
14	the town.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: We won't take that as an
16	admission.
17	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
18	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
19	MR. LEE: I went off on a bit of a tangent
20	there
21	MR. MacDONALD: Sorry.
22	MR. LEE: on the Johnson matter, but I
23	had originally asked you you said you didn't know
24	Silmser had a lawyer but you presumed that he did?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.

1	MR. LEE: You told me that you didn't
2	specifically ask Sebalj or anyone else at that point who
3	the lawyer was?
4	MR. MacDONALD: I was operating under the
5	impression he couldn't finalize a civil settlement without
6	counsel.
7	MR. LEE: Well, there
8	MR. MacDONALD: I was wrong.
9	MR. LEE: No, the that's one of the
10	distinctions that I was a little bit confused about in your
11	testimony because you first told us you presumed he had a
12	lawyer.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
14	MR. LEE: And almost as an afterthought, you
15	told us, "But I understood he could just get independent
16	legal advice at the end of the day and that would be fine".
17	So, I mean, looking back, which was it? Do
18	you remember, looking back on it? Did you presume
19	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I
20	MR. LEE: he had a lawyer or did you
21	know he didn't, and just thought it would be okay because,
22	at the end of the day, he would run it by
23	MR. MacDONALD: I I presumed he had a
24	lawyer.
25	MR. LEE: You presumed he had a lawyer?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. He was looking for a
2	lawyer in whatever you know, several months earlier, so
3	I presumed he had found one.
4	MS. McINTOSH: Just a clarification,
5	Mr. Commissioner?
6	I didn't understand the witness to say
7	that yesterday, that he thought that Mr. Silmser could
8	just get a lawyer at the end of the day. I think he was
9	making the point he just made, which is that he didn't
10	think you could enter into a settlement without a lawyer.
11	So I don't think there's a conflict in what he was saying.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: No. No, you're
13	absolutely right. He did say, I think, yesterday, that he
14	thought you needed a lawyer to settle. It's almost like
15	when you're dealing with minors or something like that,
16	but okay, that's fine.
17	MR. LEE: My recollection of the evidence,
18	it was essentially, at the end of the day, before
19	settlement could be concluded he understood you would need
20	a lawyer, so
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
22	MR. LEE: Wouldn't you typically any time
23	you were discussing a case of a legal matter, just, if for
24	noting more than to satisfy your own curiosity, ask who the
25	lawyers were on the file?

1	MR. MacDONALD: I oftentimes do that on a
2	criminal file.
3	MR. LEE: But not on this one?
4	MR. MacDONALD: No. We have a number of
5	civil counsel who will contact us, you know, either in the
6	course of a criminal prosecution or just after it's
7	completed in order to get access to the Crown brief
8	materials, the police file primarily, and it's I really
9	don't pay any heed to who's writing me in that context, and
10	that so I'd say that's the same type of analogy.
11	MR. LEE: Did the question of Mr. Silmser's
12	legal representation come up in either of your phone calls
13	with Malcolm MacDonald?
14	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.
15	MR. LEE: What about Leduc?
16	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.
17	MR. LEE: Can we take a brief look, Madam
18	Clerk, at Exhibit 1233, please? This is your July 14, '94
19	interview at the Long Sault Detachment with Officers Smith
20	and Fagan. Do you see that on the screen?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
22	MR. LEE: And, if we can go, Madam Clerk, to
23	Bates page 861, which is page 27 of the document. And if
24	we can look at the answer at the bottom of the page?
25	MR. MacDONALD: I stuttered a lot then.

1	MR. LEE: I'm sorry?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I stuttered a lot then.
3	MR. LEE: And Officer Smith's asking you
4	just above that:
5	"That things were coming to a close in
6	and around August of '93 and the
7	settlement was made. Can you tell us
8	what you were made aware of?"
9	And your answer is:
10	"I was made aware by Constable Sebalj
11	of some real hard negotiations going on
12	between Father MacDonald, Malcolm
13	MacDonald's lawyer and the Diocese. I
14	did not know who was on for the
15	Diocese. I subsequently learned it was
16	Jacques Leduc."
17	Do you see that?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	MR. LEE: What did you mean by "real hard
20	negotiations"?
21	MR. MacDONALD: It wasn't it wasn't in
22	the context we have if I can use the criminal analogy
23	with which I'm more familiar, there are counsel pre-trials
24	where, you know, at the end of the conversations, "What
25	about this?" If we do wrap up a file, and there are other

1	cases where it's "Let's settle this and let's nail down
2	the details. I'm not I will settle, Mr. Crown, if you
3	seek less penitentiary time", or whatever, you know.
4	That's what I was referring to, hard
5	negotiations versus feeling out, softly probing for a Crown
6	position or an inclination to plead.
7	MR. LEE: And the specific wording you use:
8	"real hard negotiations going on
9	between Father MacDonald, Malcolm
10	MacDonald's lawyer and the Diocese".
11	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
12	MR. LEE: No mention of the complainant
13	there. Did you understand that there were real hard
14	negotiations going on internally
15	MR. MacDONALD: No.
16	MR. LEE: between the Diocese and
17	MacDonald?
18	MR. MacDONALD: I meant with the
19	complainant.
20	MR. LEE: Did you have any information at
21	that time at all about Malcolm MacDonald's efforts on
22	behalf of Charles MacDonald to convince the Diocese
23	MR. MacDONALD: None.
24	MR. LEE: to be part of the settlement?
25	MR. MacDONALD: None.

1	MR. LEE: You didn't know any of that?
2	MR. MacDONALD: No.
3	MR. LEE: You didn't have any inkling or any
4	indication at all that Malcolm MacDonald was needing to
5	convince the Diocese of anything
6	MR. MacDONALD: None.
7	MR. LEE: or the Bishop, specifically, I
8	suppose.
9	MR. MacDONALD: None at all. None.
10	MR. LEE: So when you speak of "real hard
11	negotiations", you're speaking of
12	MR. MacDONALD: Serious efforts at a quick
13	settlement, an early settlement.
14	MR. LEE: With Silmser?
15	MR. MacDONALD: With the complainant.
16	MR. LEE: So Malcolm and the Diocese or both
17	or you had some confusion at the time of what Malcolm's
18	role was?
19	MR. MacDONALD: I thought Malcolm was on for
20	both.
21	MR. LEE: As you understood it, it was it
22	was Malcolm on one side and Silmser on the other side?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
24	MR. LEE: And I don't need you to turn it
25	up, but while we were looking at Exhibit 300 yesterday, you

I	told us that you were concerned during your second phone
2	call with Malcolm MacDonald
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
4	MR. LEE: that he believed the
5	settlement would conclude the criminal matter, and so you -
6	- you gave him what you call "a caution"?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. I told him I I told
8	him specifically that it would not.
9	MR. LEE: And when you were asked whether
10	you considered that either you as the Crown or the Cornwall
11	Police should look at the settlement documents to see if
12	they were dictating Silmser's actions, you said that you
13	were still assuming lawyers the lawyers were acting in
14	good faith, and that Sean Adams was giving Silmser proper
15	advice as to the enforceability and the legality of the
16	settlement.
17	MR. MacDONALD: Sean Adams is a very
18	capable, experienced lawyer, yes.
19	MR. LEE: And did you know Sean Adams in
20	1993?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Sean in by about that
22	time, maybe later, but around that time, I knew his father
23	better. After his father passed
24	MR. LEE: Also a lawyer?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

1	After his father passed on, I became more
2	acquainted with Sean because of his four or five times a
3	year phoning, looking for money on some charity or another.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: He wasn't a criminal
5	lawyer? When you say he's a fine lawyer, within his realm
6	of expertise?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir. I think he does
8	primarily commercial and real estate.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: So with respect
10	MR. MacDONALD: I think don't quote me on
11	that, I'm not sure.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: And so criminal law?
13	MR. MacDONALD: I've never I don't ever
14	recall talking to him about a criminal file. Well, not
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Generally
16	MR. MacDONALD: not as he spoke to me
17	once very recently on a file where he was complainant.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no. In 1993, in
19	those days was he a regular in criminal court?
20	MR. MacDONALD: An irregular in criminal
21	court.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
23	MR. LEE: Do you have a recollection of ever
24	having seen him in criminal court?
25	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall ever seeing

1	nim in criminal court, so maybe even "irregular" is
2	being too
3	MR. LEE: And so your reference that
4	Mr. Adams would call you asking for donations to various
5	charities and I take it that wouldn't be infrequent,
6	certainly. He's testified here and we've had some evidence
7	from him about what appears to be tireless work in relation
8	to charities, and I take it
9	MR. MacDONALD: Oh yes.
10	MR. LEE: it was the same in '93 and
11	before?
12	MR. MacDONALD: I don't know about back
13	then. I thought his father was the his father used to
14	lead the charge, and then when Mr. Adams the elder passed
15	on, Sean took up the torch.
16	MR. LEE: Leaving the question of whether or
17	not you should have been assuming good faith on the part of
18	the lawyers at that point aside for a moment, did you
19	consider at any point whether the settlement document
20	should be part of your file or the CPS file, just to
21	document the file in order to close it off? Is that
22	something you considered at any point?
23	MR. MacDONALD: No, I didn't consider that.
24	MR. LEE: And what you did know at that
25	point is that the settlement in one way or another had

1	directly affected the investigation?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
3	MR. LEE: Had directly affected any
4	possibility of a prosecution?
5	MR. MacDONALD: I don't know about directly.
6	I thought indirectly as a result of the settlement the
7	victim had lost interest, for whatever reason, in the
8	criminal case.
9	MR. LEE: And I take it you were presuming
10	at the time that but for the settlement Silmser would have
11	still been interested?
12	MR. MacDONALD: I was concerned that if the
13	settlement hadn't been reached I wouldn't say concerned.
14	I would have I presumed that if the settlement hadn't
15	been reached, he would have continued in his dealings with
16	Heidi.
17	MR. LEE: Did you consider the possibility
18	in September of '93 that further allegations against
19	Charles MacDonald might surface in the future?
20	MR. MacDONALD: I thought that if they were
21	out there that Heidi would have come over them. She was,
22	you know, looking at past contacts, altar boy associates in
23	the past, folks that he didn't even know. I know that she
24	checked with some folks who served on the altar under this
25	priest. I believe that's what she told me. And she was

1	I told her when it was time to drill out, as opposed to
2	down.
3	I told her that if she, you know, inquires
4	of enough folks, sooner or later if there's if he's a
5	predator that she's going to find someone else because a
6	predator is just well, obvious. It's obvious that the
7	predators are more active in terms of numbers and attempted
8	contacts with victims.
9	MR. LEE: I don't want to suggest it's the
10	role of a Crown to have a personal interest in finding
11	information and digging up dirt and laying charges and
12	prosecuting, but in terms of the possibility of a
13	prosecution and the possibility of a successful
14	investigation leading to charges in relation to the Silmser
15	complaint, it was encouraging at very least when Ms. Sebalj
16	eventually told you that she got a couple of hits,
17	essentially?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, yes.
19	MR. LEE: And you knew those people were out
20	there?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. I knew one fellow was
22	a confirmatory witness.
23	MR. LEE: And did you consider the
24	possibility, at any time of September of '93, that Silmser
25	might change his mind at some point and wish to proceed

1	after all?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I do recall I think it
3	was with Luc, but possibly the Chief, but I recall with one
4	or the other, saying, "You know what, maybe this man needs
5	some time but push him anyway".
6	MR. LEE: Do you recall whether or not you
7	instructed either Officer Brunet or Officer Sebalj to make
8	that known to Mr. Silmser at the end of the day that
9	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall. You know, I
10	may not have done that. I may have the message that I
11	may have relayed was probably more along the lines of,
12	"Push him to do it now. Don't wait till spring. Do it
13	now."
14	MR. LEE: Did you consider the possibility
15	that let me back up.
16	You spoke during your examination in-chief
17	about incremental disclosure.
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	MR. LEE: If we leave Silmser aside for a
20	moment, you had these two other people, C-56 being one of
21	them, who you seemed particularly interested in.
22	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
23	MR. LEE: Did you consider the possibility
24	there may be more there, and that in time
25	MR. MacDONALD: Well, he

1	MR. LEE: And I'm not suggesting there was,
2	by the way, before
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, yeah.
4	MR. LEE: anybody gets upset.
5	MR. MacDONALD: But in terms of probing,
6	trying to push the other folks
7	MR. LEE: Either in terms of trying to push
8	the other folks or in terms of thinking let's keep this on
9	the radar.
10	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't then; I would in
11	retrospect.
12	MR. LEE: And did you at any point consider,
13	again, the possibility that Silmser could end up as a
14	witness rather than a complainant at some point in support
15	of somebody else's allegations?
16	MR. MacDONALD: No.
17	MR. LEE: That didn't
18	MR. MacDONALD: It didn't come up, but it
19	would have had we heard of another complainant coming who
20	was willing to make an allegation, you know, proceed with a
21	charge. Then the officers would have gone back with or
22	without my suggestion, I'm sure of their own initiative, to
23	say, "Listen, we know you have a story to tell. Would you
24	be willing to come back?"
25	MR. LEE: But at no point, as far as you can

1	recall, was there any discussion between yourself and
2	either of the police officers or any police officer about
3	getting a hold of the settlement docs just to have them in
4	the file ready to go, just in case?
5	MR. MacDONALD: No, no.
6	MR. LEE: You spoke with Claude Shaver after
7	the settlement was concluded, and whether he used these
8	words or not, did you appreciate that his feeling at the
9	time was that his hands were tied?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
11	MR. LEE: And we know there's media later on
12	where Mr. Shaver uses those words. Do you recall whether
13	he used those words with you at the time?
14	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall, but he
15	certainly was frustrated; felt that, you know, he had an
16	he was encumbered.
17	MR. LEE: As I understand your evidence
18	about Mr. Shaver, he was he was annoyed or upset or
19	angry about the whole thing really. He didn't know if the
20	problem was Silmser or if the problem was the Church or if
21	the problem was the Crown. Something went bad and he was
22	upset about it. Is that right?
23	MR. MacDONALD: I'd say that's right, yeah.
24	MR. LEE: And given some of his confusion
25	about exactly what had happened and the feeling he was

l	expressing to you as the Chief of Police that his hands
2	were tied, did you during that conversation with Claude
3	Shaver, reflecting upon it afterwards, consider the
4	possibility that it may be a good idea to instruct the
5	police to look into this thing?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Oh, he was going to. There
7	is I didn't have to instruct him to do so. He was going
8	to. He was in the course of actually doing so.
9	MR. LEE: What did you understand he was
10	going to be doing exactly to look into this matter?
11	MR. MacDONALD: To review the investigation.
12	MR. LEE: He was going to review the
13	investigation? Certainly you described him, I don't
14	remember the exact wording, but being upset anyways and Ms.
15	Sebalj being in over a weekend entering everything into the
16	system. You know about that?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Well, that was my
18	impression. I don't have it's only hearsay.
19	MR. LEE: And you understood at the very
20	least that he wasn't fully up-to-speed but he was going to
21	get fully up to speed?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, he was.
23	MR. LEE: On the investigation?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. That's why he called
25	me in. He wanted my piece.

1	MR. LEE: What about in relation to the
2	settlement?
3	MR. MacDONALD: He was going to go straight
4	to the Bishop.
5	MR. LEE: And did you discuss with him at
6	any point what the goal of that confrontation with the
7	Bishop should be?
8	MR. MacDONALD: No, I but it was in that
9	part of the conversation that I cautioned him to check with
10	his civil counsel before, you know, making public
11	assertions.
12	MR. LEE: You know, obviously, that in the
13	wake of the settlement, before it becomes public knowledge,
14	there's no obstruct justice investigation.
15	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
16	MR. LEE: Right? And you didn't instruct
17	anybody to begin an obstruct justice
18	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.
19	MR. LEE: investigation?
20	MR. MacDONALD: No.
21	MR. LEE: And I take it you appreciate now,
22	and have probably appreciated for a long time, that some
23	will look at the fact that there wasn't an obstruct justice
24	investigation as evidence of collusion.
25	MR. MacDONALD: The person that would have

1	been the first question about obstruct justice, that was
2	as against the complainant himself.
3	MR. LEE: In the sense of, you know, was
4	this a ploy all along
5	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
6	MR. LEE: to further
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
8	MR. LEE: Further his own financial
9	interests.
10	MR. MacDONALD: And my view my comment to
11	the Chief was that I don't we can presume that there may
12	have been some ulterior motive in using the police, but
13	that's not sufficiently there to make an allegation.
14	I mean, this man had a right to pursue a
15	civil there's no law. You know, there's no crime to
16	pursue it and as to his motives, there was no sufficient
17	evidence to suggest that it was criminal in nature. But
18	none of us liked it and, again, we blamed him perhaps more
19	so than we should have.
20	MR. LEE: I'm trying to put myself back in
21	time and picture this conversation between you and Chief
22	Shaver.
23	You've had two phone calls with Malcolm
24	MacDonald, the second of which you felt uncomfortable and
25	felt the need to caution him.

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
2	MR. LEE: You had a phone call with Jacques
3	Leduc
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
5	MR. LEE: where there wasn't that
6	similar uncomfortableness but, nonetheless, you felt the
7	need to caution him.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
9	MR. LEE: You had been a member of a Diocese
10	subcommittee and that had you weren't happy with how
11	that turned out.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
13	MR. LEE: And generally, you had some
14	concern about the way the Church generally had reacted in
15	the past to these kind of situations?
16	MR. MacDONALD: In a spiritual context, yes.
17	MR. LEE: We have right. You told us a
18	lawyer you knew a civil settlement was okay.
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, correct.
20	MR. LEE: But as a moralist you had issues
21	with it.
22	And we have Shaver in the room who we know
23	from evidence here was not very pleased with the Diocese's
24	history in these matters from the 1986 Gilles Deslauriers
25	investigation process.

1	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't know about that.
2	MR. LEE: That's fine.
3	MS. LEVESQUE: Mr. Commissioner, this
4	witness has no knowledge of the Gilles firsthand
5	knowledge of the Deslauriers investigation or the Diocese's
6	role or whether they cooperated or not.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I don't know.
8	MS. LEVESQUE: The evidence is irrelevant.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: The Mr. Lee?
10	MR. LEE: I don't think I'm there yet,
11	frankly. I don't intend to question him about Deslauriers
12	or anything that happened there.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: No.
14	MR. LEE: We have Mr. MacDonald at a meeting
15	with Chief Shaver. I've outlined for him his own history
16	via his evidence of concerns at very least with the process
17	and I've told him we've had evidence here that Shaver had
18	concerns with the Diocese and with the Bishop relating from
19	Deslauriers. My next question was going to be whether or
20	not Shaver discussed that with him at all and maybe he did;
21	maybe he didn't.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: So it's not for the truth
23	of its contents. It's to see what his state of mind was.
24	MS. LEVESQUE: Thank you.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

1	MR. LEE: Do you recall any discussion with
2	Shaver in October of '93 about his own feelings about the
3	Diocese or his past dealings with the Bishop?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Not about his past dealings.
5	We shared the view that it may be lawful but it's not in
6	terms of optics for the Church to be doing this mid-
7	criminal investigation I thought was morally wrong and so
8	did Chief Shaver.
9	MR. LEE: Did you turn your mind at any
10	point in that period to the possibility that there was some
11	undue influence exerted upon David Silmser?
12	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.
13	MR. LEE: I take it you would have
14	recognized that there was a fairly significant power
15	imbalance here?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, but when I with the
17	impression that this is what he was set out this is part
18	of his agenda that he'd set out to do and that he had
19	succeeded we had no cause to believe that a power imbalance
20	would have done nothing other than reduce the amount of
21	money he got in his settlement.
22	MR. LEE: Is this a situation that by
23	September of 1993 you just can't get past the idea that
24	this is Silmser's doing and that Silmser has orchestrated
25	this and that Silmser

1	MR. MacDONALD: Well, Silmser, I thought,
2	participated more initiating the thing than he did. But
3	that doesn't change the fact that the Church should have
4	known better in a moral context, I think, and the lawyers
5	for the Church are going to are going to take their run
6	at me for that reason but that's my view.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Just a second.
8	MS. LEVESQUE: That's opinionated evidence.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
10	MS. LEVESQUE: It's not factual.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
12	MS. LEVESQUE: So he should not be allowed
13	to provide opinionated evidence. He should stick to the
14	facts.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Well
16	MS. LEVESQUE: It's his own personal
17	opinion.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
19	MS. LEVESQUE: It's not based on any it
20	has no factual basis other than it is his impression, it is
21	his opinion. It's not
22	THE COMMISSIONER: But he was guided by his
23	impressions and his opinions in making certain decisions.
24	So should we not know what his state of mind was in the
25	sense that he is saying now that maybe he overestimated

1	Silmser's methods and he thought at that time that the
2	Church shouldn't have done that, and how did that colour
3	his actions afterwards, if any? I think that's where we
4	need to go.
5	MS. LEVESQUE: But the basis for his
6	foundation is opinionated. It's his own personal opinion.
7	That's my objection, Mr. Commissioner.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah, I know but
9	right, but I mean this gentleman took how went on a
10	course of action, ordered his affairs professionally in a
11	certain way. And so I think it's very important to know
12	why he did that and his state of mind when he was talking
13	with him. Whether it's right or wrong it matters not. You
14	can maybe cross-examine him on those points and say, well,
15	look, ta da da da, but it's still what was motivating him
16	to move forward and I think that's relatively
17	MS. LEVESQUE: It has no factual basis.
18	That's my objection.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, but opinions
20	don't need factual basis, I think.
21	All right. So where were we?
22	MR. MacDONALD: I forget.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: We were saying that you
24	thought that Mr. Silmser may not have been as big a mover

on the settlement and you thought that the Church's

1	settlement was, in your personal view, not moral. Did you
2	say moral? I don't want to put that word in your mouth.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Civil rights aside, certain
4	creatures such as Crown attorneys
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
6	MR. MacDONALD: and I think other
7	professions, certainly, that all clerics, clerical
8	institutions, have to sometimes be, as my colleague Guy
9	Simard always says in French, plus catholique quel Pape.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: More Catholic than the
11	Pope.
12	MR. MacDONALD: And by that I mean the law,
13	the civil law notwithstanding because there is certain
14	things that we have to do and be seen to be doing that
15	retains the high ground. If an institution claims to be on
16	the high ground I think we should always be careful, be it
17	Crown attorneys, priests, doctors or anyone else in the
18	room to maintain that high ground. I don't think and nor
19	did Chief Shaver feel that that was done in this instance
20	and we were more upset about that component than we were
21	about any criminal misconduct by the Church.
22	MR. LEE: I would love to end with that
23	answer but I have some more questions so we're going to
24	have to keep going here.
25	Given your feelings at the time and what you

1	knew about Silmser, you've told us you thought something
2	went on but you didn't know if it was legal or illegal.
3	You had these
4	MR. MacDONALD: Well, the priest right,
5	and Claude and Chief Claude Shaver confirmed to me that
6	the priest had admitted an isolated moment of weakness; act
7	of indiscretion, a homosexual act.
8	MR. LEE: Did
9	MR. MacDONALD: Which caused us to which
10	is what we suspected ourselves before Claude Shaver even
11	knew that he'd admitted to it.
12	MR. LEE: Did Shaver go any further than
13	that in terms of what he understood that Father Charles
14	MacDonald had admitted to?
15	MR. MacDONALD: I'm not sure what you mean.
16	MR. LEE: Let me put it this way. Did
17	Claude Shaver tell you at any point that he had information
18	that Charles MacDonald had admitted to sexual contact with
19	Silmser?
20	MR. MacDONALD: I thought that's what he
21	admitted to, that he had I presume that he had admitted
22	to lawful homosexual contact with Mr. Silmser. That's what
23	he was reported to me by Claude Shaver, I believe.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
25	MS. LEVESQUE: We know that Claude Shaver

1	testified here and resiled on that statement.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Wait just a minute.
3	MS. LEVESQUE: Bishop LaRocque denied it.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
5	MS. LEVESQUE: We have the evidence of Luc
6	Brunet
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah, but
8	MS. LEVESQUE: which is in his
9	contemporaneous notes as well.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. But this is a
11	conversation between the Chief and this man. Does he not
12	have the right and the obligation to tell us (a) what did
13	Chief Shaver tell him and does it matter whether Chief
14	Shaver has said things to a million other people? We still
15	have the right to hear what this man said.
16	And I have to weigh what all of that means;
17	right?
18	MS. LEVESQUE: Yes.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: So
20	MS. LEVESQUE: We have the vive voce
21	evidence of Chief Shaver that he resiled on that statement.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, not to him.
23	MS. LEVESQUE: Well, he said, presumed or
24	was told. Maybe we need to clarify that.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.

1	MS. LEVESQUE: Whether he was told by Chief
2	Shaver himself or whether it's an assumption that he drew
3	from
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, no, no. Very well,
5	very well, very well, no, no.
6	MS. LEVESQUE: discussion with him.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: We're talking about a
8	conversation you had with Chief Shaver?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. So that's
11	very clear, right?
12	What did he tell you, as far as you're
13	concerned, with if anything, about Father Charles
14	MacDonald's activities?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Admission?
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
17	MR. MacDONALD: I'm sure that he made the
18	that
19	THE COMMISSIONER: He's telling you
20	MR. MacDONALD: Claude reported to me that -
21	- Claude Shaver reported to me that the priest had admitted
22	to the Bishop a homosexual act but not a crime.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
24	MR. MacDONALD: And I believe that he said
25	it was making reference to Mr. Silmser. I may be wrong but

1	that was my impression.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
3	MR. MacDONALD: I'm not certain of that but
4	it's my impression.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
6	MS. LEVESQUE: Thank you.
7	MR. LEE: Sir, I need to say that I think
8	we've now had three objections that amount to Ms. Levesque
9	doesn't like the evidence.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: I know.
11	MR. LEE: She has an opportunity to cross-
12	examine and
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Exactly.
14	MR. LEE: this gets a little tiring,
15	frankly.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
17	MR. LEE: Mr. MacDonald, the conversation
18	that you had with Claude Shaver, did he communicate to you
19	what his source of information was? You've told us that he
20	understood that MacDonald had made this admission to the
21	Bishop, but who did Shaver hear it from? Did he tell you
22	that?
23	MR. MacDONALD: I thought it was in the same
24	meeting but it may have been in a phone call that followed,
25	I'm not sure, but I thought it was in that same meeting

1	with Chief Shaver that he also said that he got this
2	information from the Bishop. However, at that first
3	meeting it may have precluded his meeting with the
4	Bishop and he may have spoken to me a day or days
5	afterwards. I just don't recall.
6	But certainly he did report back to me that
7	he got this information from the Bishop. Is that your
8	is that the question?
9	MR. LEE: Yeah, it was. Thank you.
10	MR. MacDONALD: The local Bishop.
11	MR. LEE: LaRocque?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
13	MR. LEE: Are you aware that Luc Brunet
14	testified here at this Inquiry in April?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
16	MR. LEE: I'd like to take you we're
17	going to need a couple of documents, Madam Clerk. The
18	first is Exhibit 300.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: That's a letter?
20	MR. LEE: Yes.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
22	MR. LEE: Just for some context,
23	Mr. Commissioner, Mr. MacDonald writes his opinion to Luc
24	Brunet on September $14^{\mathrm{th}}$ . This is the letter that requests
25	that opinion.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
2	MR. LEE: Do you have that before you,
3	Mr. MacDonald?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
5	MR. LEE: And, Madam Clerk, I'm also going
6	to want Volume 213 of the Inquiry transcript available at
7	some point.
8	Now, I asked Mr. Brunet about this letter to
9	you when he was here, and you'll see that he begins his
10	letter by saying:
11	"This will confirm our telephone
12	conversation of September 8 <sup>th</sup> , 1993."
13	Do you see that?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
15	MR. LEE: And do you recall having a
16	telephone conversation with Mr. Brunet prior to this letter
17	being written?
18	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall but I believe
19	it happened.
20	MR. LEE: You don't recall but?
21	MR. MacDONALD: We had a number of contacts
22	around that time of the year, so I'm sure it must have
23	happened.
24	MR. LEE: And what he says in the second
25	paragraph of the letter is that on September $3^{\rm rd}$ , he'd

1	received a letter from Malcolm MacDonald attaching a
2	statement from David Silmser stating that he'd received a
3	civil settlement to his satisfaction, and received
4	independent legal advice before accepting it and now no
5	longer wished to proceed further with criminal charges. Do
6	you see that? The second paragraph of the letter.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. The long, large
8	paragraph?
9	MR. LEE: Yes. So Officer Brunet is giving
10	you some context here about why he's writing.
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. LEE: And he gets to the point of the
13	letter in the final paragraph:
14	"It is my understanding after our
15	conversation, that your office does not
16	prosecute without the full cooperation
17	of the victim. I'm anxiously awaiting
18	your direction."
19	And from this you've sent off your reply on
20	September $14^{ ext{th}}$ that addresses directly that point, being the
21	policy of your office about proceeding without the full
22	cooperation. You recall that?
23	MR. MacDONALD: I replied, sir my letter
24	that you've just referenced applies both to the contents of
25	this letter plus the conversation I had with Luc that was,

1	you know, more expansive than just these three paragraphs
2	here.
3	MR. LEE: I'm going to have Madam Clerk hand
4	up to you Volume 213.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
6	MR. LEE: If you can turn around page 245.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
8	MR. LEE: And if you look in the middle of
9	the page, around line 11, I'm asking Officer Brunet about
10	an answer he'd given in-chief, and his answer was the
11	question was:
12	"Do you recall what information you
13	provided to Murray MacDonald during
14	that call?"
15	And Mr. Brunet in-chief had answered:
16	"Well, not word-for-word, but basically
17	there was two issues that I was curious
18	about that I wanted to get information
19	about. The first one was, can they
20	legally do that and, second of all, the
21	issue of what we do if we don't have a
22	willing complainant in a sexual assault
23	investigation."
24	You see that?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

1	MR. LEE: And I go on and follow up on the
2	first question he set out and ask him:
3	"What does that first question mean,
4	sir; 'Can they legally do that'?"
5	Mr. Brunet replies:
6	"Exactly that. Can they settle a civil
7	settlement. Can they actually give him
8	money during an active police
9	investigation?"
10	I follow up:
11	"Who would you have meant by 'they'?"
12	The transcript reads Mr. Manson; it should
13	read Mr. Lee. And I rephrase the question so:
14	"Can the Diocese settle a civil lawsuit
15	during the course of a criminal
16	investigation?"
17	And Brunet answers:
18	"That was my question, yes."
19	You see that?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
21	MR. LEE: And if you look at the next page,
22	page 247 at line 2, I ask:
23	"So can we take this answer and what
24	you've just told me now as you saying
25	that you recognized soon after, or at

1	the time of learning of the DS
2	settlement, that there might be a
3	problem with the legality of the
4	settlement?"
5	Brunet answers:
6	"I was asking the question because I
7	didn't know."
8	And I continue:
9	"The question I have is, did you
10	recognize early on, and was it one of
11	the questions you were putting to
12	Mr. MacDonald, whether or not that
13	settlement might be illegal because it
14	had an impact on the criminal
15	proceedings?"
16	He answers my question was:
17	"I really didn't know if it did or not
18	and I wanted to have legal advice on
19	that. My question was, we've got a
20	victim that's given some money here and
21	now he doesn't want to proceed. Is it
22	legal for the Diocese to give him money
23	during a criminal investigation? That
24	was my question."
25	I ask:

1	"Do you recall turning your mind to the
2	issue at that time?"
3	And he replies: "Yes."
4	You see that?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
6	MR. LEE: And he then goes on, at page 249,
7	to confirm for me that that question of the legality of the
8	settlement doesn't make its way into his letter at Exhibit
9	300 because he was satisfied, based on his discussion
10	during the telephone call of September 8 with you, that it
11	was no longer an issue.
12	And I ask him at line 9:
13	"Your concerns were allayed?"
14	And he answers: "Yes."
15	And I ask:
16	"And you didn't begin an investigation
17	of the legality of the settlement at
18	any point?"
19	And Brunet says:
20	"No, I did not."
21	Do you see all that?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir. And nor did I
23	recommend he should.
24	MR. LEE: My first question was, has
25	Mr. Brunet fairly recalled the content of that conversation

1	to the best of your recollection?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I would think that was to
3	the best of my recollection.
4	MR. LEE: My question for you is, when
5	Officer Brunet on September 8 specifically raises the
6	question of the legality of the settlement, did you not
7	think even then that you should look at the documents?
8	MR. MacDONALD: He asked he asked and we
9	conferred, and the question as to the whether you can
10	conduct a civil negotiation in the context of a criminal
11	investigation. That was the legalities that he was
12	inquiring about and that was the legalities I commented
13	upon.
14	MR. LEE: Page 247 of the transcript, I ask
15	him:
16	"At the time of learning of the DS
17	settlement"
18	Sorry. So we at line 2:
19	"So we can take this answer and what
20	you've told me, now is you saying that
21	you recognized soon after or at the
22	time of learning of the DS settlement
23	that there might be a problem with the
24	legality of the settlement?"
25	Brunet:

1	"I was asking the question because I
2	didn't know."
3	Did you, during the course of this
4	conversation or after the conversation, consider that there
5	might be a problem with the legality of the civil
6	settlement and consider whether you should get the
7	documents?
8	MS. McINTOSH: Mr. Commissioner, I think the
9	witness was just asked and answered that question, that the
10	problem that was being asked was, is it legal to settle
11	while a criminal investigation is going on, and there was
12	no question put to this witness about any particular terms
13	of the settlement and whether they were lawful or not.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Go ahead.
15	MR. LEE: May I respond?
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
17	MR. LEE: He reframed that question in his
18	answer.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
20	MR. LEE: And so I'm putting it back to him
21	having read having now asked the question for a second
22	time because I didn't get an answer to it the first
23	time, sir.
24	MS. McINTOSH: Well, but that that is not
25	the question that Luc Brunet asked this witness. And I

1 think that's clear from the whole of the transcript. 2 THE COMMISSIONER: Right. But Ms. McIntosh, 3 what about if he is changing that at this point and saying 4 something different at this point? Is he not allowed to 5 canvass that, just say "Wait a minute now, were you 6 confused or is it changed?" 7 MS. McINTOSH: Well, I think the witness 8 changed it back to the question that Luc Brunet asked him 9 recognizing that it was an unfair way to say simply 10 legality, that means that, you know, there was a concern 11 about some term of the settlement that you should have 12 looked into. The specific question, as this witness said, and answered that question, was "Is it lawful to engage or 13 14 to make a civil settlement in the middle of a criminal 15 investigation?" 16 And it's not fair to suggest there was 17 another question put to this witness that he didn't answer 18 or take up at the time. 19 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Lee? 20 MR. LEE: I think Ms. McIntosh and I can 21 disagree on what Mr. Brunet's evidence is and she has a 22 transcript and you'll have the transcript at the end of the 23 day, but I think I'm entitled to submit, at the end of the 24 day, that Mr. Brunet has given us evidence that he was

questioning the legality of the settlement in this

1	telephone call with Mr. MacDonald.
2	And I think I'm duty bound to put it to Mr.
3	MacDonald if I'm going to make that submission at the end
4	of the day.
5	My question, I read Staff Sergeant Brunet's
6	evidence as saying that he had concerns about the legality
7	of the settlement, not just the question of whether it was
8	legal to settle in civil claim, but about whether or not
9	the effect that that might have on the criminal proceedings
10	is at issue. Mr. MacDonald may well tell me that's not the
11	case and it's not what he understood. But I think I
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Go ahead.
13	MR. LEE: Mr. MacDonald, my question for you
14	is, during the course of your conversation with Officer
15	Brunet or having reflected upon it after the fact, did you
16	consider that there may be a problem with, again, the
17	legality of the settlement itself and whether or not that
18	should at least be looked into?
19	MR. MacDONALD: No, as he put it at line 18,
20	is it
21	MR. LEE: What page sir?
22	MR. MacDONALD: I'm sorry, 247 where we left
23	off.
24	MR. LEE: Yeah.
25	MR. MacDONALD: Is it legal for the Diocese

1	to give him money during a criminal investigation? That
2	was the question; that's how I answered.
3	MR. LEE: And my question for you is
4	leaving that aside, during the course of the conversation
5	with Brunet or after the conversation with Brunet, did you
6	consider did you, aside from what the question that Mr.
7	Brunet put to you, did you consider, as a result of this
8	conversation, whether there may be an issue with the
9	legality of the settlement and whether or not that should
10	be investigated?
11	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.
12	MR. LEE: Okay.
13	You were asked moving on, you were asked
14	yesterday about in-chief about information and in cross
15	by Ms. Daley, I think, about information that Ms. Sebalj
16	may have been providing to Malcolm MacDonald.
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
18	MR. LEE: Do you recall that?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I recall.
20	MR. LEE: And, having gone through what she
21	may have provided and I'll leave it at that. You told
22	us that an officer would not typically want to provide
23	details about a complainant being uncooperative or
24	unreliable to an accused person's civil counsel?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Right.

1	MR. LEE: And you understood that Malcolm
2	MacDonald was more than just Father Charles MacDonald's
3	civil counsel; did you not?
4	MR. MacDONALD: I thought
5	MR. LEE: At that time?
6	MR. MacDONALD: I'm sorry. I thought he was
7	counsel for the Diocese as well, but I was wrong.
8	MR. LEE: And I appreciate there was no
9	criminal charge laid and he wasn't into a full defence or
10	anything. But you certainly understood that Malcolm
11	MacDonald was a criminal lawyer and that his interest was
12	in Father MacDonald's possible criminal involvement in this
13	matter. Did you not?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, I think that's fair to
15	say. Mr. MacDonald did some civil and real estate too.
16	But that's aside from the point. I understand what you're
17	driving at. And yes, I presume that he would have been
18	interested in his criminal the criminal case as well.
19	Indeed he was because he contacted Sebalj
20	and said, "If and when you arrest him" there was something
21	about how he would be arrested. So that's correct.
22	MR. LEE: And where you expressed your
23	opinion that typically an officer would not want to provide
24	those types of details to a civil counsel; certainly that
25	would apply to a criminal counsel as well?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Right. He was contactbut
2	I was asked, I think, the question relating to civil
3	counsel. And that's what I had is that what I was
4	asked?
5	MR. LEE: It may well be. I'm simply you
6	would
7	MR. MacDONALD: It would apply to a criminal
8	as well, yes. Perhaps even more so. Or maybe not. But
9	either way, you don't it would be unusual to raise
10	share this information with criminal or civil counsel.
11	MR. LEE: You were asked questions about
12	your contacts with Malcolm MacDonald and your feelings
13	about those. And you're also asked about your feelings in
14	hindsight about the phone call you had with Jacques Leduc?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
16	MR. LEE: Do you recall that?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
18	MR. LEE: And one of the things that you
19	told us is that you had specifically asked Tim Smith for
20	his opinion about Jacques Leduc and whether or not he was
21	involved in the illegal settlement; do you recall that?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I didn't know whom
23	among the three
24	MR. LEE: Who are the three, sir?
25	MR. MacDONALD: The three lawyers involved.

1	MR. LEE: Yeah.
2	MR. MacDONALD: Who was party to the, you
3	know, creating the clause. And I wanted to know because I
4	had to deal with these three men, two of them more so than
5	the third, regularly in my in the future, you know. Mr.
6	Adams, I would not have dealt with regularly, but the
7	Christmas Law Society dinners, you'd want to be cordial
8	with the folks that you can be with.
9	Mr. Leduc was an executive of the
10	Association and he was active in terms of the business of
11	the Association as well as some social stuff in respect of
12	the Association. As you know, from that luncheon meeting
13	that Guy and André had with him.
14	MR. LEE: Yes.
15	MR. MacDONALD: And so I just wanted to know
16	who I could trust. And Tim Smith told me that he was of
17	the view that Adams Mr. Adams was completely clean of
18	any oblique motive. And he
19	MR. LEE: Do you remember if he expanded on
20	that at all with you?
21	MR. MacDONALD: We didn't talk much about
22	Adams.
23	MR. LEE: Okay.
24	MR. MacDONALD: We just it was "Don't
25	worry" my impression was don't worry about Mr. Adams'

1	ethics.
2	MR. LEE: What about Leduc?
3	MR. MacDONALD: And Leduc, he was not he
4	was of the view that there was insufficient he thought,
5	if I recall, and I may have the words not correct, but the
6	message was, he is a civil lawyer who probably just missed
7	it.
8	MR. LEE: Right.
9	MR. MacDONALD: And he concluded that Mr.
10	MacDonald's intent was the one that was the lead in putting
11	in that agreement. And that was disconcerting to me to say
12	the least because I had specifically told him that the case
13	would continue.
14	MR. LEE: During your examination in-chief
15	with Mr. Engelmann, you were asked about your relationship
16	with Mr. Leduc and how you knew him.
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
18	MR. LEE: You told us first that you knew
19	him professionally only; you didn't have a social
20	relationship with him.
21	MR. MacDONALD: That's correct.
22	MR. LEE: You told him you told us as
23	you've just reiterated now that he was involved in the
24	local Law Association and was active in that regard.
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

1	MR. LEE: And you told us that you likely
2	dealt with him half a dozen times per year on criminal
3	files.
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, that may be less.
5	MR. LEE: Do you have a specific
6	recollection of having dealt with him on criminal files?
7	MR. MacDONALD: No.
8	MR. LEE: How did you come up with half a
9	dozen times a year then?
10	MR. MacDONALD: I would have seen him in the
11	courthouse. And I don't have a specific recollection of
12	every case. I have a general recollection of him making
13	submissions in front of Judge Fitzpatrick on rare occasion.
14	And Judge Fitzpatrick was our Ontario our Provincial
15	Court judge at the time.
16	MR. LEE: You have recollections of Leduc
17	making submissions before an Ontario court justice?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	MR. LEE: On a criminal matter?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I do. I'm almost
21	certain of that.
22	MR. LEE: And you joined the Crown's office
23	here in September of '88?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
25	MR. LEE: And this all happens in September

of '93, so there's about a five-year period there.

1

1	or 93, so there's about a rive-year period there.
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
3	MR. LEE: Would you have had some
4	professional dealings with Leduc throughout that five-year
5	period in terms of legal work, not Law Association work?
6	MR. MacDONALD: I'm I would I'm not
7	sure but reasonably confident that he would have
8	occasionally written for a brief or he, like most
9	practitioners in Cornwall, would act for the duty impaired
10	file on the client's son, you know.
11	MR. LEE: The right. So he I
12	understand.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
14	MR. LEE: You were aware that Mr. Leduc
15	testified here?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
17	MR. LEE: He told us he did not practice
18	criminal law. And we have an interview report from 1994
19	where he tells Tim Smith and Mike Fagan the same thing,
20	that he did not practice criminal law.
21	MR. MacDONALD: I believe he dabbled in it.
22	MR. LEE: And you were interviewed by the
23	Ottawa Police Service in '94, the OPP in '94, and the OPP
24	in '98 about issues surrounding the Silmser settlement?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

1	MR. LEE: And do you recall ever having been
2	asked about your knowledge of Mr. Leduc's criminal law
3	experience by any of those investigators?
4	MR. MacDONALD: No, I don't recall. Can you
5	point them out to me?
6	MR. LEE: I don't believe you were.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Oh.
8	MR. LEE: Just, I'm I'm asking, you're a
9	Crown Attorney
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
11	MR. LEE: and the police officer, I
12	presume there was some discussion off the record and
13	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall. There was a
14	lot of discussion off the record over the years, that's
15	true, but I don't recall our talking about I just
16	asked I remember inquiring of Tim Smith as, who can I
17	trust here, you know?
18	MR. LEE: M'hm? And you're aware Tim Smith
19	testified here recently?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
21	MR. LEE: And one of the things he told us
22	is that in his determination of who was involved in the
23	civil settlement, a relevant factor in his mind was that
24	Malcolm MacDonald was a former Crown Attorney, a criminal
25	defence lawyer, and Leduc was not.

1	MR. MacDONALD: He told me that.
2	MR. LEE: And his reasoning, as I understood
3	it, was that Leduc would have needed some knowledge of
4	criminal law in order to appreciate that there was a
5	problem with paragraph 2 of that settlement.
6	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
7	MR. LEE: Okay? Leaving whether that's true
8	or not aside, that was Smith's theory on it.
9	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
10	MR. LEE: Did he ever discuss that theory
11	with you in any detail?
12	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir. I wasn't privy to
13	that component of the investigation.
14	MR. LEE: Mr. Commissioner, I have I'm
15	not going to be done by 11:00. I don't know if now is a
16	good time for a break or
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.
18	Before we go before we go, how much
19	longer do you have? I just need to plan our time.
20	MR. LEE: It's entirely my fault. My
21	estimate was not very good. I would say I probably have at
22	least a half-an-hour left, sir.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Thirty minutes? All
24	right.
25	Mr. Neville? Can you give me some idea?

1	MR. NEVILLE: Perhaps three-quarters-of-an-
2	hour, sir.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
4	Mr. Chisholm?
5	MR. CHISHOLM: Five minutes, sir.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
7	Ms. Robitaille?
8	MS. ROBITTAILLE: Five minutes, Mr.
9	Commissioner.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
11	Ms. Levesque?
12	MS. LEVESQUE: Ten to fifteen minutes, sir.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
14	Mr. Manderville?
15	MR. MANDERVILLE: First, I believe
16	Mr. Chisholm said three minutes yesterday, so I am
17	concerned, but
18	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
19	MR. MANDERVILLE: half-an-hour to forty-
20	five minutes, sir.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: So we'll give you thirty
22	minutes for that comment.
23	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Right, Mr. Chisholm?
25	MR. CHISHOLM: Yes, sir, thank you.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
2	Mr. Kozloff?
3	MR. KOZLOFF: None contemplated, Mr.
4	Commissioner.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Carroll?
6	MR. CARROLL: None, sir.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
8	And Ms. McIntosh?
9	MS. McINTOSH: Half-an-hour to forty-five
10	minutes, sir.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
12	So, hopefully, we might be able to get this
13	done by early afternoon.
14	All right, good, thank you.
15	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. A l'ordre;
16	Veuillez vous lever.
17	This hearing will resume at 11:15 a.m.
18	Upon recessing at 10:57 a.m./
19	L'audience est suspendue à 10h57
20	Upon resuming at 11:21 a.m./
21	L'audience est reprise à 11h21
22	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. A l'ordre;
23	Veuillez vous lever.
24	This hearing is now resumed. Please be
25	seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.

1	MURRAY MacDONALD, Resumed/sous le même serment:
2	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR. LEE:
3	(cont'd/suite):
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Gees, Mr. Lee, I thought
5	you had changed sides and seen the light.
6	MR. LEE: Madam Clerk, I'm going to want two
7	exhibits, Exhibit 298 and Exhibit 863. Two-nine,-eight
8	(298).
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Two-nine-eight (298).
10	MR. LEE: And eight-six-three (863).
11	These relate to Malcolm MacDonald's
12	statements to the police.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
14	MR. LEE: So, sir, 298 is the no, wait
15	863 is the other number.
16	MR. MacDONALD: Okay.
17	MR. LEE: You have 298 up, sir?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	MR. LEE: And you'll see this is I
20	believe Ms. Daley took you to this it's the June $20^{\rm th}$ ,
21	'94 statement from Malcolm MacDonald, and paragraph 5
22	reads:
23	"Before taking any further action, I
24	discussed this matter with Murray
25	MacDonald, Crown Attorney, and

1	explained the Church's position and my
2	part in it. He indicated to me he saw
3	nothing wrong and to go ahead on that
4	basis and avoid further court
5	proceedings."
6	Do you see that?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
8	MR. LEE: I take it you disagree with
9	MR. MacDONALD: Well, it's a lie.
10	MR. LEE: And you have no recollection at
11	all of having said anything like that?
12	MR. MacDONALD: I know I didn't.
13	MR. LEE: Not even possible?
14	MR. MacDONALD: I beg your pardon?
15	MR. LEE: Not even possible?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Not even possible.
17	MR. LEE: And if we look at Exhibit 863
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
19	MR. LEE: this is the October 28, '94
20	interview of Malcolm MacDonald, and if I can take you to
21	page 18. For the record, it's Bates page ending 944.
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
23	MR. LEE: We have Tim Smith asking, "Did
24	you" The first question on the page:
25	"Did you indicate at that time that it

1	was a civil matter that you were
2	settling or the totality?"
3	And Malcolm MacDonald replies:
4	"The totality of it, yes, yeah."
5	Smith asks:
6	"Even the criminal end of it?"
7	MacDonald:
8	"Yes, yes. Yeah, yeah."
9	And it goes on:
10	"What did he say to that?"
11	And at the top of page 19, we have the
12	answer that you're purported to have responded:
13	"Well, fine. If everybody's happy, I'm
14	happy."
15	And Smith presses again:
16	"Even on the criminal end?"
17	And Malcolm says:
18	"Well, he didn't be specific in
19	anything, he just said"
20	And it goes on with Smith pushing:
21	"Are you sure it was criminal?"
22	And at the end of the page, the last answer
23	by MacDonald:
24	"I don't think I said specifically, you
25	know, civil and criminal, you know. I

1	think that it was clear to him that he
2	wouldn't proceed with anything, put it
3	that way."
4	Do you see that?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
6	MR. LEE: And presumably what he's saying
7	there is it was clear that Murray MacDonald, that David
8	Silmser, wouldn't proceed with anything "put it that
9	way", right? That's what he's saying?
10	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
11	MR. LEE: And
12	MR. MacDONALD: If it was clear to Mr.
13	MacDonald, it wasn't clear to me, because that's not the
14	the gist of our conversation.
15	MR. LEE: We'll get there and I
16	I'll ask you directly to comment on that.
17	If I can just take you first to page 27?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
19	MR. LEE: Malcolm says:
20	"Well, as far as I was concerned, I
21	felt that Mr. MacDonald, Murray
22	MacDonald, was full well aware of what
23	was going on and what we were talking
24	about. You know, I didn't walk in and
25	just say I have a matter here you know,

1	would you agree to this, you know."
2	Okay? So it's a couple of times in this
3	interview that Malcolm MacDonald's suggesting that you were
4	in the loop and whether he explicitly said, yeah, criminal
5	and civil, you knew exactly what we were talking about
6	here? That what he's saying here.
7	So it seems to me there are a couple of
8	interpretations here; okay? And I'll ask you directly for
9	comment.
10	Number one, you might take what he's saying
11	here, that you had a specific knowledge that the settlement
12	would stipulate both the civil and criminal would come to
13	an end. Or, number two, you knew that the effect of the
14	settlement, whatever its terms, would be the whole thing of
15	both the criminal and civil proceedings; okay?
16	You obviously flatly deny the first,
17	specific knowledge that
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	MR. LEE: the terms, right that no
20	doubt in your mind on that?
21	MR. MacDONALD: And I can flatly deny the
22	second, too.
23	MR. LEE: And dealing with the second,
24	that's what I want to talk to you about, and the way I
25	framed it is you knew that the effect of the settlement,

1	whatever it included, would be the halting of both the
2	civil and criminal proceedings?
3	Is that not true from a practical point-of-
4	view? Wasn't that in your mind at the time?
5	MR. MacDONALD: No, not at all. I recall
6	I either told him clearly it would not or the gist of the
7	conversation was made that apparent. I hate to speak
8	ill of the dead but he's just not recounting it the way it
9	was, sir.
10	MR. LEE: What did you think the point of
11	the settlement was?
12	MR. MacDONALD: In a small, local law
13	association, to show the Crown that I'm doing something
14	that may be of no assistance to your case but I'm sorry,
15	the settlement, not the call. Sorry, I missed
16	MR. LEE: No, I think we definitely have
17	your evidence
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	MR. LEE: in terms of
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
21	MR. LEE: what you thought the point
22	of
23	MR. MacDONALD: Sorry.
24	MR. LEE: the telephone calls were.
25	MR. MacDONALD: Sorry.

1	MR. LEE: What did you think the point of
2	this settlement was, if not, for the lack of a better term,
3	to get Father MacDonald and the Diocese off the hook
4	complete? What else would the purpose of the settlement
5	be?
6	MR. MacDONALD: To hope that that would be
7	enough for this man and that he would not be inclined to
8	continue with his allegations.
9	MR. LEE: In other words, you considered
10	it you considered the possibility that the at least
11	the hope of Malcolm MacDonald and Charles MacDonald and the
12	Diocese was that, "If we settle with this man civilly, he
13	may just give up on the criminal"? Is that
14	MR. MacDONALD: Sure. He may change his
15	story, soften his story, or give up.
16	MR. LEE: And did you consider in that time
17	that the Diocese and/or Father MacDonald would not likely
18	negotiate a settlement and pay out monies without some
19	certainty that this matter was going to be concluded?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Oh, I've seen a number of
21	settlements where the criminal cases continued or even were
22	initiated after them, so, no, that didn't it struck me
23	that what we hoped for, it struck me that what we hoped
24	for, Heidi, the staff sergeant and I, the detective
25	sergeant and I, was that when we got this out of the way

1	then we'd be in a position to clear away the spectre of
2	monetary motive for continuing on a criminal case.
3	MR. LEE: You'd agree with me this what
4	you're dealing with here is a different situation as
5	compared to a situation where a charge has already been
6	made or been laid, rather, and the matter was public and
7	there is then a civil negotiation?
8	MR. MacDONALD: We had seen some of that in
9	the Alfred case.
10	MR. LEE: You would agree with me and
11	well, did you turn your mind to the fact that a major
12	concern of Father MacDonald and the Diocese would be this
13	becoming public?
14	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.
15	MR. LEE: That didn't enter you mind at all?
16	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir. I knew it was
17	going to become public if charges were laid.
18	MR. LEE: And they knew it would become
19	public if charges were laid. My point is, did you consider
20	the fact that everything they were doing was to avoid that
21	very publicity and avoid this becoming public knowledge?
22	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall if I thought
23	about their views on public disclosure.
24	MR. LEE: Let me briefly summarize. You had
25	absolutely no idea that Charles MacDonald or the Diocese

1	were attempting to buy Silmser's silence in totality.
2	MR. MacDONALD: I think they were hoping to
3	discourage him after he got his money.
4	MR. LEE: And you say neither Malcolm
5	MacDonald nor Jacques Leduc advised you of what they were -
6	- of an attempt to put a halt to the criminal proceedings.
7	That's not the way they spun it to you?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Right. They spun it as
9	they're exercising their civil liberty, at least the
10	complainant the suspect, sir, or the defendants,
11	whatever we call them, were exercising their right to civil
12	negotiations.
13	MR. LEE: I take it you've spent a lot of
14	time since news of the illegal settlement became public in
15	early '94 playing these events over in your mind?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
17	MR. LEE: But with the benefit of hindsight,
18	with the benefit of having prepared for the Inquiry, with
19	the benefit of the documents and everything else, sitting
20	here today why do you believe what do you believe was
21	going on when you were contacted by Malcolm MacDonald and
22	Jacques Leduc in those three telephone calls?
23	MR. MacDONALD: I'm not sure how to answer
24	that.
25	MS. LEVESQUE: Mr. Commissioner, I'm not

24

25

1 sure that that's a proper question today. I mean, the 2 witness has testified about what he took from the telephone calls then. I don't know that it's helpful to ask him to 3 revisit that today and say, you know, "Do you think they 4 5 were trying to pull the wool over your eyes?" I just don't 6 see the utility of that question. 7 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. ---8 MR. LEE: We're at a public inquiry, sir. 9 We have the Crown attorney here. He was directly involved. 10 He dealt with these people. He knew these people. He's 11 been party to the telephone calls. I think it's a valid question to ask him what he thinks was going on now that he 12 has the facts and now that he's had time to reflect over 13 14 it. THE COMMISSIONER: How is that relevant to 15 16 the Inquiry? 17 MR. LEE: I think it's relevant to the 18 Inquiry that depending on his answer I may elicit further 19 information from him about why he believes that and -- I'm 20 not satisfied, at least in my mind. I fully understand his 21 answers in relation to why at the time he believed that 22 Malcolm MacDonald was calling him, why he believed at the

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, he's told us that

time Malcolm MacDonald called the second time, why he

believed at the time that Jacques Leduc ---

1	already. He has told us that he thought they were taking
2	the high road, that they were telling him that at that
3	time.
4	MR. LEE: And
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah, okay, go ahead.
6	MR. LEE: I think I'm entitled to press him
7	a little bit on whether or not that's true and whether or
8	not he had other thoughts in his mind at the time and
9	whether or not he was in fact suspicious at the time.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: You can do that but what
11	does asking him for his opinion as to what things are now,
12	how is that going to I think you can
13	MR. LEE: I think can we ask the witness
14	to be excused for a moment?
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure, thank you.
16	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
17	MR. LEE: I suppose if he tells me that with
18	the benefit of hindsight nothing in his mind has really
19	changed and that he still believes that, the best I can do
20	is say to him, "Well, it wasn't reasonable to believe at
21	the time" and lay out for him why I say that. If on the
22	other hand he says, "With the benefit of hindsight, I think
23	they set me up. I think they were in on it. I have now
24	figured out exactly what's going on and here's what I say
25	was going on"

1 THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. 2 MR. LEE: --- I think I'm then entitled to put that back to him and say, "Well, what's changed? What 3 4 information you have now that you didn't have in '94 that 5 wouldn't lead you at that time to think of it?" I mean, 6 you know, as I said it's a public inquiry. This man is 7 directly involved. He is obviously -- we've got some 8 impression from his evidence that this has affected him in 9 a great way, that he spent a lot of time thinking about it and, you know, I think I should be entitled to ask him what 10 11 his theory is on it. 12 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. 13 There is someone ---14 MS. ROBITAILLE: Mr. Commissioner, my 15 concern is that there is a lot of water under the bridge 16 from the time that these conversations occurred to today. 17 I'm not sure that this witness will be able to isolate 18 knowledge that he acquired through preparation for the 19 Inquiry, certain pieces of news that he's read, websites he 20 may have read, and so his impression of those phone 21 conversations could be tainted in any number of ways that will be very difficult to weed out. That's my first 22 23 concern. 24 My second concern is his evidence as to what 25 he believes now, what his theory is, is not exactly

1	probative, and we know that my client's involvement in the
2	settlement was investigated and reviewed by no less than
3	five Crown attorneys and no charges were laid. So you
4	know, I think the value of the evidence is not very great.
5	And those are my submissions.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, okay.
7	I think Ms. McIntosh?
8	MS. McINTOSH: As I understand what Mr. Lee
9	is saying, he's saying that if Mr. MacDonald concedes today
10	or says today, "I think I was set up" that that is somehow
11	probative of the fact that he should have known at the time
12	of these conversations that he was being set up. And my
13	friend says, "What's changed?" Well, for starters, Malcolm
14	MacDonald pleaded guilty to obstructing justice.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
16	MS. McINTOSH: So to suggest that his
17	opinion today is somehow probative of something else than
18	what he's told us then and in light of what Ms. Robitaille
19	has said about all of the water under the bridge including
20	a guilty plea from one of the parties to obstructing
21	justice, it just can't be correct, Mr. Commissioner.
22	Thank you.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
24	MR. LEE: Can I just very, very briefly?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, yes, yes.

1	MR. LEE: All right.
2	The book on Malcolm MacDonald on this has
3	been written. My version of events that I'll put to you at
4	the end of the day in relation to Mr. Leduc is going to be
5	far different from Ms. Robitaille's and that's what I'm
6	trying to focus.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Right, but I think you're
8	going about it in a way that you're asking him the wrong
9	question to start off with. I don't know that his opinion
10	is all that relevant at this point but I'm sure that you
11	can put to him, "Well, you know, we now know this. You
12	know, how would that factor in?" And so if you put in the
13	facts that you want to factor in, I think I might be more
14	inclined to have you do that.
15	MR. LEE: I think I understand your ruling,
16	sir, and I think for the most part I have the evidence I
17	need. I have a couple of questions that I don't think
18	anybody is going to have an issue with.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.
20	Can we get the witness back in, please?
21	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
22	THE COMMISSIONER: So sir, I think you've
23	heard this before but when witnesses are asked to leave it
24	has nothing to do with your testimony. It's an
25	administrative matter that we have to deal with, the

1	admissibility of certain questions.
2	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.
4	Go ahead, Mr. Lee.
5	MR. LEE: You knew Malcolm MacDonald by 1993
6	at least fairly well in a professional capacity as a lawyer
7	in town?
8	MR. MacDONALD: I thought I did.
9	MR. LEE: And there's information in one of
10	his statements that he was called to the Bar in June of
11	1955. He was a very senior lawyer by the time that you
12	were dealing with him in '93?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir. He had Judge
14	Fitzpatrick's ear in a particular way.
15	MR. LEE: We've had evidence here that
16	Mr. Leduc was called to the Bar in 1978, so he'd been out
17	about 15 years by 1993.
18	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
19	MR. LEE: And you've told us here that you
20	were called to the Bar in 1987.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
22	MR. LEE: And became the fulltime Crown in
23	1992.
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
25	ADD. THE TAX AND A C

MR. LEE: You were about five years out at

1	the time.
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
3	MR. LEE: And you recognized at the time, I
4	take it, Mr. Leduc and Mr. MacDonald as senior members of
5	the Bar?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I would have considered
7	them such.
8	MR. LEE: Moving on.
9	You understood that Silmser initially
10	alleged abuse by both Charles MacDonald and Ken Seguin;
11	you've told us that. And Mr. Engelmann took you yesterday
12	to the fact that in March of 1993 Mr. Silmser told Ms.
13	Sebalj that he wished to proceed. He could only he
14	could only handle essentially proceeding against Charles
15	MacDonald. He couldn't do he couldn't go with both at
16	the same time. You recall that?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
18	MR. LEE: And you understand that his
19	original handwritten statement was received in December of
20	'92?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Silmser's? Yes, sir.
22	MR. LEE: Yeah, and in January of '93 you
23	now know that he was interviewed by the Cornwall Police
24	Service?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.

1	MR. LEE: So in March of '93 we have
2	Mr. Silmser saying, "Let's go with Charles MacDonald only.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
4	MR. LEE: And that's depending on the
5	date, it's a couple of months after the interview of
6	January '93 where you now know he provided some details of
7	the abuse by Mr. Seguin.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
9	MR. LEE: Did you at any point instruct the
10	Cornwall Police Service to more closely examine why
11	Mr. Silmser advised that he wished to not proceed at that
12	time against Mr. Seguin?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
14	MR. LEE: And do you recall what your
15	instruction was?
16	MR. MacDONALD: To go back and to tell
17	Mr. Silmser encourage him to try to have the
18	wherewithal, try to collect the wherewithal to disclose
19	this one too.
20	MR. LEE: And
21	MR. MacDONALD: The detail of this
22	disclosure.
23	MR. LEE: Do you recall whether or not you
24	asked the Cornwall Police to inquire into whether or not
25	there'd been any contact between Silmser and Sequin?

1	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir, I don't recall. I
2	don't believe I did.
3	MR. LEE: Or whether you asked them to flesh
4	out the nature of any contacts that they may have had?
5	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall.
6	MR. LEE: Do you remember turning your mind
7	at that time to the question of whether or not it was
8	possible that Seguin had exerted some influence over
9	Silmser?
10	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir, I don't recall.
11	MR. LEE: Just not something that occurred
12	to you at the time?
13	MR. MacDONALD: It didn't occur to me.
14	MR. LEE: Can we turn up, please, Exhibit
15	228? I think we looked at this earlier. Hopefully it's
16	still there.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: What is it?
18	MR. LEE: This is the April 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 97 memo from
19	Robert Pelletier to Peter Griffiths.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
22	MR. LEE: And if we look at the second-last
23	page, page 9, the second paragraph, Mr. Pelletier has, to a
24	large extent, outlined many of the allegations contained in
25	the Dunlop-Bourgeois brief, as you referred to it

1	yesterday, and he says:
2	"Needless to say, I am not convinced
3	that these allegations are well
4	founded."
5	And he goes on and he says:
6	"Given three unfortunate
7	coincidences"
8	These people are convinced of the existence
9	of a conspiracy as it relates to your involvement.
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
11	MR. LEE: And in the next paragraph, midway
12	through he says:
13	"A decision not to recommend charges
14	would in all likelihood be seen as the
15	latest in the obstructive measures
16	employed by those in authority. It is
17	in this connection that my personal as
18	well as professional affiliations with
19	Murray MacDonald become a complicating
20	factor. Your views in this regard
21	would of course be very much
22	appreciated."
23	This is Mr. Pelletier writing to
24	Mr. Griffiths. Do you know what he is referring to when he
25	says his, "personal as well as professional affiliations"

1	with you? Specifically I'm interested in the personal
2	relationship there.
3	MR. MacDONALD: We were close personal
4	friends. We are close personal friends.
5	MR. LEE: And you were in 1997, I take it?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir. By virtue of his
7	new role in the system we don't have regular contact any
8	more but we're still we're still on good terms.
9	MR. LEE: Where did that friendship
10	originate, just generally? I mean
11	MR. MacDONALD: Undergrad
12	MR. LEE: Okay, so it goes back a fair ways.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
14	MR. LEE: And so certainly by '93 and when
15	all of this is happening you were at that point good
16	friends of Peter Griffiths?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Peter Griffiths or Bob
18	Pelletier?
19	MR. LEE: Sorry, Robert Pelletier. Robert
20	Pelletier, sorry.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: He does that sometimes
23	just to see if we're
24	MR. LEE: Having never met any of these
25	people, it's hard to keep them straight.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: I understand, Mr. Lee.
2	MR. LEE: I want to just briefly ask you
3	about a woman named Geraldine Fitzpatrick.
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
5	MR. LEE: Do you know her, sir?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
7	MR. LEE: And you know she's a Children's
8	Aid Society worker?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir, I know her. I
10	know her and I know her brother.
11	MR. LEE: Sorry, her brother?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
13	MR. LEE: Mr. Chisholm has picked up his
14	pen.
15	If we can look, please, at Exhibit 2353.
16	Are you aware that Ms. Fitzpatrick testified
17	here?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
19	MR. LEE: While Madam Clerk is getting that
20	I can tell you that in February of 2008 Ms. Fitzpatrick, in
21	preparation for the Inquiry, was interviewed by Bill
22	Carriere, among others, just to see what information she
23	had about the Inquiry. We've been produced what I'll
24	describe as a summary of that interview, where she says a
25	number of things and I want to put some of those to you and

1	get your response; okay?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you, ma'am.
3	MR. LEE: Let me start by asking you whether
4	you ever discussed, after the media got a hold of the
5	Silmser settlement and the it was well known that there
6	was an illegal clause and the OPP and the OPS had come in
7	to look at things.
8	Did you at any point sit down with
9	Ms. Sebalj to discuss what had happened and the fallout, or
10	anything along those lines?
11	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.
12	MR. LEE: To this day have you ever done
13	that?
14	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir. It was at a time
15	when we couldn't talk about it because she was under
16	investigation, other police services or my supervisor were
17	involved, so it was a topic that we both recognized we
18	should stay away from.
19	MR. LEE: Do you recall having a specific
20	conversation with her even about that, or was it just
21	understood that you would both
22	MR. MacDONALD: I understood it. I would
23	imagine she did too. She didn't articulate it to me but
24	she understood, you know, the big picture.
25	MR. LEE: And have you ever met

1	Ms. Fitzpatrick?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, yes.
3	MR. LEE: In a professional capacity, I take
4	it.
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, yes.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: But you also knew her
7	personally?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Only professionally. Her
9	brother is a few years older than me but he grew up in
10	Lancaster, in South Lancaster, which is the suburb of
11	Lancaster.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh yes.
13	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
14	MR. MacDONALD: And so we would run into his
15	brother from time to time.
16	MR. LEE: The I'm going to take you to
17	all at once I'm going to take you to four pages of this.
18	I'm going to point you to some bullets. I'm going to let
19	you read them and then they all deal with the same
20	matter and I'm going to ask you generally for comment;
21	okay?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
23	MR. LEE: We start on page 1, the fourth-
24	last bullet:

103

"Heidi said she didn't know why they

1	were making issue in this case now.
2	Heidi said she had discussed the case
3	with the Crown attorney and he had said
4	she didn't have a case. Now they want
5	to open it up as a case."
6	Okay? And this all stems from Ms. Sebalj
7	having received some allegations of abuse from a woman
8	named Jeannette Antoine; okay? And Ms. Sebalj asked
9	Ms. Fitzpatrick to come along for an interview and they had
10	many discussions about many things during the course of
11	that; okay?
12	So that's the first bullet. If we turn over
13	to the second page, they're talking in the context of
14	Ms. Fitzpatrick saying, "Here's what Heidi Sebalj told me
15	about the Silmser affair." In the second bullet:
16	"Heidi had gone to the Crown attorney.
17	By the time Heidi goes to the Crown,
18	victim had gone to the Diocese. Victim
19	being offered a settlement. Murray
20	MacDonald told Heidi she didn't have a
21	case. Heidi felt very frustrated."
22	And then skip a bullet and:
23	"Heidi is unhappy about opinion of
24	Murray MacDonald and goes back and
25	speaks to a few officers."

1	Okay? Then if we turn over to page 5.
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
3	MR. LEE: And if you can start just below
4	halfway on the page, there's a bullet that reads:
5	"Geri said she asked Heidi why she
6	wasn't going to her supervisor."
7	You see that?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
9	MR. LEE: And if you can just read the rest
10	of that page to yourself.
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. LEE: You've read that already?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
14	MR. LEE: So she's suggesting that
15	Ms. Fitzpatrick is suggesting that Heidi Sebalj told her
16	that she had some issue with both you and Luc Brunet. Do
17	you see that there?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	MR. LEE: And in the second-last bullet:
20	"Geri says that Heidi wanted to bring
21	the victim to the Crown Attorney but
22	basically he was protecting somebody
23	and that the chain of command was going
24	to silence her. That's what she felt."
25	Okay?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
2	MR. LEE: Finally, if we can turn to page 11
3	and just above the midpoint of the page, this relates to
4	the Antoine matter.
5	"Bill" is Bill Carriere being referred to,
6	he's conducting the interview:
7	"Bill asked Geri if Heidi provided her
8	with any details as to why Heidi was
9	acting on the matter. Geri says that
10	it was because of the way that the
11	Crown Attorney handled the priest's
12	case and Geri says she was becoming
13	suspicious; this is not the right chain
14	of command or something. And now the
15	agency is in trying to read her file.
16	She's starting to think what is going
17	on here."
18	Things along those lines; okay?
19	When she testified here, Ms. Fitzpatrick was
20	adamant that Heidi Sebalj told her that Heidi wanted to
21	charge Father MacDonald and that you would not let her;
22	okay?
23	And she also told us that Heidi said that
24	she could not trust you or Luc Brunet with the Jeannette
25	Antoine investigation because of how she'd been let down on

1	the Father MacDonald investigation; okay?
2	That was Ms. Fitzpatrick's evidence here and
3	you've seen what she said; a summary, granted, but she
4	confirmed that it was accurate.
5	So question number 1, did you ever have a
6	discussion with
7	MR. MANDERVILLE: Sorry, Mr. Commissioner.
8	Sorry to interrupt my friend.
9	You will recall that Ms. Fitzpatrick resiled
10	from her statement to a degree, in that she acknowledged
11	that her statement was inaccurate to the extent that she
12	suggested Heidi didn't trust Luc Brunet.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
14	MR. MANDERVILLE: And she repeatedly resiled
15	from that.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
17	MR. LEE: That's fair, sir.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.
19	MR. LEE: I didn't frame that properly.
20	You understood the distinction Mr.
21	Manderville said about
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
23	MR. LEE: Did you ever have a discussion
24	with Heidi Sebalj about the fact that she felt you had let
25	her down on the Charles MacDonald case?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Never.
2	MR. LEE: Did you ever have a discussion
3	with Heidi Sebalj that she wanted to charge Charles
4	MacDonald after all and that she felt you would not let
5	her?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Never.
7	MR. LEE: Do you have any knowledge that
8	Ms. Sebalj had concerns about your impartiality as a Crown?
9	MR. MacDONALD: I don't she didn't think
10	I had an impartial that I was impartial that I was
11	biased.
12	MR. LEE: She never confronted you about any
13	of these matters? You never had a discussion with Ms.
14	Sebalj about any of this?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Never. And I had a number
16	of conversations with her on a number of files after that
17	fact, and our relationship in terms of a professional
18	comfort zone didn't change in the least bit. As a matter
19	of fact, I would think that both having gone what we went
20	through, I had the sense that we had more respect for one
21	another than before. At least we knew each better, you
22	know?
23	MR. LEE: Right.
24	MR. MacDONALD: So I am shocked to see this
25	allegation and I don't believe that Heidi said any of it.

1	MR. LEE: We know that Ms. Sebalj went off
2	on sick leave at some point.
3	MR. MacDONALD: I just don't recall when but
4	
5	MR. LEE: Right. Did you at a I may have
6	asked this but I'm not certain so I'm going to ask it again
7	did you at any point have an opportunity to sit down at
8	any time prior to today with Heidi Sebalj and talk about
9	the MacDonald matter and talk about
10	MR. MacDONALD: No.
11	MR. LEE: So you've never done that?
12	MR. MacDONALD: No.
13	MR. LEE: Okay.
14	I think out of fairness, while I'm here,
15	sir, if you can turn to page 16. Midway down the page
16	there's a bullet that begins:
17	"Geri proceeds to explain our
18	involvement."
19	Do you see that?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
21	MR. LEE: There are some names there that we
22	certainly don't need to say aloud, but I'd like to give you
23	an opportunity to read the rest of that page
24	MR. MacDONALD: Okay.
25	MR. LEE: all of page 17 and the first 6

1	bullets of page 18; okay? These relate directly to you and
2	I'm going to give you an opportunity to comment.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Next page, please, up.
4	MR. LEE: Next page, please, Madam Clerk.
5	MR. MacDONALD: I'm reading it a little more
6	slowly than the last one. I'm having to read some lines
7	twice. The next sorry.
8	MR. LEE: Scroll down, please, Madam Clerk.
9	MR. MacDONALD: Next.
10	MR. LEE: And then, just as I said, the
11	first six bullets or so, sir.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Okay. Thank you.
13	MR. LEE: Do you have any recollection of
14	the case that Ms. Fitzpatrick is referencing here?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Not particularly.
16	MR. LEE: Do you have any recollection of
17	her having sought advice from you at any point?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	MR. LEE: Do you have any recollection of
20	her having worked on a case with Kevin Malloy, in
21	particular, and having sought your advice?
22	MR. MacDONALD: No independent recollection.
23	MR. LEE: Do you have any recollection of a
24	meeting with Ms. Fitzpatrick as she describes on page 17?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Well, as she describes, I

1	may have met with her on a file or that file with Kevin
2	Malloy. I believe that's possible. The rest is melodrama.
3	MR. LEE: You know the gist of it: "He was
4	so rude to me. He was degrading and attacking me."
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
6	MR. LEE: "Insulting me in a very demeaning
7	way". She was shocked, she was going to leave the agency.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I'm well known to be a
9	degrader of members of the CAS. It's preposterous.
10	MR. LEE: You
11	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall ever being
12	anything less than courteous and professional with any
13	member of the CAS, even when their members were had
14	made, you know, steps that I could have been critical
15	about; not in terms of bad faith but just in terms of
16	errors committed in the exercise of their discretion.
17	And so it's I mean, it's one thing for
18	somebody to say from their point-of-view they felt that
19	they were treated rudely or insulted in a meeting,
20	everybody's got their right to give a perspective here, but
21	I don't believe that I ever treated her or anybody else at
22	the CAS in that manner.
23	MR. LEE: Do you have any recollection of
24	every having ever having had any kind of confrontation
25	or anything of the sort with Ms. Fitzpatrick?

1	MR. MacDONALD: No. I thought we were on
2	good civil terms.
3	MR. LEE: I have
4	MR. MacDONALD: Didn't I prosecute this
5	case?
6	THE COMMISSIONER: No. It doesn't look like
7	it was prosecuted.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Oh.
9	MR. LEE: That's certainly the information
10	we have here. I mean, this is what I'm relying on.
11	MR. MacDONALD: Because I've prosecuted
12	cases of hers, I think, before.
13	MR. LEE: She's been a CAS worker for some
14	time.
15	MR. MacDONALD: For some time. I don't know
16	how long but I don't know if she predates me, but for
17	some time.
18	MR. LEE: I have two matters I need to deal
19	with you on, sir. I'm
20	MR. MacDONALD: The other piece of the last
21	page you showed me?
22	MR. LEE: Yeah.
23	MR. MacDONALD: I wish that community
24	rumours had they'd told me about.
25	MR. LEE: The last page is in relation to

1	rumours about
2	MR. MacDONALD: About my father.
3	MR. LEE: Okay.
4	And two matters I need to deal with. Both
5	hopefully won't take too long. The first is Gilf Greggain.
6	You were
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
8	MR. LEE: asked a few questions. Gilf
9	Greggain.
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
11	MR. LEE: The schoolteacher Mark Latour was
12	the complainant. You recall that?
13	MR. MacDONALD: I don't remember that case.
14	MR. LEE: But you recall being asked about
15	it in-chief by Mr. Engelmann briefly?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
17	MR. LEE: I'm on for Mr. Latour. I have a
18	few questions I'd like to ask you. If we can start,
19	please, at Exhibit 362.
20	MR. MacDONALD: If you can bring it up, that
21	would be fine.
22	MR. LEE: Sure. These are Jeff Carroll's
23	notebooks notes, he was the investigation officer, he
24	looked at these briefs

113

THE COMMISSIONER: What exhibit again?

1	MR. LEE: Three six two (362).
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
3	MR. LEE: And Madam Clerk, if we can go to
4	the third page of the document, Bates 229, down at the
5	bottom? We have a Monday, January $6^{\rm th}$ , 2003 entry and at
6	11:15, we see Officer Carroll's notes:
7	"All tapes and brief with criminal
8	record of victim turned over to Guy
9	Simard, hand-delivered by myself."
10	Do you see that?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. LEE: And then over on the next page,
13	Mr. Engelmann briefly looked at the fact that later on
14	Officer Carroll has a discussion with you about it and that
15	you've reviewed the videos and are of the opinion and it
16	goes on. And I'll get into the opinion with you.
17	If you're the one providing the opinion
18	here, can we presume that you would have reviewed the
19	materials that Officer Carroll sent over?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
21	MR. LEE: And that would have included the
22	videos and the Crown brief?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
24	MR. LEE: And presumably the criminal record
25	of the complainant?

1	MR. MacDONALD: I presume so.
2	MR. LEE: And as part of your review of a
3	Crown brief in 2003, would you have endeavoured to assess
4	the adequacy of the police investigation?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Possibly.
6	MR. LEE: Let me give you an example if
7	an hypothetical example, if Mr. Latour had said "One of my
8	classmates witnessed the abuse" and Officer Carroll doesn't
9	appear to have followed up with the classmate, that's
10	something that you would take note of and you would go back
11	to Officer Carroll obviously; is that
12	MR. MacDONALD: Possibly.
13	MR. LEE: And well, I mean, is it one
14	goal of your review of a Crown brief to assess the
15	investigative steps taken or is it not?
16	MR. MacDONALD: I think it's fair to say
17	that was this pre- or post-charge? Can you recall?
18	MR. LEE: He was never charged.
19	MR. MacDONALD: Never charged.
20	Investigative flaws, in that context, we oftentimes would
21	point out to the officers.
22	MR. LEE: Okay. And I take it you had
23	situations where that's occurred. You've reviewed a brief
24	and noted flaws and pointed those out?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir, I pointed out new

1	areas to explore, yes.
2	MR. LEE: And I take it, in particular, if
3	you're being asked to comment pre-charge in a situation
4	where an officer is coming to you saying that the does not
5	have RPG
6	MR. MacDONALD: M'hm.
7	MR. LEE: you certainly would want to
8	satisfy yourself that the investigation's been completely
9	thorough?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I recall that Guy
11	Simard and I scrummed this file.
12	MR. LEE: Right.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Scrum meaning a second
14	opinion
15	MR. LEE: Yeah.
16	MR. MacDONALD: review. And I don't
17	I have the impression it was sort of a thorough review. I
18	don't recall if we set Jeff off for further follow-up. I
19	don't recall if Guy did. Guy met with him first and I
20	don't know I don't recall. And I would I can't
21	speculate on that.
22	MR. LEE: What we have on the screen:
23	"Discussion with Murray MacDonald re: R
24	and Greggain, Murray has reviewed the
25	case videos and is of the opinion that

no reasonable prospect of conviction
exist and feels that my determination
that R&PG to lay a charge has not been
established. Will not consider having
the victim take a polygraph. Points to
credibility problems of victim, lack of
corroboration, and witnesses whose
credibility is in question. Advised I
will follow up with written letter of
understanding regarding our
conversation."
Do you see that?
MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
MR. LEE: And the points that you set out,
number one is credibility problems of victim; do you see
that?
MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
MR. LEE: And the alleged victim in this
case was, as I said, a man named Marc Latour. Can you help
me out at all with what credibility problems of the victim
you were referring to here?
MR. MacDONALD: I'm sorry, I can't recall.
MR. LEE: Do you know Mr. Latour, sir? Does
MR. LEE: Do you know Mr. Latour, sir? Does that name ring a bell to you?

1	MR. LEE: Do you recall ever having had any
2	dealings with him in relation to a fraud charge?
3	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.
4	MR. LEE: Doesn't ring a bell at all?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Prosecuting him?
6	MR. LEE: Yes.
7	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall.
8	MR. LEE: All right. You don't recall a
9	situation where a fraud charge was withdrawn on the eve of
10	trial against Mr. Latour?
11	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.
12	MR. LEE: You don't recall him being rather
13	irate about the entire thing? Doesn't ring a bell at all?
14	MR. MacDONALD: No, no, sir.
15	MR. LEE: Do you have not the greatest
16	question I'll ever ask but I'll ask it anyways; do you have
17	any recollection of having assessed Mr. Latour's
18	credibility or this Crown brief with any information other
19	than was in the Crown brief at the time?
20	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall sir, sorry.
21	MR. LEE: So how would that work
22	generally? If you have some knowledge of a criminal
23	complainant that is not encapsulated in any way in the
24	Crown brief
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

1	MR. LEE: is that proper to consider?
2	Is that improper to consider?
3	MR. MacDONALD: I think it's fair to say I
4	sometimes do.
5	MR. LEE: Okay. But you don't recall doing
6	that in this case?
7	MR. MacDONALD: No, I have no recollection
8	of this. The only thing that I can recall garnered is I
9	think I saw a screening form or something on the file
10	recently
11	MR. LEE: Right.
12	MR. MacDONALD: if you have one in your
13	record somewhere. I may have that's all my memory is of
14	this case. Although it's very, very, very common for me to
15	scrum a file with an assistant Crown attorney or two.
16	MR. LEE: Right.
17	MR. MacDONALD: And usually Mr. Simard.
18	MR. LEE: I spent
19	MR. MacDONALD: Our scrums are usually the
20	most animated in terms of looking at things in detail.
21	MR. LEE: I spent a fair of time on this
22	investigation with Officer Carroll. I'll leave it there.
23	The final area I want to ask you about is an
24	investigation conducted by Shawn White of the Cornwall
25	police.

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
2	MR. LEE: And allegations made by Jeannette
3	Antoine and then throughout the course of that
4	investigation, it mushroomed and many allegations were
5	received by other persons in relation to the Second Street
6	Group Home. Do you have any recollection of this at all?
7	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir. I don't even
8	remember the home.
9	MR. LEE: Let me show you a document. Could
10	we have Exhibit 2214, please?
11	You know Shawn White, I take it?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir, yeah.
13	MR. LEE: I think you can put it on the
14	screen, that's fine. I'm looking specifically I'll give
15	you the specific Bates page, 717 yeah, 7176177. These
16	are Officer White's notes, sir. If we go to the second
17	half of the page, Madam Clerk, we have an entry the $19^{\rm th}$ of
18	October 1994, 1400 hours, it reads:
19	"Murray MacDonald and I met with
20	Regional Crown Peter Griffiths, he
21	indicated he read the brief and was in
22	agreement with us that there was no
23	evidence to support Ms. Antoine's
24	allegations against Bryan Keough."
25	He was a former CAS worker against whom Ms.

1	Antoine had alleged abuse.
2	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
3	MR. LEE: "In regards to other sexual
4	misconduct by other workers, after
5	March '76, it was felt that given the
6	fact that none of the complainants were
7	willing to make a formal complaint, and
8	because in each their own"
9	The gist of it, there were problems in
10	memory and establish to obtain the fact. Do you see that?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
12	MR. LEE: So he says in relation to that, we
13	have Antoine and we have others. Okay? In relation to the
14	others, the first problem noted is that none of the
15	complainants were willing to make a formal complaint; do
16	you see that?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
18	MR. LEE: And then the second bullet on that
19	page:
20	"At best the Crown could show common
21	assault which a trial would be a
22	summary conviction offence which after
23	18 years would have elapsed because of
24	the Statute of Limitations. Mr.
25	Griffiths will forward me a

1	correspondence on this within a few
2	days."
3	Okay?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
5	MR. LEE: Madam Clerk, if you can pull up
6	Exhibit 1339 on the screen?
7	This is just a letter I don't know if the
8	screen's fine or not? This was notice given by I can
9	give you the Bates page if you want, 7175882.
10	Sir, this is a letter from Peter Griffiths,
11	the Regional Director of Crown Attorneys, to Shawn White on
12	October 24th, so five days after the notebook entry. And
13	if we look at he begins by saying that in early
14	September he had been sent the entire investigation brief
15	with respect to the allegations made by Antoine. In the
16	second paragraph:
17	"I've now completed my review and I've
18	met with yourself and Crown Attorney
19	Murray MacDonald who has conducted a
20	similar review."
21	Okay?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
23	MR. LEE: In the next paragraph he says:
24	"For simplicity, I've divided my review
25	into two parts and like at the meeting

1	part one is Antoine and part B is the
2	other allegations."
3	Okay? And if we go to go the second page,
4	Madam Clerk, he spends the first three paragraphs talking
5	about the Antoine allegations and I'm not going to deal
6	with that with you.
7	The last paragraph he writes:
8	"The allegations that report sexual
9	misconduct suffered by other victims is
10	subject to several apparently
11	insurmountable impediments. I
12	understand that none of the victims
13	wish to make a formal complaint to the
14	police about any sexual assaults
15	suffered by them in the 1970s,
16	notwithstanding that they have had
17	every opportunity and encouragement to
18	do so during the course of this
19	investigation and, indeed, the last 15
20	years. Some of the victims have been
21	adamant to the point of hysteria on
22	this instruction to the police."
23	Do you see that?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
25	MR. LEE: And he goes on, in fairness, on

1	the next page to set out other impediments. Do you see
2	that at the top of the page?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
4	MR. LEE: And the second-last paragraph he
5	says that regretfully, notwithstanding a most through
6	investigation, he is of the opinion that there are no RPG
7	to warrant the laying of criminal charges and if he's wrong
8	there's no RPC either.
9	And he says:
10	"I have had the benefit of the wisdom
11	and advice of Murray MacDonald in
12	reaching this opinion and he joins me
13	in my conclusion, if not in my choice
14	of words."
15	Okay?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
17	MR. LEE: And has anything in that letter
18	refreshed your memory at all about
19	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.
20	MR. LEE: these matters?
21	MR. MacDONALD: No, I'm sorry.
22	MR. LEE: I take it, given that you were at
23	the meeting and that Mr. Griffiths has written this letter,
24	you don't take any issue with the fact that you obviously
25	would have reviewed the Crown brief or discussed it with

1	Mr. Griffiths?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Right. The last point is
3	that I wouldn't have chosen his words because he is a much
4	better writer than I am.
5	MR. LEE: The reason I'm bringing you to
6	this, sir, is that both in the meeting and in the letter,
7	the first issue that is raised in support of Mr. Griffiths'
8	conclusion that it would not be prudent to proceed with
9	charges, is that there are no willing complainants; okay?
10	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
11	MR. LEE: And it certainly when you review
12	the brief, he's quite right that there are complainants who
13	flatly refuse to participate who won't proceed and who just
14	don't want to be involved.
15	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
16	MR. LEE: I'm going to just take you to a
17	couple of examples though where it appears that there are
18	some willing complainants and I just want to see perhaps if
19	this will jog your memory and whether or not this was
20	discussed with Mr. Griffiths.
21	The Crown brief is Exhibit 2210 and we're
22	going to be dealing with some monikers here, sir.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Okay.
24	MR. LEE: Of three people in particular.
25	MR. MacDONALD: Okay. I won't say any

1	names.
2	MR. LEE: Yeah. We'll have Madam Clerk show
3	you the names or perhaps even write just on
4	THE COMMISSIONER: We have the system now,
5	Mr
6	MR. LEE: So let's get this up first and
7	then we can I'd like to start, Madam Clerk, at I'll
8	give you the Bates page, 7175409. And can you show him
9	three monikers, please, 84, 86 and 14?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Okay.
11	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
13	MR. LEE: Okay. So as I said, the exhibit
14	we're looking at
15	MR. MacDONALD: Sir, I went to high school
16	with the third name.
17	MR. LEE: Oh, okay. That was unexpected,
18	one of my clients or perhaps not. Which was the third name
19	you showed him? Okay, never mind. Thank you for that
20	though.
21	The first person we're looking at here is an
22	interview with C-84, Madam Clerk, if you can just go to the
23	top of the page just to refresh the witness' memory, and we
24	see the witness there. Do you see that, sir?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

l	MR. LEE: And if you go to the very bottom
2	of the page, Madam Clerk, and I don't want to belabour
3	anything here, I just want to try to put this to you. The
4	final paragraph begins:
5	"I recall a time"
6	And three rows down in the middle of the
7	page, C-84 say:
8	"Also, I remember a time in which one
9	of the other kids were given a strap to
10	the extent of blistering and bleeding.
11	I myself was given the strap to the
12	point of blistering and bruising and it
13	was so painful I couldn't even sit but
14	was made to sit down on a hard-bottomed
15	chair which only increased the pain. I
16	myself was involved in an isolated
17	incident where Mike, a staff member,
18	and myself were arguing and I was
19	swearing at him and"
20	Well, I'll just read it.
21	"I was swearing at him and he was
22	swearing back at me and he told me to
23	stop swearing or I would have to go to
24	the garage and stay there until I
25	cooled down. I told him he could not

1	make me and he lifted me off the ground
2	and literally put me through the
3	hallway wall right into the living
4	room, at which point I suffered from
5	bruising."
6	You see that?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
8	MR. LEE: Serious allegations?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
10	MR. LEE: We have blistering and bleeding
11	and bruising and being put, as he says it, literally
12	through the wall into the living room.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
14	MR. LEE: Would those, in your opinion, have
15	amounted to more than a common assault?
16	MR. MacDONALD: I can speculate. It's hard
17	to say with a one liner vis-à-vis opinions made on a
18	broader perspective of a whole file, you know. At law
19	is that one line potentially raising criminal liability as
20	far as actus reus is concerned; yes.
21	MR. LEE: I'm concerned more about part
22	of the opinion is that the allegations disclosed common
23	assault and there's a limitation period.
24	MR. MacDONALD: I can't say anything more
25	than that one line would, I think, hold bare bones, hold

1	the actus reus for assault/bodily harm.
2	MR. LEE: Let's go to page ending 412, Madam
3	Clerk. This is just the end of the interview.
4	Officer White asks, in the middle of the
5	page:
6	"Did you consider the physical
7	discipline at the Second Street Group
8	Home abusive and if so in what way?"
9	And the answer is:
10	"Yes, I do not believe that any child,
11	regardless of his or her actions,
12	should be hit with a belt until he or
13	she bruises, blisters or bleeds. I
14	don't believe for whatever the reason a
15	child, as in my case, should be put
16	from one room to the other by being
17	thrown right through the wall."
18	Do you see that?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
20	MR. LEE: And then at the end, at the very
21	last question:
22	"Is there anything else that you would
23	like to tell me?"
24	The answer:
25	"This time, I feel I have told you all

1	I know or remember through counselling.
2	I may remember more and at such time if
3	I feel it would help, I would contact
4	you but this is all there is at this
5	time."
6	Do you see that?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
8	MR. LEE: And it would appear that C-84,
9	based on that last answer, is being quite helpful?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
11	MR. LEE: And at least on the face of this
12	statement, you don't see I mean excerpts, I take it, you
13	don't see any indications he's unwilling to proceed?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Well, at the time he gave
15	that statement he said he'd get back even if he had
16	remembered anything, he'd go back to them with more, so it
17	looked like from that last sentence that he was inclined to
18	proceed.
19	MR. LEE: And Mr. Commissioner, just for
20	your own reference, I'm not going to take the witness
21	there.
22	Bates page beginning 7175334 is a
23	supplementary occurrence report that contains many of the
24	same details in it and a discussion of the discussions
25	Officer White had with C-84.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
2	MR. LEE: And, Madam Clerk, if we can now go
3	to Bates page ending 5341? You see if we can this
4	relates to if we can turn to the second page, Madam
5	Clerk, the next page rather, down towards the bottom of the
6	page on Friday, March 18 <sup>th</sup> , you'll see a name in that line,
7	sir, and that's C-86; okay?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Is that the fellow I
9	referred to in high school?
10	MR. LEE: I believe so. Madam Clerk has a
11	cursor pointed there right now. That's the gentleman that
12	you know?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, that's the one.
14	MR. LEE: And they've contacted him out of
15	town and he says he remembers he's asked specifically
16	about his stay at the Second Street Group Home which is the
17	major focus of Mr. White's investigation.
18	MR. MacDONALD: I see, I see.
19	MR. LEE: Okay, Second Street here in
20	Cornwall. He says he remembers:
21	"no traumatic experiences while he
22	was there [meaning the group home].
23	However, he did indicate that he was
24	sexually abused during the 1970s while
25	he was a ward of CAS and was staying at

1	Laurencrest. He states that a home
2	worker by the name of Bernie was
3	engaged in sexual activity with him."
4	Do you see that?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
6	MR. LEE: And if we go down to the fourth
7	line, fourth last line on the page, C-86 claims that he:
8	"never told anyone about the sexual
9	abuse but would be interested in having
10	the matter investigated by police."
11	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
12	MR. LEE: See that?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
14	MR. LEE: And then we have over on I'm
15	not sure you need to look at it over on Bates page
16	ending 353, we have a reference made of the fact that C-86
17	was contacted in the town that he lived in and an
18	appointment was set-up to be interviewed by that police
19	service.
20	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
21	MR. LEE: Just in terms of an easy way to do
22	things, I suppose.
23	And on page ending 374 at the top, Madam
24	Clerk, we have a reference here on Friday, June 10 somebody
25	from that other police force had been unable to locate this

1	person.
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
3	MR. LEE: And, therefore, Mr. White is
4	unable to ascertain whether or not he still wishes to file
5	a complaint.
6	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
7	MR. LEE: Do you see that?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
9	MR. LEE: And then we have, at Bates page
10	ending 5459, a witness statement of this person and the
11	statement time being '94 07 04, so after that time, and we
12	have a statement being taken here; okay?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
14	MR. LEE: And I'm going to suggest to you
15	that there's nothing in this statement to indicate anything
16	contradictory to his original originally stated desire
17	to have the police look at this thing; okay? I realize in
18	a perfect world I'd give you the entire Crown brief and
19	have you rely on it but or have you review it and give
20	me your opinion, but what I can tell you is based on the
21	information in the Crown brief I don't see anything that
22	suggests that this person suddenly changed his mind and
23	articulated to Officer White that he's not willing to
24	proceed.
25	MR. MacDONALD: I see.

1	MR. LEE: And finally, just one more page,
2	sir.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Manderville wishes to
4	comment.
5	MR. MANDERVILLE: I'm honestly not sure if
6	my friend was here for Officer White's testimony, but
7	Officer White gave testimony that that individual in the
8	not not long after this statement, passed away.
9	MR. LEE: I was here and I have no
10	recollection of that whatsoever, and nor does Ms. Jones
11	apparently. I can't tell you any more. I just have no
12	recollection of that whatsoever.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Me either.
14	MR. LEE: It would be a heck of a defence
15	though. We have the transcripts. If it's there it's
16	there, and that sort of disposes of that.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Homework for you though.
18	MR. LEE: Yeah, and it's fine, and if we
19	well, homework for Mr. Manderville, who's up later today, I
20	suppose.
21	If we can have Bates page ending the last
22	page, Bates page ending 5373.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Passing the buck I think
24	it's called, Mr. Manderville.
25	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)

1	MR. LEE: This relates to C-14. And if you
2	look at the very bottom of the page
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Hold on.
4	Do you know who C-14 is?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Is he is his name
6	MR. LEE: We'll have the name here, sir.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
8	MR. LEE: C-14, the last two paragraphs. It
9	begins on June 2, '94:
10	"[C-14] contacted writer and advised
11	him that he had a pending civil suit
12	against the CAS for multiple incidents
13	of physical and sexual abuse. He
14	indicated that none of these were at
15	the hands of Bryan Keough but that Mr.
16	Keough knew that was going on in his
17	life. [C-14] indicated that he would
18	have to speak to his lawyer, Mr.
19	Michel"
20	It's a spelling mistake; I believe it's
21	Mazerolle:
22	"before agreeing to speak to
23	police."
24	And at 1420:
25	"Writer spoke to Mr. Mazerolle, who

1	advised that his client, Mr. [C-14] is
2	emotionally traumatized from his past
3	and therefore feels that it would not
4	be in his best interest to speak to
5	police at the present time."
6	You see that?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
8	MR. LEE: So we have at least three people
9	here who on the well, the first two, I suppose. Let's
10	leave this one aside. The first two one of them on the
11	face doesn't seem to have any information about not being
12	willing to proceed.
13	The next one specifically says he'd be
14	interested in proceeding. And then we have Mr. C-14 here,
15	who says he has a civil claim and he's going to need legal
16	advice, and the lawyer then says apparently on the same
17	day that he's emotionally traumatized and therefore
18	feels he shouldn't speak to the police. Do you see that?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
20	MR. LEE: Do you I suspect I know the
21	answer but I'm going to ask anyways. Do you have any
22	recollection of having recognized what C-14 says here and
23	asking Sergeant White, or Officer White, to follow up on
24	this or to
25	MR. MacDONALD: No, I don't recall at all.

1	MR. LEE: Just don't recall this at all?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I just don't remember the
3	case, no.
4	MR. LEE: And you can't, I take it, really
5	help me in relation to what you were thinking at the time
6	or with discussions you had with Mr. Griffiths in relation
7	to any of these people?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Well, if I met with
9	Mr. Griffiths it would have been a thorough review of the
10	file. That's all I'd be able to tell you.
11	MR. LEE: You can't get into details with
12	me; you don't recall what
13	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall
14	MR. LEE: you did at the time?
15	MR. MacDONALD: No, I can't.
16	MR. LEE: You don't recall the discussion at
17	the time?
18	MR. MacDONALD: No. I could speculate but I
19	better not.
20	MR. LEE: Finally, sir, you know that I'm on
21	for the Victims Group
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
23	MR. LEE: at this Inquiry. You're
24	obviously the Crown attorney here. I'm wondering and
25	feel free to decline if you wish, but I'm wondering if

you'd like to take this opportunity you're going to need
to deal with my clients I think probably in an official
capacity at some point other complainants in this
community as a Crown. I'm going to give you the
opportunity, if you have anything you'd like to say, to do
that now.

MR. MacDONALD: Oh. Well, thank you for the opportunity. I would -- I'd like to -- the comments I make with reference to Crown are to my legal staff as well as myself, and I would -- I'd hope every Crown in Ontario.

But I'm going to focus on my legal staff. I'd ask that you -- you probably have already, but I'd hope that your clients understand that when we exercise our discretion and sometimes determine that we can't take cases in the direction that complainants wish we would -- we could or would -- complainants wish we could, we're doing this by virtue of our responsibility as agents of the Attorney General, but we aren't doing it as cold-hearted bureaucrats.

I'm sure there are occasions when some of your clients felt that way, and probably many of those occasions where they were rightly so. By that I mean that people didn't always get information in a timely fashion from me; that perhaps I -- cases had to be resolved for sentences less than were hoped, or if they couldn't be

continued, if their charges had to be withdrawn at some point for whatever reason, that I wasn't the most diplomatic in getting the responses back to them on time in that regard, or sending an officer who wasn't -- who didn't give as thorough an explanation as they should have.

I believe that we've improved dramatically since 2001 with the Victim Witness Assistance Program's support, but I know that we were not always perfect with our prior systems that we had in play. In that regard I'd just like to remind them that the words of Josh Billings always come to mind when I think of my legal staff; that reason occasionally makes mistakes but conscience never does. We didn't make any -- any mistakes we made we apologize for. They were never done in bad faith and they were never done out of a cold-hearted sense for how to help these -- for the fact that we were trying to otherwise help these folks navigate through the criminal justice system.

And I'll end by saying that every one of my legal staff on numerous occasions have gone home and taken home with them, in the context of vicarious trauma, some of the hardships felt by victims of crime, whether the cases went to trial or not, whether there was convictions of not. And although we may sometimes again seem like bureaucratic machines, these folks do really care and it's because we care that I want to express to your clients the fact that I

1	wish every one of them had walked away from our office
2	thoroughly pleased with the service they got.
3	MR. LEE: A major goal of this Inquiry, as
4	you know, is to look to the future as well as the past. I
5	take it as the Crown here, and the Acting Regional Director
6	soon, you are confident and can assure my clients and
7	others here publicly that complaints of historical sexual
8	abuse are going to be taken seriously in Cornwall.
9	MR. MacDONALD: We always thought they were
9 10	MR. MacDONALD: We always thought they were and will continue to do so. What the difference I think
10	and will continue to do so. What the difference I think
10 11	and will continue to do so. What the difference I think that your clients should know is we've we in the city
10 11 12	and will continue to do so. What the difference I think that your clients should know is we've we in the city and we in the province and in the country have learned a
10 11 12 13	and will continue to do so. What the difference I think that your clients should know is we've we in the city and we in the province and in the country have learned a lot as investigators and prosecutors as well, so that

MR. LEE: And I take it locally this Inquiry has kept the issue and some of the challenges relating to the prosecution of historical sexual abuse claims in the fore of your mind and the mind of your colleagues here in Cornwall.

23 MR. MacDONALD: Yes, yes, that's certain.

24 That's for sure.

to take on these cases.

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

MR. LEE: And many of the challenges that

1	are inherent in these cases have been recognized, and I
2	take it there have been ongoing discussions of what you
3	need to do better and what you can do in the future.
4	MR. MacDONALD: At a personal level, at an
5	office level, at a province-wide level, that's true.
6	MR. LEE: Mr. Commissioner, those are all
7	the questions I have.
8	I would like to apologize, My estimate was
9	not even close time-wise and I've gone over horribly, but
10	those are all my questions.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Manderville will
12	gladly donate his time and I guess you're paying lunch.
13	MR. LEE: That's fair.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
15	Let's have the lunch break and come back at
16	2:00 o'clock. Thank you.
17	THE REGISTRAR: Order. All rise. À
18	l'ordre. Veuillez vous lever.
19	This hearing will resume at 2:00 p.m.
20	Upon recessing at 12:29 p.m./
21	L'audience est suspendue à 12h29
22	Upon resuming at 2:00 p.m./
23	L'audience est reprise à 14h00
24	THE REGISTRAR: Order. All rise. À
25	l'ordre. Veuillez vous lever.

1	This hearing is now resumed. Please be
2	seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Neville?
4	MURRAY MacDONALD, Resumed/Sous le même serment:
5	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
6	NEVILLE:
7	MR. NEVILLE: Good afternoon, Commissioner.
8	Good afternoon, Mr. MacDonald.
9	MR. MacDONALD: Sir.
10	MR. NEVILLE: We know each other, obviously?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. NEVILLE: For many years.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Never in this context
14	before.
15	MR. NEVILLE: No, indeed.
16	I represent, as you know, Father Charles
17	MacDonald and you may or may not also know I represent the
18	Estate of Ken Seguin, his brother and family. So I'd like
19	to spend a few minutes with you this afternoon if I could.
20	During your evidence in-chief, as I recall
21	it was, you mentioned to Mr. Engelmann that at some point
22	in the narrative of the Charles MacDonald/David Silmser
23	matter, other people formed opinions and authored opinions
24	about the merits of that case, including Mr. Griffiths.
25	You're aware of that?

1	MR. MacDONALD: That's actually what I was
2	referring to.
3	MR. NEVILLE: Yes, I know you were, and
4	could we just briefly, Commissioner, have Mr. MacDonald see
5	our Exhibit 1147?
6	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
7	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
8	MR. NEVILLE: You have it there, sir?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
10	MR. NEVILLE: And I take it at some point, I
11	assume even prior to these proceedings or preparing for
12	them, you had read this document, you had seen it and read
13	it?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
15	MR. NEVILLE: All right. And in this
16	document, Mr. Griffiths then was offers his opinion to
17	Detective Inspector Smith on the Father Charles MacDonald
18	case and he reviews, in particular at the bottom of page 1
19	and the first paragraph on the top of page 2, the concept
20	of reasonable probable grounds including the subjective and
21	objective components?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
23	MR. NEVILLE: All right.
24	Now, would you agree with this suggestion,
25	Mr. MacDonald, that the key factor in terms of reasonable

1	probable grounds is the personal state of mind, the
2	personal, subjective belief of the person who must swear to
3	the oath to lay a charge? That's your start.
4	MR. MacDONALD: I think you're reading that
5	from the case law.
6	MR. NEVILLE: Well, I may have committed
7	some of it to memory.
8	Do you agree with me, sir, that the
9	subjective component, that personal, subjective belief,
10	cannot be imposed on the affiant by anyone, including you
11	as a Crown?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
13	MR. NEVILLE: He or she has it or they
14	don't.
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
16	MR. NEVILLE: Do you agree with me, sir,
17	that reasonable probable grounds, apart from being a legal
18	standard originally in the Criminal Code, is now since 1982
19	with the Charter, a constitutional standard?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
21	MR. NEVILLE: It is a constitutional
22	protection for everyone, isn't it?
23	MR. MacDONALD: That's my understanding.
24	MR. NEVILLE: Yes.
25	And the second concept of reasonable

1	prospect of conviction is as it were in the continuum, the
2	next step from the Crown Attorney's standpoint when the
3	brief lands on his or her desk. For screening purposes,
4	where does this case go next, if at all, right?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, and it stems from our
6	quasi-judicial overseeing obligation of agency of the
7	Attorney General. There's a certain gatekeeper component
8	to it.
9	MR. NEVILLE: Exactly. And it flowed, in
10	part at least, from the Martin Committee report?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. That's where the
12	determination was to have it a clearly established test.
13	MR. NEVILLE: And it has a public interest
14	component, right?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
16	MR. NEVILLE: Because a prosecution, apart
17	from its merits vis-à-vis, the accused ought to be one
18	that's in the public interest?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
20	MR. NEVILLE: And that has to do with many
21	issues, some as mundane as resources and the like.
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. There are a number of
23	elements to that.
24	MR. NEVILLE: Yes. And when you are
25	exercising that decision function on the basis of

1	reasonable prospect of conviction, you will analyse it
2	through the prism of the presumption of innocence?
3	MR. MacDONALD: That that's the
4	foundation to the analysis.
5	MR. NEVILLE: The onus on the Crown?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
7	MR. NEVILLE: And that the onus ultimately
8	will be proof beyond a reasonable doubt?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
10	MR. NEVILLE: All right.
11	Do you agree as well, Mr. MacDonald, that in
12	the hierarchy of criminal charges and the stigma that flows
13	from them, perhaps short of murder, there are few more
14	damaging to one's reputation than a charge of sexual abuse
15	of a child?
16	MR. MacDONALD: That's for sure, yeah.
17	MR. NEVILLE: When the charge is laid, the
18	damage is frequently done regardless of the outcome?
19	MR. MacDONALD: I I expect so.
20	MR. NEVILLE: Yes. And that is why both
21	reasonable probable grounds and reasonable prospect of
22	conviction are such critical steps?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. They aren't the only
24	steps, but that's irrelevant to that.
25	MR. NEVILLE: Of course they're not, because

1	once the decision is made, yes on both, the person is
2	before the courts, it's in the public domain, and whatever
3	the fall-out may be, it will not be changing?
4	MR. MacDONALD: I see what you mean, yes.
5	MR. NEVILLE: Right?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
7	MR. NEVILLE: All right.
8	So you were asked to assist Constable Sebalj
9	
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
11	MR. NEVILLE: as she worked her way
12	through the Silsmer file?
13	MR. MacDONALD: By Constable Sebalj, yes.
14	MR. NEVILLE: Right. And she made it clear
15	to you very early on that she was experiencing some
16	difficulties with the case?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
18	MR. NEVILLE: And I'm going to suggest to
19	you, it had in part to do with Mr. Silmser and his
20	personality?
21	MR. MacDONALD: That was my impression,
22	partly.
23	MR. NEVILLE: Yes, and in part the contents
24	of what he was saying?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Partly, yes.

1	MR. NEVILLE: All right. Can we look, by
2	way of a couple of quick illustrations, at two documents,
3	Commissioner, Exhibit 262? Actually it would be three,
4	three exhibits to assist at this point: 262 which is Mr.
5	Silmser's handwritten statement; 314 which is Officer
6	Sebalj's notes of January 28 <sup>th</sup> , 1993; and 295 which is the
7	dedicated notes for the Silmser file.
8	MR. MacDONALD: I have 314 and 295 here.
9	MR. NEVILLE: Okay. You'll also need 262.
10	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
11	MR. NEVILLE: Can we start if you have it
12	there, Mr. MacDonald with 262, Mr. Silmser's statement?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you. Yes, I've got
14	it.
15	MR. NEVILLE: And it's an eight-page
16	handwritten statement. And you'll recall, I take it you've
17	reviewed it then and perhaps a few occasions since,
18	including for these proceedings that in this narrative he
19	wrote out for the police and you understood that he had
20	been orally interviewed and we know the date because
21	we'll turn to the notes of Ms. Sebalj in a moment on the
22	$28^{\mathrm{th}}$ of January, was provided with forms to fill out on his
23	own initiative, his statement and brought those back, the
24	statement finished two or three weeks later.
25	MR. MacDONALD: I know that now. I don't

1	know if I knew then about the exchange
2	MR. NEVILLE: Fair enough. All right.
3	And we know from your evidence that you were
4	provided with a copy of this, Exhibit 262; right?
5	MR. MacDONALD: I believe this is the one
6	that I saw.
7	MR. NEVILLE: Yes, that's what you've told
8	us. That's fine. And he sets out in the statement, I'm
9	just summarizing, basically four allegations: The touching
10	of his leg in the Sacristy; an event at a retreat; an event
11	in Father MacDonald's office; and an event involving a
12	drive into the country.
13	MR. MacDONALD: In the car, yes, sir.
14	MR. NEVILLE: All right. Now, if you just
15	look for me at what is in and you'll see page numbers at
16	the top right page 8. Do you have it?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
18	MR. NEVILLE: Actually, this part of the
19	statement is the narrative of the drive in the country
20	event; all right? So the tail end of it is the top four-
21	five lines at the top of page 8. Right?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
23	MR. NEVILLE: And he describes what he
24	alleges Father MacDonald did. And in the fifth line, he
25	describes feeling pain, et cetera; right?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
2	MR. NEVILLE: From an alleged attempt to
3	penetrate with a penis in his rectum; that's what he
4	alleges
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
6	MR. NEVILLE: right?
7	MS. JONES: I just want to intercede at this
8	point what the purpose of going over the Silmser suit
9	statement in such detail with this particular witness has?
10	I just don't see the relevancy of it. Is Mr. Neville
11	trying to test the credibility of Mr. Silmser through this
12	witness? This is not appropriate at this particular point.
13	Many people have looked at this statement already, and I
14	don't think this is relevant whatsoever with this
15	particular witness at this juncture.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Neville?
17	MR. NEVILLE: What I'm trying to illustrate,
18	Commissioner, is some of the evidentiary concerns the
19	officer had and whether she raised some of these with Mr.
20	MacDonald.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: What's but this fourth
22	element wasn't when the charges were finally laid,
23	MR. NEVILLE: Precisely.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: this thing didn't go
25	anywhere.

1	MR. NEVILLE: It didn't. And we're coming
2	to that. That's part of the narrative, indeed.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Carry on. I'll
4	give you some leeway.
5	MR. NEVILLE: Thank you.
6	Now, if you'd look for me, Mr. MacDonald, at
7	Exhibit 314?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
9	MR. NEVILLE: These are Constable Sebalj's
10	notes of the January 28 <sup>th</sup> interview. Right?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. NEVILLE: If you look at Bates page
13	ending in 508.
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I'm there.
15	MR. NEVILLE: This are the notes she records
16	when he is describing the same event we just looked at in
17	the subsequent written statement; all right?
18	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
19	MR. NEVILLE: If you count down about 10
20	lines
21	MR. MacDONALD: "Never touch."
22	MR. NEVILLE: "Never touched me with his
23	penis."
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
25	MR. NEVILLE: All right. It appears to be

1	significantly at odds with the written statement that
2	arrives about two and a half weeks later; right?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I presume he is
4	referring to the same incident.
5	MR. NEVILLE: Yes. Well "never" seems to
6	cover pretty much all events.
7	But in any event, let's look briefly back at
8	Exhibit 262.
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
10	MR. NEVILLE: Again at page 8.
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. NEVILLE: We look in the bottom half of
13	the page, he has described the four events; right? And
14	then throughout the rest of the page, describes what he
15	says his life became i.e. a life of crime and other
16	misconduct caused, he says, by the abuse he suffered at the
17	hands of apparently Father MacDonald and he also alleges
18	Ken Seguin; right?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
20	MR. NEVILLE: And if you look about 10 lines
21	from the bottom, he's talking about how he's started into a
22	life of crime, petty theft and the like and says:
23	"I was placed on probation at age 14 or
24	just the beginning of 15 with Ken
25	Seguin."

1	Right?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
3	MR. NEVILLE: So he has now into his
4	criminal career and the like presumably as a result of
5	these abuses; right?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
7	MR. NEVILLE: Now, as part of Constable
8	Sebalj's investigation, I can advise you that she
9	interviewed his mother and his sister.
10	MR. MacDONALD: I knew that.
11	MR. NEVILLE: I know you did. And his
12	sister, who was born in 1959, says that she was at the
13	retreat in question at St. Andrew's. And on the date of
14	the weekend of the retreat, on the $2^{nd}$ of June, she turned
15	14; that would make it 1973. Mr. Silmser was born in March
16	of 1958. So by June of 1973, he's already 15 years old and
17	at least three of the events haven't even happened yet.
18	Now this is the kind of thing that would
19	clearly, by anybody looking at it, cause a concern; would
20	it not?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I can't say
22	specifically that Heidi and I talked about it, but these
23	are the types of things that would have did concern her
24	in the context of the course of drilling down.
25	MR. NEVILLE: That's I was going to

1	borrow your phrase. This is part of what called drilling
2	down. I know it's your choice of term, of looking
3	properly, and with some degree of discrimination, what is
4	going on and what is the story; right?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
6	MR. NEVILLE: And this is the kind of thing
7	that would tell an investigator "I'm not sure I can ever
8	form reasonable probable grounds here." Right? Unless
9	somehow that gets reconciled; right?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah. Officers are well
11	and Heidi as well as the other detectives, are aware that a
12	one-sentence allegation of a crime doesn't mean the RPG
13	assessment is complete.
14	MR. NEVILLE: Right. Now, I want to talk to
15	you just briefly about the word "confirmation" or
16	"corroboration" was used with you in your evidence in-chief
17	with Mr. Engelmann. Right?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
19	MR. NEVILLE: And there was talk about these
20	two other persons who might have some degree of
21	confirmatory status. And you were given the moniker C-56
22	and C-3; right?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
24	MR. NEVILLE: All right. We can look at
25	Exhibit 295, Officer Sebalj's notes.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: It's coming up. It's on
2	the screen.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Oh, thank you. Yes, sir.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: We have to get what page
5	though.
6	MR. NEVILLE: Yes, Commissioner, it would be
7	Bates page ending in 791.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
9	MR. NEVILLE: Now, just to put some context
10	both legal and otherwise to this next few questions, you,
11	of course, as a lawyer and a Crown in particular, are quite
12	familiar with the concept of similar act or similar fact;
13	correct?
14	MR. MacDONALD: As it's evolved from time to
15	time.
16	MR. NEVILLE: Exactly. And among other
17	things, and I'll just touch on a few significant points, it
18	is presumptively inadmissible
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
20	MR. NEVILLE: right? It requires a high
21	degree of similarity to the substantive offence alleged.
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
23	MR. NEVILLE: And it is specifically
24	prohibited to be used for mere propensity?
25	MR. MacDONALD: It's not a grounds for

1	yeah, it's not ground for use.
2	MR. NEVILLE: So, turning then to page
3	ending in 791 you have it there?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
5	MR. NEVILLE: This is C-56; do you see it?
6	Right?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir, I see it.
8	MR. NEVILLE: And he describes an event
9	which he says happened at the age of 18 or 19 when a hand
10	was placed in his groin area for about a minute and then
11	removed.
12	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
13	MR. NEVILLE: Right?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
15	MR. NEVILLE: Are you familiar that that's
16	the nature of his allegation?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
18	MR. NEVILLE: Okay. Now, you know what the
19	nature of the allegations was by Mr. Silmser?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
21	MR. NEVILLE: Both the nature, the age and
22	the like?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
24	MR. NEVILLE: I'm going to suggest to you
25	that from your knowledge and experience, the story of C-56

1	would likely never qualify as similar-act evidence.
2	MR. MacDONALD: That's for sure.
3	MR. NEVILLE: Likewise, C-3, who alleges an
4	event at the rectory in Apple Hill when he was at least 18,
5	again I suggest to you would not likely qualify as a
6	similar-act event in relation to the allegations of David
7	Silmser.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Well, actually that type of
9	scenario is what the Court of Appeal has been particularly
10	harsh on the Crown when sending trials back in that when
11	that type of simfac was proffered by the Crown.
12	MR. NEVILLE: Right. So when police
13	officers like Officer Sebalj come and meet with you for
14	advice, you're bringing to bear on your advice, on your
15	consultations, this kind of legal knowledge. That's why
16	she's speaking to you.
17	MR. MacDONALD: Partially, yes, as well as -
18	
19	MR. NEVILLE: No, not exclusively
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
21	MR. NEVILLE: but that's the kind of
22	help she's looking for, right?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Correct.
24	MR. NEVILLE: So when we get to the end of
25	the day, as it were, late August on the eve of the

1	settlement or even as it's just been struck
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
3	MR. NEVILLE: and we go and look at your
4	statement, you are very clear in what you say to the OPP in
5	'94, that even with these two other events that we've now
6	looked briefly at, C-56 and C-3, she and Officer Brunet did
7	not have subjective belief that they could lay a charge.
8	MR. MacDONALD: No, they didn't. That's
9	what they told me.
10	MR. NEVILLE: And, in fact, you go on to say
11	very carefully and I'm trying to save us all time here
12	but it's in your statement and the Commissioner has it
13	that you even asked them, even in the face of these and
14	now we've looked at them from a legal analysis standpoint -
15	- they didn't feel they could lay a charge.
16	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
17	MR. NEVILLE: All right.
18	Now, I just want to touch briefly while we
19	have her notes out Exhibit 295. Mr. Engelmann took you
20	to a couple of entries in Ms. Sebalj's notes, particularly
21	I'll wait for you. It's 295.
22	MR. MacDONALD: Is that what's up now?
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, except
24	MR. NEVILLE: It is.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: not the right page.

1	MR. NEVILLE: Not the right page yet.
2	MR. MacDONALD: Okay. Thank you.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: What page are we looking
4	at?
5	MR. NEVILLE: Well, I was going to just set
6	a foundation first if I could, sir.
7	If we look at her notes and if you need
8	to look at the pages I'll take you there, Mr. MacDonald
9	she has recorded in her notes, particularly in February of
10	'93, that Mr. Silmser tells her how he's been contacted by
11	the Diocese, right?
12	And an example of that, Commissioner, is
13	page 7 Bates 733.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Seven-three-three (733)?
15	MR. NEVILLE: That's one point where this
16	happens. You see at the bottom of the page?
17	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
18	MR. NEVILLE: Do you have it there, sir?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
20	MR. NEVILLE: It's at the bottom of that.
21	There you go. That's it.
22	Okay, and if we look at the next page, 734,
23	the bottom half of the page under the date 9 February, '93.
24	This deals with him describing a meeting he attended at the
25	Diocese, right?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
2	MR. NEVILLE: Okay.
3	And then if we look at the next page, 735,
4	under the heading "February $16^{\rm th}$ " which is the date in fact
5	he brings in his written statement that we looked at, he
6	refers to a Father McDougald calling the previous night,
7	the 15 <sup>th</sup> , to discuss a settlement.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
9	MR. NEVILLE: Right?
10	Let's look if we can, briefly, at Bates page
11	750. The date is the 25 <sup>th</sup> of February.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Sorry, top part of the page?
13	MR. NEVILLE: No, sir. It starts right at
14	the bottom. The entry is 14:55. It's a telephone call
15	from Malcolm MacDonald.
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
17	MR. NEVILLE: Right. If we look at the top
18	of the next page
19	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
20	MR. NEVILLE: she actually is aware that
21	he is acting for Father MacDonald, right?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
23	MR. NEVILLE: And she actually gets advice
24	from him, or information from him, that Mr. Leduc is the
25	lawyer for the Diocese.

1	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
2	MR. NEVILLE: Which makes me think that
3	perhaps she didn't convey that piece of information to you.
4	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall it.
5	MR. NEVILLE: That's my sense from your
6	evidence, all right.
7	And then she's got, "Gave his history of his
8	file". You see that? Fourth line, fifth line from the top
9	of that page.
10	MR. MacDONALD: "Gave history of his file",
11	yes.
12	MR. NEVILLE: Okay. And then he refers to a
13	Monsignor Schonenbach
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
15	MR. NEVILLE: meeting with Silmser.
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
17	MR. NEVILLE: Right? Monsignor McDougald.
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
19	MR. NEVILLE: At the bottom of the page that
20	he, Angus Malcolm MacDonald, and Father Charles MacDonald
21	had met with Father McDougald on December 17 <sup>th</sup> .
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
23	MR. NEVILLE: Top of the next page, Father
24	McDougald sent a letter to Mr. Silmser indicating the
25	allegations were being denied by Father Charles, right?

161

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
2	MR. NEVILLE: Okay.
3	Now, let's look you'll see the black dot
4	for the middle hole.
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
6	MR. NEVILLE: And you'll see right beside it
7	that, "Attended headquarters" sorry, I'll just go up.
8	Let's just go up about three lines:
9	"Victim told Church he was going to the
10	police."
11	Are you with me?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
13	MR. NEVILLE: "Suggests that after
14	victim first attended [headquarters] HQ
15	on 28 January, 1993"
16	And we know, stopping there, that's the date
17	of the interview that we looked at the notes.
18	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
19	MR. NEVILLE: "at approximately 23:00
20	hours that night"
21	The night of the first interview.
22	"called McDougald and stated he
23	wanted to go through the Diocese."
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
25	MR. NEVILLE: So this is a version where the

1	initiative is coming not from the Diocese to Silmser but
2	from Silmser to the Diocese, right?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Appears to be.
4	MR. NEVILLE: Okay.
5	"McDougald believes victim was very
6	intoxicated at the time, therefore,
7	meeting at the Diocese on Montreal Road
8	on February 9 <sup>th</sup> set up at victim's
9	request."
10	Right?
11	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
12	MR. NEVILLE: Let's look over at the next
13	page, fourth line fifth line from the top:
14	"Advises victim has retained Tom Swabey
15	and Don Johnson, both, and has parted
16	ways with both a couple of days later."
17	So that fits in with the entries Officer
18	Sebalj has where Silmser said he's retained Johnson but
19	fired him because he was doing things he didn't want him to
20	do.
21	MR. MacDONALD: I've never heard
22	Mr. Swabey's name mentioned before though.
23	MR. NEVILLE: Other than in these notes,
24	you're right.
25	MR. MacDONALD: No, this is the yeah,

1	this is the first time
2	MR. NEVILLE: Yes?
3	MR. MacDONALD: I've seen this one.
4	MR. NEVILLE: Says this to her:
5	"Advises the Church's files are open.
6	They are willing to cooperate. Advised
7	he would get go-ahead from McDougald to
8	provide me with a copy of victim's
9	allegations to the Church."
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
11	MR. NEVILLE: "States Church believes
12	victim wants money as he has made
13	certain demands"
14	And then it says, "i.e. for starters".
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
16	MR. NEVILLE: Now, you were asked about a
17	letter, and it's referred to on the previous page, to
18	Monsignor Schonenbach, right?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
20	MR. NEVILLE: You may recall that when Mr.
21	Engelmann was dealing with that part of your evidence, I
22	started to come forward to object and the Commissioner
23	MR. MacDONALD: On the two
24	MR. NEVILLE: did my job for me, and
25	pointed out that in fact what Mr. Silmser says to

1	Schonenbach is, "I want an apology for starters".
2	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no. I think he says,
3	"For starters, I want an apology".
4	MR. NEVILLE: You know what, Commissioner,
5	I'll say, "For starters, I want an apology".
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
7	MR. NEVILLE: Now, Mr. MacDonald, put
8	yourself in the position of a lawyer.
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
10	MR. NEVILLE: A person comes in and says,
11	"I've had an allegation made against me and the person
12	alleging it says they want me to apologize, for starters".
13	What would you think? You might want to
14	know what "for starters" meant, right?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Well, there'll be a
16	something, another request to follow the apology.
17	MR. NEVILLE: So something is being sought
18	more than an apology, right?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Something.
20	MR. NEVILLE: All right.
21	Let's look at page 760; Bates page 760. The
22	date is the 2 <sup>nd</sup> of March.
23	There it is. Yeah, it's on the screen, if
24	you could blow it up for Mr. MacDonald. It's the first
25	it's the entry at 1535?

1	MR. MacDONALD: That yes. That's 12
2	March?
3	MR. NEVILLE: Yes. Now, this is where she
4	actually has notes recorded about her meeting with you.
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
6	MR. NEVILLE: Have you seen these before
7	this particular entry?
8	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall this.
9	MR. NEVILLE: All right. Let's just look at
10	it, briefly, together.
11	"Meet Crown MacDonald in CIB."
12	I think it's "office." No, "Asked."
13	MR. MacDONALD: Oh, I've seen this, yes,
14	before.
15	MR. NEVILLE: "Asked," meaning, I think,
16	you:
17	"Asked how investigation was going.
18	Advised re"
19	And that's a monikered person, that first
20	name.
21	"C-9."
22	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
23	MR. NEVILLE: I won't use the next name. A
24	couple of names are mentioned.
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

1	MR. NEVILLE: "Denial," and then another
2	name, not being present:
3	"became concerned about my grounds."
4	What she appears to be saying here is, she
5	is summarizing some of what she's developed so far, and you
6	are saying to her that you have, or are developing, concern
7	about her grounds?
8	MR. MacDONALD: I thought that was a mutual
9	impression about
10	MR. NEVILLE: Oh, I I'm not saying it
11	wasn't. I'm just saying, she clearly records you telling
12	her that, "If this is what you're coming up with, there is
13	a concern here about reasonable probable grounds," right?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Well, it certainly would
15	have it was prompting I was prompting her to dig
16	deeper.
17	MR. NEVILLE: Oh, sure, absolutely.
18	MR. MacDONALD: Meaning, there wasn't enough
19	there yet.
20	MR. NEVILLE: Right. So we'll come back
21	MS. McINTOSH: Sorry. Sorry to interrupt my
22	friend, but I'm not sure the witness knows he's being asked
23	whether that's his expression or Ms. Sebalj's expression.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Can you clear that up
25	there, Mr. Neville?

1	MR. NEVILLE: Certainly, Commissioner.
2	As the notes are recorded, Mr. MacDonald,
3	when she wrote here:
4	"Became concerned about my grounds"
5	I suppose that could be her speaking to
6	herself, right? Or, it seems more likely, that she's
7	putting, in very short form, an opinion or advice you are
8	giving back to her as a result of her telling you some of
9	this material that's recorded?
10	MR. MacDONALD: That's possible.
11	MR. NEVILLE: Yes.
12	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall
13	MR. NEVILLE: So it could go either way?
14	MR. MacDONALD: either way, yes.
15	MR. NEVILLE: It could be either way, all
16	right. I'll come back to another little part of her notes
17	in a moment.
18	I just want to spend a couple of minutes, a
19	few minutes, if I could, with your recorded statement on
20	July 14 <sup>th</sup> , 1994. It's Exhibit 1233, Commissioner.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: One two three three
22	(1233).
23	MR. NEVILLE: You should have a hard copy,
24	unless you're happy with the screen.
25	MR. MacDONALD: I have a hard copy, and I

1	like it up on the screen, too, if possible.
2	MR. NEVILLE: Okay. No, whatever's
3	comfortable.
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I've got it.
5	MR. NEVILLE: You have it?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, thank you.
7	MR. NEVILLE: Can we look at and it's
8	perhaps easier to find it, the pages at the top, the
9	numbering that are part of the document, and I'm looking at
10	page 24.
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I've got it.
12	MR. NEVILLE: All right. And Detective
13	Inspector Smith is asking you, at the top of that page,
14	about being updated on an ongoing basis by Constable
15	Sebalj; right?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
17	MR. NEVILLE: All right. And you say:
18	"Yes, I had an ongoing every contact
19	I had with her was an update of the
20	investigation, and it was verbal. This
21	is where this is where I'm at now."
22	And that's you, as if speaking of her.
23	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
24	MR. NEVILLE: "And so the plot was
25	thickening every time we spoke, and by

1	that I mean she was her
2	difficulty difficulties, with the
3	investigation were increasing, and by
4	that I mean she was having more
5	difficulty managing this complainant,
6	in terms of how how to in terms
7	of securing his, sort of, cooperation.
8	And I understand she explained to me
9	things, like, in calling it an
10	intoxicated state"
11	And you go on to give other examples of her
12	interpersonal difficulties with him, all right?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
14	MR. NEVILLE: And then we look at the
15	bottom:
16	"She had managed to do some follow-up
17	contact, managed to get more details,
18	and she told me, in some of our
19	meetings, that these details were
20	being were proving to be
21	uncorroborated. She was telling
22	me it was very clear in my mind,
23	just so I can maybe spell it out.
24	As Constable Sebalj and I had meetings,
25	or update meetings, she was having more

1	and more difficulty believing this
2	person."
3	Is what you tell Smith, right?
4	MR. MacDONALD: That was my impression.
5	MR. NEVILLE: "My impression is, she
6	started this with an open mind. I have
7	no criticism at all of Constable
8	Sebalj's motive throughout this whole
9	investigation. She started it with an
10	open mind and, as her investigation
11	developed, she lost she did not have
12	belief sufficient to lay a charge. Her
13	belief, indeed, was giving more and
14	more she was becoming more
15	disbelieving as the investigation"
16	And obviously you're cut off. I presume you
17	meant to say, "progressed" or "went on." And, Smith
18	actually, finishes the sentence, in a sense:
19	"Through the conduct of Silmser,
20	himself or was she unable to get any
21	other witnesses that had similar"
22	Page 26:
23	"similar things that occur, or
24	corroboration?"
25	And your answer is:

1	"Both."
2	Eight?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
4	MR. NEVILLE: Now, can we look next at the
5	top at page 36?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I'm there.
7	MR. NEVILLE: All right. No, maybe I've led
8	you astray there. Just give me a moment.
9	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
10	MR. NEVILLE: Yes. If we can go to page 47?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir, I'm there.
12	MR. NEVILLE: Actually, let me just back up.
13	Can we go back to page sorry, pardon me for this
14	confusion; page 33?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir, I'm there.
16	MR. NEVILLE: All right. The second the
17	second-last entry at the bottom, Detective Inspector Smith:
18	"Subsequently, did you have further
19	meetings with Constable Sebalj, and did
20	she bring to your attention that there
21	had been a settlement?"
22	And you say:
23	"Yes, she contacted me after that call
24	I had from Malcolm MacDonald. She
25	contacted me on it seemed on the eve

1	of the settlement to say that her
2	investigation had come up with some
3	indication that there seemed to
4	be have been the target of the
5	investigation, Father MacDonald, may
6	have had, you know, homosexual
7	tendencies. This was from someone else
8	who was reluctant to assist in the
9	police investigation"
10	If we stop there, we know that's likely C-3,
11	right?
12	MR. MacDONALD: I I presume so.
13	MR. NEVILLE: Right:
14	"but did say that he"
15	That is the other person:
16	"had sex had homosexual contact
17	with the priest. So this, sort of, was
18	the first time in many contacts I've
19	had with Constable Sebalj which seemed
20	to be whether there was something in
21	favour of the complainant, as opposed
22	to against his credibility. As it
23	turned out, and as I asked the police,
24	was this alone sufficient to give them
25	RPG, and they didn't feel they did,

1	because they didn't feel they by
2	that point, still didn't feel they had
3	enough to believe the complainant to
4	the point of reasonable grounds."
5	Right?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. They were sufficiently
7	inspired now to to certainly continue vigorously with
8	the investigation, however that's fair to say, too.
9	MR. NEVILLE: Right. Well, we seem to have
10	notes, though, that at this point from an investigating
11	standpoint, Officer Sebalj felt she was finished and was
12	going to seek, through your assistance, the advice of a
13	Crown?
14	MR. MacDONALD: That's not my recollection.
15	MR. NEVILLE: No? Well, let's look at her
16	notes, Exhibit 295.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Two ninety-five (295).
18	MS. McINTOSH: I'm sorry to interrupt my
19	friend. I don't think the witness is denying that that's
20	in the notes. I think what he's saying is that's not his
21	recollection, at the time.
22	MR. MacDONALD: That's not the way I think
23	it went.
24	MR. NEVILLE: Okay. Well, I'm just seeing
25	if I can either refresh your memory or correct your

1	recollection.
2	MR. MacDONALD: Okay.
3	MR. NEVILLE: How's that? The date,
4	Commissioner, is August $24^{\rm th}$ , '93. The Bates page in
5	Exhibit 295 is ends in 835.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Eight-three-five (835).
7	M'hm, yes.
8	MR. MacDONALD: The very start?
9	MR. NEVILLE: Do you have it? It's at the
10	bottom of the page. The date is 24 August '93.
11	MR. MacDONALD: Okay, thank you.
12	MR. NEVILLE: This is her entry at 12:09
13	noon.
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
15	MR. NEVILLE: "Return TC [telephone call]
16	to Dave Silmser requesting progress
17	report. Advised"
18	i.e. she advised him:
19	"simply awaiting meeting with
20	out-of-town Crown to review."
21	MR. MacDONALD: That's what she's got here.
22	MR. NEVILLE: Right. So I'm not questioning
23	what you may recall now, I'm looking where she appears to
24	have been at in her mind on the $24^{\rm th}$ of August. All right?
25	MR. MacDONALD: I understand your point.

1	MR. NEVILLE: Now, I understand what you're
2	suggesting, and may I put it this way.
3	The police would always be prepared to
4	investigate and keep the matter going if there was
5	something worth looking at, right?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
7	MR. NEVILLE: But if nobody comes to the
8	door or they don't get the lead and they have what they
9	have, a decision has to be made. Fair enough?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
11	MR. NEVILLE: And it looks like, as part of
12	her decision-making process, she was going to get the
13	advice of an out-of-town Crown. At least that's what she
14	feels as recorded in her notes.
15	MR. MacDONALD: That's what she feels. I
16	MR. NEVILLE: Okay.
17	MR. MacDONALD: I thought otherwise.
18	MR. NEVILLE: Okay.
19	Let's look at the next page. The next date
20	she has entered in her notes is the $7^{\rm th}$ of September 1993.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
22	MR. NEVILLE: And let me just refer to the
23	top of the page because you mentioned this in passing
24	during your evidence in-chief. Here's one of the
25	indications where now he's saying, take your time, no rush,

1	take three or four months more if you want, right?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
3	MR. NEVILLE: Do you see that at the top?
4	And you were told of some of these things, weren't you?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
6	MR. NEVILLE: All right. So now she has the
7	7 <sup>th</sup> of September:
8	"Met with Staff Sergeant Brunet.
9	Handed a letter from Malcolm
10	MacDonald's office in which is enclosed
11	a direction signed by Silmser on 3
12	September '93 to stop any further
13	proceedings."
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
15	MR. NEVILLE: So, on the face of it, this
16	would appear to be her learning of the settlement and the
17	direction to close the file. That appears to be what she's
18	recorded? Now, it could be that between the $24^{\text{th}}$ and the
19	7 <sup>th</sup> , she was told something verbally, but she certainly sees
	, she was told something verbally, but she tertainly sees
20	a document to that effect on the 7 <sup>th</sup> , right?
<ul><li>20</li><li>21</li></ul>	
	a document to that effect on the $7^{\rm th}$ , right?
21	a document to that effect on the $7^{\rm th}$ , right?
21 22	a document to that effect on the 7 <sup>th</sup> , right?  MR. MacDONALD: Right. I thought that there was a phone call or heads-up first from them.

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
2	MR. NEVILLE: right from the lawyer.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
4	MR. NEVILLE: Okay.
5	Now, can we look just momentarily, briefly,
6	at page 49? I'm going back to your recorded statement.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir, I'm there.
8	MR. NEVILLE: Okay. And it's a fairly long
9	discussion by yourself with Detective Smith and it starts,
10	really, back on page 47 and goes on for the better part of
11	two or three pages.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
13	MR. NEVILLE: Actually, almost four.
14	MR. MacDONALD: I go on sometimes.
15	MR. NEVILLE: And the essence, if I can
16	summarize it here, Mr. MacDonald, is you're telling the
17	police, who are now faced with the fait accompli, as it
18	were, worked by the civil lawyers that, look, you have a
19	reluctant complainant, you've had all these various
20	difficulties. The bottom line answer here is you don't
21	have reasonable probable grounds.
22	MR. MacDONALD: They knew that.
23	MR. NEVILLE: That's what I'm saying. And
24	you lay this out here in two or three pages of the
25	conversations you have with them saying because if you

1	look at 48 for me sorry, 49.
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
3	MR. NEVILLE: You see about eight lines from
4	the top:
5	"What do we do with a reluctant
6	witness?"
7	And you talked further down that page how
8	the police were "hung up" on the notion of reluctant sexual
9	assault complainant witnesses and the policy of the Crown
10	not to force them to go on, right?
11	MR. MacDONALD: I think hung up to the
12	extent that they needed it explained to them.
13	MR. NEVILLE: Oh, yes. But what you're
14	really telling them ultimately is, look, there's that
15	problem all right, but here's where you're at. There is no
16	reasonable probable grounds. That's what you're telling
17	me. If that's your state of mind, the law says to me and I
18	say to you, the case is stopped until you get beyond that
19	point.
20	MR. MacDONALD: They didn't really need
21	instruction though on that, they understood that.
22	MR. NEVILLE: Yeah.
23	MR. MacDONALD: We were just sort of
24	MR. NEVILLE: Yeah.
25	MR. MacDONALD: walking it through

1	logically the three of us, you know.
2	MR. NEVILLE: M'hm. Okay. So this was
3	perhaps more of a give-and-take conversation.
4	But just so it's clear, on these four pages
5	up to page 50 is where you set out the essence of that and
6	you're, in effect, reminding them, as you put in the letter
7	
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
9	MR. NEVILLE: there's a policy about a
10	reluctant complainant
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. NEVILLE: and the root problem
13	before that is
14	MR. MacDONALD: You still need
15	MR. NEVILLE: you don't have RPG.
16	MR. MacDONALD: You still need RPG.
17	MR. NEVILLE: Okay. Let's look just for a
18	moment, if we could
19	MR. MacDONALD: Sorry, I never told them
20	they didn't have RPG.
21	MR. NEVILLE: Oh, I know you didn't.
22	They're because they have to tell you or
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
24	MR. NEVILLE: or tell themselves, right?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Right.

1	MR. NEVILLE: It's not for you to tell them.
2	They do or they don't.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
4	MR. NEVILLE: Right. We talked about that a
5	few minutes ago.
6	Can we look at Exhibit 1421?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
8	MR. NEVILLE: This is the taped interview
9	with the OPP of Staff Sergeant Brunet.
10	MR. MacDONALD: It's up on the screen, yes.
11	MR. NEVILLE: And if we can look at Bates
12	page, Commissioner, 849.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Which exhibit number
14	again, sir?
15	MR. NEVILLE: The exhibit number,
16	Commissioner, is 1421, is what I have.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, right.
18	MR. NEVILLE: Document Number 728585.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
21	MR. NEVILLE: We're together? And this is
22	where they asked the staff sergeant about his discussions
23	or dealings with you on the Silmser matter. I just want to
24	go through it with you and see if you agree with his
25	explanation.

1	So you can see the question starts in the
2	second line:
3	"Did you ever have any discussions with
4	Crown Attorney, Murray MacDonald as"
5	MR. MacDONALD: Could you bring that up just
6	to
7	MR. NEVILLE: Oh, yes.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Madam Clerk?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
10	MR. NEVILLE: All right?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. NEVILLE: So, if you see, it starts end
13	of the second sentence:
14	"Did you ever have any discussion with
15	Crown Attorney Murray MacDonald as the
16	investigation proceeded before any
17	settlement was ever reached?"
18	Staff Brunet says:
19	"If if I did, it was just in"
20	MS. JONES: I'm just going to reiterate the
21	objection I raised earlier.
22	It seems that this is exactly what Mr.
23	Neville is doing, going on and on and on again about the
24	so-called credibility, or lack thereof, of David Silmser.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.

1	MS. JONES: And I don't know if Mr.
2	Neville's intent is to go through every document that we've
3	already had many, many times over in this Inquiry, pointing
4	out the same statement over and over again.
5	I think we established about half-an-hour
6	ago that there was a lack of R&PG on the part of Heidi
7	Sebalj, there were discussions with Mr. MacDonald, and
8	there was a discussion with Staff Sergeant Brunet. We've
9	established that. I'm just wondering why we need half-an-
10	hour to go over it and over it and over it.
11	MR. NEVILLE: If my friend would be patient
12	and we look at this passage together, Commissioner, you
13	will see that it does not deal only with that. And I'm
14	asking Mr. MacDonald if this by the Staff Sergeant
15	accurately summarizes the position.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: And how much longer do
17	you have, sir?
18	MR. NEVILLE: About five minutes.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Go ahead.
20	MR. NEVILLE: Of my forty-five, sir, and I
21	think I'm on target.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: You're pretty well there.
23	MR. NEVILLE: I think so. Are we together,
24	Mr. MacDonald?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

183

1	MR. I	NEVILLE: All right. His answer is:
2		"If I did, it was just in passing while
3		discussing something else. I remember
4		and I can't remember if it was
5		before or right after the settlement,
6		but I remember talking to Murray, and
7		Heidi had mentioned to him that she was
8		having a real hard time with
9		credibility of the witness, like the
10		of the victim, and she felt that the
11		victim was very, very difficult to
12		handle because he was up and down and
13		very aggressive and she was having
14		credibility problems. And he had also
15		made it very clear to her"
16	This	is Silmser.
17		"right from the beginning that he
18		was going after money, and he seemed to
19		have a real interest in a civil
20		settlement. So that made her a little
21		bit uneasy about the m'hm his
22		credibility. And Murray had mentioned
23		to me that there was a credibility
24		issue, but I don't remember if that was
25		prior to the settlement or after the

1	settlement."
2	Right?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
4	MR. NEVILLE: Now, that would then be
5	consistent with what you said in Exhibit 301 to Staff
6	Sergeant Brunet about Mr. Silmser having an evident
7	ulterior motive, wouldn't it?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Possibly. The one thing
9	that I I'm pretty sure that Luc and I didn't speak up
10	until late August for the first time on this file. He
11	MR. NEVILLE: Okay. Well, as you can see,
12	even he's not certain
13	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
14	MR. NEVILLE: whether it was before or
15	after.
16	MR. MacDONALD: I'm
17	MR. NEVILLE: The essence of what he's
18	saying
19	MR. MacDONALD: I'm certain. I'm certain we
20	hadn't until just before.
21	MR. NEVILLE: Okay.
22	You did say in cross-examination yesterday
23	with, I believe, Ms. Daley, that "we all" was the way you
24	put it, and I took that to mean you, Sebalj and Brunet.
25	"believed there was some kind of"

185

1	I think I wrote it down fairly carefully:
2	"some kind of sexual contact between
3	David Silmser and Father MacDonald."
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
5	MR. NEVILLE: Would I be fair to say that
6	there was a suspicion?
7	MR. MacDONALD: A definite suspicion.
8	MR. NEVILLE: Okay.
9	MR. MacDONALD: Not nothing more but that
10	was
11	MR. NEVILLE: That's fine; nothing more.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
13	MR. NEVILLE: That's fine.
14	MR. MacDONALD: That was to be explored,
15	sir.
16	MR. NEVILLE: All right.
17	Mr. MacDonald, I think I'm finished with my
18	questions but I want to say something. There's a party
19	here, some of whose members contributed to the personal
20	anguish that you and your family have felt, who have not
21	seen fit to be here to ask you any questions.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa,
23	whoa, whoa. Sir
24	MR. NEVILLE: For whatever reason.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: No, come on. I don't

1	need
2	MR. NEVILLE: Well, I'm going to simply say,
3	Commissioner, that Mr. MacDonald should take that as
4	recognition that his character and strength
5	THE COMMISSIONER: No.
6	MR. NEVILLE: and integrity speak for
7	themselves.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, sir.
9	MR. NEVILLE: Those are my questions.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
11	Sir, we're going to take a well, no,
12	we'll see what I don't know that I want that type of
13	editorializing to occur here, sir. So while Mr while
14	the emotion may have been there, I don't know that it
15	should have been said here. All right? So there we go.
16	Ms. Robitaille. Oh no, Mr. Chisholm. I'm
17	sorry.
18	MR. CHISHOLM: Good afternoon, sir.
19	Mr. MacDonald, we know each other.
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir. Could I just have
21	a moment, please?
22	MR. CHISHOLM: Certainly; sure.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you. Good morning
24	afternoon.
25	MR. CHISHOLM: Good afternoon.

187

1	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR
2	MR. CHISHOLM:
3	MR. CHISHOLM: I act for the CAS, as you
4	may be aware.
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
6	MR. CHISHOLM: Just a couple of areas that I
7	want to touch upon.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
9	MR. CHISHOLM: Would you agree with me, Mr.
10	MacDonald, that over the years you have encouraged the
11	cooperative relationship between your office and the CAS?
12	MR. MacDONALD: I've tried.
13	MR. CHISHOLM: I'm going to suggest that you
14	succeeded. You wouldn't disagree with me?
15	MR. MacDONALD: I hope I I hope that's
16	correct.
17	MR. CHISHOLM: If I understand your evidence
18	from a couple of days ago and today during Mr. Lee's cross-
19	examination of you, I take it you got along well with
20	Elizabeth MacLennan of the CAS.
21	MR. MacDONALD: I always have.
22	MR. CHISHOLM: And also William, or Bill,
23	Carriere?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Very well with Bill and Liz,
25	yes. Those are the two folks I knew and dealt with most

1	irequently at the Society.
2	MR. CHISHOLM: And we would expect those to
3	be the individuals that you would be involved with on a
4	more day-to-day basis, as opposed to the Executive
5	Director, Mr. Abell. Is that fair to say?
6	MR. MacDONALD: That's correct.
7	MR. CHISHOLM: During your cross-examination
8	by Mr. Lee today and during your evidence in-chief when you
9	were speaking to Mr. Engelmann, you spoke of a chilling
10	effect between you and some of the institutions within the
11	city. Do you recall that?
12	MR. MacDONALD: With me as institution,
13	Crown Attorney's Office?
14	MR. CHISHOLM: Yes.
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
16	MR. CHISHOLM: And you suggested it was
17	nothing overt, I believe were your words.
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah. We never spoke we
19	never said a word about it. We never have to this day said
20	a word about it. But there was I felt it and I believe
21	the others did too.
22	MR. CHISHOLM: So no-one ever suggested
23	none of the institutions in the City of Cornwall ever
24	suggested to you that, "We're concerned with respect to the
25	allegation that has been made against you with respect to

1	you attempting or conspiring to cover up an allegation"
2	MR. MacDONALD: No, no, no, no, that I
3	don't mean in that context, no.
4	MR. CHISHOLM: And would you agree with me,
5	Mr. MacDonald, that when you once you heard of such an
6	allegation you'd be rather sensitive on that point?
7	Rightfully so, but you'd become sensitive whenever you hear
8	of an allegation that you've attempted to cover up an
9	allegation of sexual abuse?
10	MR. MacDONALD: I was sensitive and angry;
11	more angry than sensitive.
12	MR. CHISHOLM: And is it possible that you
13	could be mistaken in your perception I'm speaking now of
14	the CAS. Is it possible that you could have been mistaken
15	in your perception that there was a chilling effect brought
16	about by the allegation that was made against you?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Oh, I think the chilling
18	effect may well have been that they were just uncomfortable
19	around me because they knew that I was in the eye of the
20	hurricane in certain respects, and so maybe it was just
21	uncomfortable. They were uncomfortable and you know why
22	you will know better than I. But I just thought I sensed
23	that and I thought my colleagues thought they sensed it
24	too.
25	MR. CHISHOLM: That's your perception that

you had. You perceived them being uncomfortable? 1 2 MR. MacDONALD: Right. 3 MR. CHISHOLM: They never told you that? MR. MacDONALD: No, and Bill Carriere went 4 5 out of his way to be diplomatic every time we spoke, and we've -- I don't -- I understand your point and I'm sure 6 7 that my sensitivity, as you've used it, was -- may not have 8 been completely accurate. But I just felt something -- in 9 terms of all institutions in the city. We were all looking 10 behind each other's back for a while; around each other's -11 - looking round each other's shoulder for a while. 12 MR. CHISHOLM: That's the way you perceive 13 and that -- given the allegations made against you, that 14 could be a normal human reaction. Would you agree with 15 that? 16 MR. MacDONALD: Sure. We didn't know what 17 the bottom line was in all of the -- you know, the rumour 18 mills and allegations that were starting to swirl around 19 and kept swirling, and so you're inclined to hold your 20 tongue, and that's probably why I wasn't on the phone as 21 regularly as I would have been prior to, saying, "Liz, 22 let's try a conference on this, " or to the Chief of Police 23 in Cornwall, "Let me -- let's get a training session on the 24 new amendments to impaired driving law." 25 MR. CHISHOLM: And from the perspective of

1	the CAS it could also be another reason why you were not on
2	the phone as often. I'm going to suggest to you that
3	during the period of time that you've spoken of, it's
4	possible that you weren't communicating as often because
5	there was no need to communicate with the CAS for the
6	CAS never went to you for advice or consultation because
7	the need never arose. Is that a possibility?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Well, there was a
9	significant length of time where they didn't come, and
10	perhaps it's my paranoia I presumed that's why they weren't
11	coming, but maybe it's just didn't have work to take.
12	MR. CHISHOLM: And if I suggested to you
13	that in fact was the case, you couldn't disagree with me?
14	MR. MacDONALD: I couldn't disagree with
15	you. It's nice to hear.
16	MR. CHISHOLM: And I take it you wouldn't
17	disagree with me if Richard Abell held the view that you
18	were, in his from his perspective you were always a top-
19	flight professional. You couldn't disagree with that?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Well, it's nice to hear.
21	MR. CHISHOLM: And that there was always,
22	from his perspective, an excellent relationship between the
23	CAS and you in particular, and your office. You wouldn't
24	disagree with that?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Well, not with the senior

1	management group. I think that Ms. Fitzpatrick would
2	suggest otherwise but
3	MR. CHISHOLM: And I'll come that's what
4	I'll go to next with Ms. Fitzpatrick. But from the
5	perspective of Mr. Abell, Ms
6	MR. MacDONALD: Senior management.
7	MR. CHISHOLM: Ms. MacLennan, Bill
8	Carriere.
9	MR. MacDONALD: No.
10	MR. CHISHOLM: If I suggested to you that's
11	what they felt, you wouldn't disagree with me?
12	MR. MacDONALD: No, no.
13	MR. CHISHOLM: Now, if I could take you,
14	please, to on to Exhibit 2353. That's the statement
15	that Mr. Lee took you to this morning that arose and I
16	say "statement," it's a summary of the an interview of
17	February 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2008 involving Ms. Fitzpatrick, Anne McKinnon
18	and Bill Carriere, and it's Exhibit 2353, and if I take
19	you, please, to Bates page 7181408, which is page 17 of the
20	document.
21	Are you going to work off the screen, Mr.
22	MacDonald, or do you want
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. Yes, thank you.
24	MR. CHISHOLM: Okay.
25	We'll go to page 17, please.

1	THE REGISTRAR: Can you give me Bates page
2	number?
3	MR. CHISHOLM: Yes, 7181408. I'm going down
4	six if we start at the sixth bullet from the top, and
5	I'll just read summarize these, Mr. MacDonald.
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
7	MR. CHISHOLM: The suggestion is that the
8	Crown attorney, being as I understand it, the reference
9	to the Crown attorney is you:
10	"The Crown attorney is 'so rude to
11	me.'"
12	And the next bullet, the Crown attorney was
13	degrading Ms. Fitzpatrick and attacking Ms. Fitzpatrick.
14	And the next bullet refers to "insulting me in a very
15	demeaning way."
16	And down four more bullets:
17	"The Crown Attorney was terrible to
18	me."
19	Can I ask you, sir, what your reaction was
20	when you first saw this document and particularly these
21	statements?
22	MR. MacDONALD: If she felt that way, I
23	don't recall how and what I did or said to cause it. I
24	certainly didn't intend for her to feel the least bit
25	embarrassed. I may have met her about weaknesses in the

1	evidence and I may have suggested or had to come out
2	directly and say that this procedure will result in this
3	piece being inadmissible or otherwise, but that's not I
4	didn't intend to be in any way demeaning or terrible to
5	her.
6	MR. CHISHOLM: If there was not
7	necessarily with Ms. Fitzpatrick but if you ever had
8	such a type of meeting where you treated someone out of the
9	ordinary, I would submit, would that be something that you
10	might remember?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Oh, for sure. I thought
12	I've always been particularly respectful towards I'm
13	harder on police officers that I am on CAS workers.
14	MR. CHISHOLM: Yes.
15	MR. MacDONALD: And I only really get rough
16	with people when I have to push back. It's not my nature
17	to do so unless fighting fire with fire.
18	MR. CHISHOLM: So do I take it you were
19	somewhat taken back when you saw these this statement?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Oh, very disappointed to see
21	it, but I understand that this was not the agency's
22	position. I'm not suggesting that. I understand that this
23	is her view and I was greatly taken aback.
24	MR. CHISHOLM: And just with respect to the
25	allegation I put to you, what is your position with respect

1	to those allegations?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I think she's mistaken in my
3	words and conduct because I had no intention to be anything
4	other than professional and diplomatic with her, and either
5	I failed miserably of I've or I'm anyway, that's it.
6	MR. CHISHOLM: Thank you, Mr. MacDonald.
7	Those are my questions.
8	STATEMENT BY THE COMMISSIONER/DÉCLARATION PAR LE
9	COMMISSAIRE:
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
11	Before we take the break, I think it's
12	incumbent on me to comment on Mr. Neville's comments at the
13	end of the examination.
14	And perhaps it is my fault in the sense that
15	I have permitted counsel, in my view at least, great leeway
16	in order to advance the interest of the parties or and,
17	even more, the interests of this Inquiry.
18	I find that Mr. Neville's comments dealing
19	with the conduct of another party and other solicitors in
20	this Inquiry, unfortunate. I am also saying that I'm
21	surprised that it would be coming from a senior member of
22	the Bar.
23	We've had considerable press about how we
24	deal with this Inquiry, the length and its cost, but I've
25	always been proud of the fact that we have always attempted

1	to deal with matters in a professional way.
2	Accordingly, and this is an admonishment to
3	Mr. Neville and to all of us, that those types of comments
4	will not be permitted and I suggest you govern yourselves
5	accordingly. Thank you.
6	Let's take the break.
7	Oh, by the way, now we should be checking
8	about time, I know there's a witness here. I'm prepared to
9	sit late tonight to have him started and maybe even finish
10	his chief, but I'll ask Ms. Jones to speak with the witness
11	and the parties and see how we're going to finish this off.
12	Okay?
13	Thank you.
14	THE REGISTRAR: Order. All rise. À
15	l'ordre. Veuillez vous lever.
16	This hearing will resume at 3:15 p.m.
17	Upon recessing at 15:01 p.m./
18	L'audience est suspendue à 15h01
19	Upon resuming at 15:20 p.m./
20	L'audience est reprise à 15h20
21	THE REGISTRAR: Order. All rise. À
22	l'ordre. Veuillez vous lever.
23	This hearing is now resumed. Please be
24	seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

1	STATEMENT BY/DÉCLARATION PAR MS. JONES:
2	MS. JONES: Mr. Commissioner, just a couple
3	of things to clarify.
4	Mr. Manderville had said earlier that Mr.
5	White, or Officer White's testimony with regards to C-86
6	had to do with the demise of C-86, and that's why Officer
7	White had not continued any further, or why the
8	investigation hadn't continued any further in any event.
9	But I just want to refer to the transcript on this issue
10	with Officer White.
11	It's at Volume 290, at page 176, when he's
12	under cross-examination by Ms. Daley, and Ms. Daley stated:
13	"And setting aside that you found the
14	statement somewhat undetailed, he was
15	demonstrating his willingness to
16	cooperate?
17	SERGEANT WHITE: Yes.
18	MS. DALEY: Is there a reason why his
19	allegations weren't further pursued?
20	SERGEANT WHITE: Yes.
21	MS. DALEY: What's the reason?
22	SERGEANT WHITE: The statement was
23	lacking detail and I needed more detail
24	from him or try to get more detail
25	about the specific criminal allegation.

1	And what happened was he moved and all
2	efforts to try to relocate him again
3	fell through. I could never find him
4	again.
5	MS. DALEY: So when you went back to
6	him for further details he couldn't be
7	located?
8	SERGEANT WHITE: That's right.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, so bottom line is,
10	rumours of his demise had been greatly exaggerated?
11	MS. JONES: So it would appear. He
12	confirmed that also with Mr. Lee a few pages later.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, unless Mr.
14	Manderville wants to
15	MR. MANDERVILLE: During the lunch break,
16	Mr. Commissioner I had a concern about that as well, and
17	during the lunch break, I made an inquiry of my client to
18	track that issue down in terms of documents and I hope to
19	be able to advise you and ideally for C-86 repeat the words
20	of Mark Twain.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. Oh, I thought
22	maybe you were going to say sorry for having extinguished
23	his life so prematurely?
24	STATEMENT BY/DÉCLARATION PAR MR. MANDERVILLE:
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: I believe it was Mark

1	Twain who said rumours of one's demise were greatly
2	exaggerated.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
4	All right, so Ms. Robitaille, or did you
5	want to speak about time.
6	MS. JONES: Yes, I do. I'm wondering if
7	perhaps the Crown counsel could speak to Mr. Johnson
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Scharbach?
9	STATEMENT BY/DÉCLARATION PAR MR. SCHARBACH:
10	MR. SCHARBACH: Good afternoon, Mr.
11	Commissioner.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
13	MR. SCHARBACH: I had spoken to Don Johnson,
14	he was prepared to testify this afternoon but in view of
15	the lateness of time, he was informed by Ms. Jones that it
16	was his choice as to whether to start again on January the
17	$6^{\mathrm{th}}$ , anew, or to continue on this afternoon. He chose to
18	start on January the $6^{\mathrm{th}}$ , anew. So as I understand it, he
19	won't be participating later on tonight.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.
21	MR. SCHARBACH: Thank you.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: I know that that
23	disappoints a lot of the lawyers here, that we'll have to
24	leave a little earlier, but it will have to do.
25	Ms. Robitaille?

1	MS. ROBITAILLE: Mr. Commissioner, I have an
2	agreement with counsel for the Diocese that their cross-
3	examination will proceed before mine. Thank you.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Ms. Levesque?
5	MURRAY MacDONALD, Resumed/Sous le même serment:
6	CROSS EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE DE MS.
7	LEVESQUE :
8	MS. LEVESQUE: Good afternoon, Mr.
9	MacDonald.
10	MR. MacDONALD: Madame.
11	MS. LEVESQUE: My name is Gisèle Levesque.
12	I'm counsel for the Diocese of Alexandria-Cornwall
13	MR. MacDONALD: Madame.
14	MS. LEVESQUE: And Bishop Larocque.
15	I just have a few areas I want to cover with
16	you this afternoon. I shouldn't be very long.
17	The first area is the statement that you
18	gave to Detective Inspector Smith and Detective Constable
19	Fagan
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, madame.
21	MS. LEVESQUE: on July 14 <sup>th</sup> of 1994?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, madame.
23	MS. LEVESQUE: You were told at that time
24	that you were a person of interest in an investigation for
25	obstruction of justice? That was your evidence earlier.

1	Your evidence in-chief is that you were advised prior to
2	giving your statement that you were a person of interest?
3	MR. MacDONALD: I believe I was, yes.
4	MS. LEVESQUE: You recall that?
5	So they were investigating your conduct;
6	correct? You knew that they were investigating your
7	conduct?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, ma'am.
9	MS. LEVESQUE: And your role as a Crown
10	Attorney; correct?
11	MR. MacDONALD: My conduct in respect to
12	this the case of the Silmser complaint.
13	MS. LEVESQUE: Correct. And your role as a
14	Crown Attorney in that investigation?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Correct.
16	MS. LEVESQUE: And they were also
17	investigating your involvement with the Diocese of
18	Alexandria-Cornwall, so the question of the conflict of
19	interest?
20	MR. MacDONALD: With regard
21	MS. LEVESQUE: You knew that they were
22	investigating you with regards to your role with the
23	Diocese of Alexandria-Cornwall?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, because I told them
25	about it.

1	MS. LEVESQUE: Correct. So you know that as
2	a Crown Attorney and an officer of the court, you have an
3	obligation to provide comprehensive information to the
4	police?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, ma'am.
6	MS. LEVESQUE: You have an obligation the
7	complete information?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, ma'am, which I did.
9	MS. LEVESQUE: And you wanted to facilitate
10	their investigation as well at that time?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
12	MS. LEVESQUE: And you'll agree with me that
13	your evidence a year-and-a-half rather your statement
14	that you gave a year-and-a-half following the events is
15	fresher than the events today?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Probably is, yeah.
17	MS. LEVESQUE: Okay. Because you've told us
18	in your in-chief that you agreed that the events were
19	fresher in your mind a year-and-a-half after the events, so
20	in 1994
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, as a rule
22	MS. LEVESQUE: than they are today?
23	MR. MacDONALD: As a rule, the sooner the
24	better, except for instances where I've since learned
25	things, you know, after the fact, after the event

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
2	MS. LEVESQUE: so in 1994
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, as a rule.
4	MS. LEVESQUE: than they are today?
5	MR. MacDONALD: As a rule, the sooner the
6	better, except for instances where I've since learned
7	things, you know, after the fact. If I didn't know
8	something in 1993, my there was no memory there, of
9	course.
10	I've learned a lot of things as time has
11	gone by. I try to delineate what I knew then from present
12	memory learned about past events.
13	MS. LEVESQUE: And there's a difficulty
14	there as well, because some of the information you've
15	learned could be from the media or from discussions
16	THE COMMISSIONER: So far we've gone over
17	this exact, same testimony in chief, almost to a "T", so
18	can we get on?
19	MS. LEVESQUE: I'd just like to look at
20	your your statement. It's Exhibit 1233.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, Ma'am.
22	MS. LEVESQUE: And I'd like to go to Bates
23	page 5840. It's page 6 in the statement.
24	I want to look at you I want to look with
25	you at what you told the officers in '94 regarding your

1	participation in the Ecclesia 2000 Committee.
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
3	MS. LEVESQUE: And I'm just going to
4	go if you look at the bottom, I'm just going to go
5	straight to the recommendation.
6	So they were questioning you regarding your
7	role in Ecclesia, and if you look at the bottom of page 6,
8	or Bates page 5840, starting with and I'm just going to
9	read it in:
10	"The recommendation that I participated
11	in writing and I must say I that
12	I was the only lawyer on the particular
13	subcommittee, and so I had
14	considerable, ah, ah, involvement in
15	writing that that one particular
16	recommendation."
17	Do you see that?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, Ma'am.
19	MS. LEVESQUE: Okay. I'm just going to take
20	you down now, just a few lines, four lines down, to then
21	it goes on and then you give your the recommendation
22	that you made at that committee, and you say:
23	"Cooperation, ah, with ah,
24	particularly with the CAS and the
25	police, as well as being upfront with

1	the media,"
2	And that's what you would have told the
3	officers at that time was your involvement?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
5	MS. LEVESQUE: And the recommendation that
6	you did, which you would have drafted; correct?
7	THE COMMISSIONER: He didn't tell us about
8	what the recommendation was, but just he drafted it.
9	MS. LEVESQUE: Yeah.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: And you claimed
11	privilege, so I don't know where we're going.
12	MS. LEVESQUE: I'd like to look at now
13	the the report and recommendations of the Ecclesia 2000.
14	It's in your document, Mr. Commissioner.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: You're waiving privilege?
16	MS. LEVESQUE: Yeah. I didn't claim
17	privilege on the document. I raised a concern as to
18	where
19	THE COMMISSIONER: I thought for sure you
20	said you claimed privilege, but
21	MS. LEVESQUE: I did not claim privilege.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
23	MS. LEVESQUE: I did not claim privilege,
24	Mr. Commissioner. It's in the database; it's been
25	disclosed.

1	MR. MacDONALD: Can you also show me the
2	recommendation that our
3	MS. LEVESQUE: I will.
4	MR. MacDONALD: that our committee sent?
5	MS. LEVESQUE: I will, yes. That's where
6	I'd like to go. It's Document Number 129777.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, so what's the
8	relevance of this to the Inquiry? Like, you know, this is
9	what he thought. This is why he had a conflict. Now you
10	want to show me this document. Why?
11	MS. LEVESQUE: I want to look at his
12	recommendation with him.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: His recommendation?
14	MS. LEVESQUE: Yeah, the recommendation
15	that
16	MR. MacDONALD: I've been informed, up to
17	this point, ma'am, that it couldn't be found.
18	MS. LEVESQUE: That it could not be found?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
20	MS. LEVESQUE: It's no. This was
21	disclosed to the Commission some time ago.
22	MR. MacDONALD: Can I see the document?
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
24	MS. LEVESQUE: And it's in our cross
25	documents

1	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, no, that's all
2	right.
3	MS. LEVESQUE: Yes, it's coming.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: So is Christmas.
5	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Exhibit 2937
7	is
8	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: a report and
10	recommendations of Commission Number 3, "Co-Responsibility
11	in the Ministering Role of the Clergy."
12	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-2937:
13	(129777) - Diocese Alexandria-Cornwall
14	Report and Recommendations of Commission 3:
15	Co-Responsibility in the Ministering Role of
16	the Clergy dated 2000
17	MS. LEVESQUE: So if you go to page it's
18	Bates page
19	THE COMMISSIONER: In the year 2000, by the
20	way. Okay.
21	MS. LEVESQUE: Yeah, Ecclesia 2000. Bates
22	page 8020. Actually, it should be, 8021. The pages are
23	not numbered, Mr. MacDonald, but the recommendations are,
24	and the recommendations I'm looking at is Recommendation
25	Number 23.

1	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
2	MS. LEVESQUE: Which is the second one on
3	Bates page 8021.
4	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
5	MS. LEVESQUE: So if you look at
6	Recommendation Number 23, it says:
7	"Be it resolved that this commission
8	prepare guidelines to deal with such
9	situations; these guidelines should be
10	made public, especially through parish
11	councils, and they should include the
12	following points: Cooperation with the
13	civil authorities, assistance to the
14	accused and the victim, and procedures
15	for dealing with the media."
16	MR. MacDONALD: Can I see my recommendation?
17	MS. LEVESQUE: This is the recommendation
18	that was made to the committee, and, if we go back to your
19	statement, you'll see that it is consistent with your
20	statement.
21	MS. McINTOSH: Pardon me. Mr. Commissioner,
22	you may recall yesterday the witness said that his
23	subcommittee produced a report which this document that
24	he's just been shown is not the same document, and so I
25	think when he says, "Can I see my recommendation?" what

1	he's saying is, "I'd like to see what my subcommittee
2	produced."
3	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
4	MS. McINTOSH: We don't have that.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Do you
6	MR. MacDONALD: My
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Just a second. Okay,
8	thank you. Do you have his recommendation from the
9	committee?
10	MS. LEVESQUE: My understanding is that
11	these are the recommendations that were made. The
12	recommendation, if you go to the back of the document,
13	you'll see that there was a resolution. It's at Bates page
14	8024.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
16	MS. LEVESQUE: It's number 20, which is
17	identical to Recommendation Number 23. So that resolution
18	was is the resolution that was voted on and adopted. At
19	the bottom of the page, Mr. Commissioner.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
21	MR. MacDONALD: I've never seen this
22	document before.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, so, sir
24	MS. LEVESQUE: It may be that the final
25	document was never shown to you but this is what this is

1	the final Ecclesia report that's headed "Report and
2	Recommendations."
3	MR. MacDONALD: Well, this is not the report
4	I'm referring to. I'm referring to a it was a
5	single our report the reports that we drafted were
6	stand-alone documents that were handwritten.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: So, sir, counsel is
8	showing you Documentation Number 21. Is that
9	MS. LEVESQUE: Twenty-three (23).
10	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry, which one,
11	what number?
12	MS. LEVESQUE: Twenty-three (23).
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Twenty-three (23). Is
14	this the recommendation that you had drafted?
15	MR. MacDONALD: No, our what I drafted
16	would have filled the page.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Right. Mr. Lee to the
18	rescue.
19	MR. LEE: Sir, I'm a little bit concerned
20	that yesterday when this issue arose during the examination
21	in-chief, it was during in the context of the conflict
22	of interest, or bias, or whatever it was.
23	Ms. Levesque got up here and essentially
24	said that none of this was put to the Diocese witnesses and
25	therefore we couldn't put it to Mr. MacDonald.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
2	MR. LEE: He told us that there was an issue
3	whereby he had advanced a recommendation. When matters
4	came to a vote his recommendation was nowhere to be found.
5	He became upset, he I don't know if "upset" is the right
6	word. He took issue with that and he
7	THE COMMISSIONER: He and his wife left,
8	yes.
9	MR. LEE: Mr. Engelmann backed away from
10	that area, as I understood, in relation to your comments
11	with respect to Ms. Levesque's objection. We now have her
12	going back into this, and I think she's clearly opened a
13	door, and we now have no appreciation of what the initial
14	recommendation from this witness was because he hasn't
15	given us that evidence because he wasn't asked for it.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
17	MR. LEE: But now we have this being put to
18	him, which is the final result, and now we have this
19	evidence out there, hanging, that he had some issue with
20	what was put to a vote, and we have no evidence at all on
21	whether I think he needs to be entitled to
22	explore not that needs to be entitled, he needs to be
23	specifically asked what his issue was, and what the problem
24	was, because we're now into this and we don't have the
25	evidence.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I don't know that
2	we're going to get very go very much further.
3	This is a collateral issue, Madame Levesque.
4	I don't see how it's relevant. All we know is that this
5	gentleman prepared a resolution and he thinks it really,
6	whether you adopt he adopted it later is irrelevant.
7	In his state of mind, right, he thought a
8	set of facts, and because of that he developed his idea
9	that he had a conflict, un point c'est tout. Now, if
10	you're thinking of bringing him back and saying, "Well,
11	look, it was really the same," it's a collateral issue and
12	I don't want to go much further than that, unless you can
13	persuade me otherwise.
14	MS. LEVESQUE: Well, there might be an
15	underlying inference.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Inference? Oh, you
17	MS. LEVESQUE: Depending on this
18	resolution is consistent with what he would have told
19	the
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Well
21	MS. LEVESQUE: in 1994, the police.
22	There was there is no mention in the statement
23	THE COMMISSIONER: I'll tell you what
24	MS. LEVESQUE: to his storming out.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: I'll tell you what, I

1	won't take any inference against the Diocese because this
2	man says that he walked out because he his resolution
3	was different, and I'm not going to take any adverse
4	inference on that point against the Diocese. That should
5	make it easy.
6	MS. LEVESQUE: Nor that the resolution was
7	not adopted.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, I don't know about
9	that. There's no proof of that. None. And it's
10	irrelevant to the Inquiry.
11	MS. LEVESQUE: Well, it's adopted in this
12	document. It's resolved
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Ms. Levesque
14	MS. LEVESQUE: and adopted. His dissent
15	is not shown anywhere.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Ms. Levesque?
17	MS. LEVESQUE: Yes.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Let's go on.
19	MS. LEVESQUE: Okay. So I'm just going to
20	renew my objection that it is unfair if you draw any
21	inferences from any of his evidence based on the fact that
22	our clients were not canvassed. Commission counsel was
23	aware of this Ecclesia document
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Ms. Levesque
25	MS. LEVESQUE: when they met with the

1	<del>-</del>
2	THE COMMISSIONER: I understand your
3	objection and I don't agree with it and we're going to move
4	on now, please.
5	MS. LEVESQUE: Okay, yes
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
7	MS. LEVESQUE: I will. Thank you. The
8	next area I wanted to touch very briefly with you is the
9	for the financial settlement for the David Silmser
10	investigation
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, madame.
12	MS. LEVESQUE: you had an explanation
13	that the Church did not support David Silmser or his mother
14	in the past. That was one of the explanations that was
15	provided to you?
16	MR. MacDONALD: I believe by Malcolm
17	MacDonald.
18	MS. LEVESQUE: That's your that was your
19	evidence.
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah. It may have been
21	Jacques Leduc, but I don't recall now. I think it was
22	Malcolm MacDonald.
23	MS. LEVESQUE: I believe your evidence was
24	Malcolm MacDonald.
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, I think so.

1	MS. LEVESQUE: So you never personally
2	interviewed David Silmser?
3	MR. MacDONALD: No.
4	MS. LEVESQUE: Okay. You read his
5	statement?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, madame.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: One of them.
8	MS. LEVESQUE: And that was not in his
9	statement. Do you agree with that?
10	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall.
11	MS. LEVESQUE: And this information is
12	something that you obtained from a third person, which was
13	second- or third-hand? You obtained from Malcolm
14	MacDonald, but it was
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, it was
16	MS. LEVESQUE: It would have been second-,
17	third-hand.
18	MR. MacDONALD: That's right.
19	MS. LEVESQUE: Okay.
20	The last area I'd like to look at with you
21	is, as part of this investigation, you never interviewed
22	Bishop LaRocque; correct?
23	MR. MacDONALD: No, ma'am.
24	MS. LEVESQUE: You never interviewed any
25	priests of the Diocese of Alexandria-Cornwall?

1	MR. MacDONALD: I don't interview directly
2	myself, ever.
3	MS. LEVESQUE: Okay. Heidi never
4	interviewed Bishop LaRocque; correct?
5	MR. MacDONALD: I don't believe so. I
6	believe that Chief Shaver did.
7	MS. LEVESQUE: Heidi Heidi
8	THE COMMISSIONER: He doesn't know. How
9	could he know?
10	MS. LEVESQUE: Heidi well, Heidi never
11	interviewed any priests of the Diocese?
12	THE COMMISSIONER: To your knowledge, did
13	
14	MS. LEVESQUE: To your knowledge?
15	MR. MacDONALD: I don't know. I don't I
16	don't believe so.
17	MS. LEVESQUE: And you've told us that you
18	were involved in
19	MR. MacDONALD: Well, she did I think she
20	had her notes suggest she spoke to one or two priests
21	during that period of time. So there were certain a
22	couple of priests that appears from the notes today she
23	spoke I didn't
24	MS. LEVESQUE: From the Diocese?
25	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't know

1	MS. LEVESQUE: From the Diocese
2	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't know it
3	MS. LEVESQUE: of Alexandria-Cornwall?
4	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't know it then, but I
5	see in Heidi's notes reference to a monsignor and a
6	MS. LEVESQUE: Well, she spoke no, it
7	wasn't
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Ms. Levesque, he doesn't
9	know who he [sic] spoke to.
10	MS. LEVESQUE: And you've told us that in
11	your investigations you prosecuted two of you did two of
12	the prosecutions for the Alfred Training School
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
14	MS. LEVESQUE: correct? And then you
15	did some historical prosecutions in the City of Sudbury;
16	correct?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Possibly. I think
18	MS. LEVESQUE: Okay.
19	MR. MacDONALD: I did. I can recall
20	one.
21	MS. LEVESQUE: One? You did one?
22	MR. MacDONALD: It was not institutional; it
23	was intrafamilial.
24	MS. LEVESQUE: Okay. And your involvement
25	with the David Silmser matter ended at the 29th of

1	September, '93; correct? Or shortly thereafter. As a
2	Crown attorney.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Except for giving statements
4	and reports back to the police and others, yes. My
5	supervisors that went on into '94 and beyond.
6	MS. LEVESQUE: Because of
7	MR. MacDONALD: Follow-up.
8	MS. LEVESQUE: collateral follow-up or
9	collateral
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
11	MS. LEVESQUE: investigations.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
13	MS. LEVESQUE: But your involvement as a
14	Crown attorney in that investigation ended at the end of
15	September
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, madame.
17	MS. LEVESQUE: '93; correct?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	MS. LEVESQUE: Those are my questions.
20	Thank you.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
23	Ms. Robitaille?
24	MS. ROBITAILLE: No questions for the
25	witness.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
2	Mr. Manderville?
3	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR
4	MR. MANDERVILLE:
5	MR. MANDERVILLE: Good afternoon,
6	Mr. Commissioner.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, sir.
8	MR. MANDERVILLE: Good afternoon,
9	Mr. MacDonald.
10	MR. MacDONALD: Sir.
11	MR. MANDERVILLE: We have met before, but
12	I'm Peter Manderville, I'm counsel for the Cornwall Police.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
14	MR. MANDERVILLE: Sir, you've been a Crown
15	here for 20 years?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir, 20 and a bit.
17	MR. MANDERVILLE: And over those years
18	you've worked very closely with my client?
19	MR. MacDONALD: The Cornwall Police Service?
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: Yes.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. Still do.
22	MR. MANDERVILLE: I do have other clients
23	but that's the one I want to talk about.
24	And I take it you would say you have a good
25	relationship with members of the Cornwall Police Service?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Well, we've been through
2	thick and thin and we still work well together.
3	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you know the Cornwall
4	Police to be staffed by competent, capable, hard-working
5	officers?
6	MR. MacDONALD: I do. That's for sure.
7	MR. MANDERVILLE: I want to go through, to
8	some degree, your 1994 interview with the OPP.
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: And that would be
11	Exhibit 1233. What I'd like to do, for the sake of
12	brevity, is to propose various things to you that you
13	indicated during the interview, and if you need to we can
14	certainly go to the specific page where you talk about it.
15	I just want you to have it handy, but if you
16	recall what you said and I put it to you and you agree, so
17	much the better. You've told us, and you told the OPP
18	officers, that you felt you had met with Heidi Sebalj seven
19	to 10 times through the course of her investigation?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
21	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you knew that she was
22	grappling with the issue of reasonable and probable
23	grounds.
24	MR. MacDONALD: She was grappling with the
25	issue of how to how to collect sufficient evidence to

1	formulate reasonable and probable grounds.
2	MR. MANDERVILLE: Correct. And she sought
3	some guidance from you and you tried to provide it.
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
5	MR. MANDERVILLE: And Ms. Daley yesterday
6	suggested to you that Heidi was coming to you in the
7	absence of guidance from Luc Brunet. And Staff Sergeant
8	Brunet gave evidence that he and Constable Sebalj met
9	relatively regularly on an informal basis concerning this
10	investigation.
11	And given your knowledge of Luc Brunet, I
12	take it that would be consistent with your understanding of
13	him?
14	MR. MacDONALD: I'm not surprised to hear
15	that he did that. I didn't know I didn't have the sense
16	from Heidi that she had been conferring with him as well.
17	I may be wrong on that. If Luc says he did, that's he
18	probably did.
19	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you understood that
20	Constable Sebalj was finding Mr. Silmser difficult to deal
21	with?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
23	MR. MANDERVILLE: And finding it difficult
24	to get information from him?
25	MR. MacDONALD: At times. Not always, but

1	at times.
2	MR. MANDERVILLE: And as the investigation
3	went on, you came to the view that Constable Sebalj's
4	difficulties with the investigation were increasing rather
5	than decreasing?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Especially in the sort of
7	the March to the end of April timeframe, that's where most
8	of our contacts were and that's where it seems most of the
9	dead ends were being encountered.
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you understood that
11	despite the information Constable Sebalj secured from C-3
12	and C-56, that she never formed a subjective view that she
13	had reasonable and probable grounds to lay charges prior to
14	Mr. Silmser insisting that he didn't want to proceed any
15	further?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
17	MR. MANDERVILLE: And as you suggested to
18	Mr. Neville, it's not for you or for anyone else to go
19	behind the officer's subjective view, is it?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
21	MR. MANDERVILLE: Unless you question or
22	second-guess her bona fides or her good-faith belief.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Oh, her good faith was never
24	in question, sir.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: That was what I was going

1	to say to you, that or put to you that you never
2	questioned that at all
3	MR. MacDONALD: No.
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: did you?
5	MR. MacDONALD: No, no. No.
6	MR. MANDERVILLE: You subsequently came to
7	understand that when the OPP reinvestigated the Silmser
8	complaint regarding Father MacDonald in 1994
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: that Tim Smith, a
11	highly experienced OPP officer, was also unable to form the
12	subjective view that he had reasonable and probable grounds
13	to lay charges; correct?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
15	MR. MANDERVILLE: And once again, it's not
16	for you or for anyone else to go behind or second-guess
17	officer Smith's subjective view, is it?
18	MR. MacDONALD: No. We now have a practice
19	of, when asked, offering our thoughts on the objective
20	component, but you can never question ultimately the
21	subjective conclusion.
22	MR. MANDERVILLE: That's right. And you
23	advised officer Brunet and/or Sebalj to go to Silmser
24	following the settlement, or Sean Adams, to advise him or
25	to make it clear to him that his criminal complaint was not

1	affected by the civil settlement; correct?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. I think that that
3	suggestion to Luc Brunet was not a surprise to Luc. I
4	think he seems to me his response was and I have it
5	somewhere in my notes, but it seems to me he said he had
6	was about to do it, anyway.
7	MR. MANDERVILLE: And to your knowledge,
8	they did do so?
9	MR. MacDONALD: I know they did.
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: And and
11	MR. MacDONALD: Twice.
12	MR. MANDERVILLE: And Mr. Silmser made it
13	clear he didn't want to proceed?
14	MR. MacDONALD: That's what we thought.
15	MR. MANDERVILLE: And both Staff Sergeant
16	Brunet and Chief Shaver came to you to express their
17	concerns with the effects this settlement had had on the
18	investigation?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: Mr. Shaver was quite upset
21	by the outcome?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Oh yes, sir.
23	MR. MANDERVILLE: He was looking to you to
24	assist him in what steps the Cornwall Police might be able
25	to take to deal with the problems that they felt the

1	settlement created?
2	MR. MacDONALD: "Can we force the victim on
3	despite his wishes? Can we somehow hold the Diocese
4	responsible for undertaking these negotiations, civil
5	negotiations? Can we is Mr did Mr. Silmser himself
6	go into the range of obstructing justice or attempting to?"
7	These were all questions that Mr that Claude Shaver
8	had.
9	MR. MANDERVILLE: Looking at what legal
10	avenues might we be able to pursue?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you understood that
13	Mr Chief Shaver subsequently went to the Bishop of the
14	Diocese?
15	MR. MacDONALD: I understand he went to the
16	Bishop, Probation, and the CAS.
17	MR. MANDERVILLE: And do you also understand
18	he went to the Papal Nuncio in Ottawa?
19	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall then. I've
20	since heard that at one point he did, but I don't recall if
21	he told me that.
22	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you understood that in
23	each case his approaches to the Bishop and to the CAS and
24	to Probation were to deal with the potential problems posed
25	by the possibility that Father MacDonald and/or Ken Sequin

1	were at large in the community, based on Mr. Silmser's
2	allegations?
3	MR. MacDONALD: That would have been one of
4	the main reasons, one of the main points he would have
5	brought up. I'm sure that's what he expressed to me.
6	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you told the OPP that
7	one of Chief Shaver's primary concerns was, "How do we
8	protect children if Mr. Silmser's allegations are in fact
9	true?"
10	MR. MacDONALD: That's fair to say.
11	MR. MANDERVILLE: And I take it you'd agree
12	with me that these actions do not appear to be the actions
13	of a man or of a police department looking to cover up the
14	Silmser allegations, do they?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Heidi Sebalj could have
16	covered this up in January if she wanted to.
17	MR. MANDERVILLE: So you do agree with me?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Oh, this was it may have
19	been less than a perfect investigation, but it was nothing
20	near a cover-up, sir. It was the definitely not a
21	anywhere near that, as far as everything I've seen in terms
22	of my involvement then and even subsequently.
23	MR. MANDERVILLE: I want to switch areas for
24	a little bit. You spoke to Mr. Engelmann in your first day
25	of evidence here about how the law regarding corroboration

1	had changed in 1988.
2	MR. MacDONALD: Between '88 and '93, yeah.
3	The Evidence Act I think was changed in '93.
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: And prior to that time the
5	Evidence Act required that the evidence of a child was to
6	be corroborated; correct?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
8	MR. MANDERVILLE: And a child's allegations
9	of a sexual assault had to have some form of corroboration?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
11	MR. MANDERVILLE: So in 1985, a nine-year-
12	old mentally challenged child presenting with an allegation
13	of sexual assault would require corroboration of that
14	allegation in some form?
15	MR. MacDONALD: If it was investigated in
16	'83?
17	MR. MANDERVILLE: Eighty-five ('85).
18	MR. MacDONALD: Eighty-five ('85)? Yes.
19	MR. MANDERVILLE: And in the absence of
20	corroboration there would not be a basis to lay a charge.
21	MR. MacDONALD: In '85.
22	MR. MANDERVILLE: Correct.
23	Yesterday Mr. Engelmann took you through a
24	few documents from your Assistant Crown, Lynn Robinson
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

1	MR. MANDERVILLE: in the Earl Landry,
2	Jr. prosecution.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: And in particular he took
5	you through some memos and correspondence between Ms.
6	Robinson and Staff Sergeant Brian Snyder. You recall that?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
8	MR. MANDERVILLE: I understand Ms. Robinson
9	came to you and provided you with her perceptions of
10	Sergeant Snyder's responsiveness to her letters.
11	MR. MacDONALD: She was upset about him
12	at him for that point.
13	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you wrote a letter to
14	Chief Repa in response to that; correct?
15	MR. MacDONALD: I just don't recall. Is it
16	
17	MR. MANDERVILLE: We looked at that
18	yesterday.
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yesterday; okay.
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: I take it you did not (a)
21	question the accuracy of Ms. Robinson's perceptions as she
22	told them to you.
23	MR. MacDONALD: No, I didn't.
24	MR. MANDERVILLE: And (b) you did not speak
25	to Staff Sergeant Snyder about it?

1	MR. MacDONALD: No, I alan't.
2	MR. MANDERVILLE: And Chief Repa and the
3	Cornwall Police were responsive to your letter and the
4	concerns expressed therein?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, because I'd spoken to
6	the Chief and then in my writing in my letter you note
7	that I'm referring to different issues that I brought to
8	his attention on the topic of timely disclosure, and I did
9	not quote Lynn at large when I spoke to the Chief.
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: Now, you've spoken,
11	certainly in your letter of September 14, '93, on the
12	Silmser investigation and elsewhere about the Crown policy
13	of not compelling an unwilling complainant to proceed
14	against their wishes in the context of a sexual assault;
15	correct?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
17	MR. MANDERVILLE: And I take it this is
18	because there are concerns about revictimization or
19	traumatization that the complainant may endure in the trial
20	process.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Precisely.
22	MR. MANDERVILLE: And indeed people commit
23	suicide over these sorts of issues if it's severe enough;
24	correct?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

1	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you as a Crown, and
2	the provincial Crowns in general, are sensitive to that
3	to avoid that possibility?
4	MR. MacDONALD: We had I recall it being
5	discussed in the early years late eighties, early
6	nineties the caution that had to be applied. I don't
7	recall if it was at a provincial education session, a
8	regional session or but it was something that we as a
9	professional group were recognizing.
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: Now, yesterday,
11	Mr. MacDonald, Ms. Daley took you to a statement of Malcolm
12	MacDonald's, suggesting that he was getting information
13	from the Cornwall Police about Mr. Silmser's attendance
14	record at appointments, or lack thereof, and I objected and
15	indicated to the Commissioner that there was no indication
16	in Officer Sebalj's notes of any sort.
17	And, Mr. Commissioner, I've gone through the
18	notes and I have the Bates pages to refer Mr. MacDonald to,
19	recording her conversations with Malcolm MacDonald.
20	Beginning at and it's Exhibit 295. That's Document
21	717428.
22	MR. MacDONALD: Sir, I really don't know
23	what she did or didn't tell Malcolm MacDonald.
24	MR. MANDERVILLE: I appreciate that. I know
25	that, Mr. MacDonald. I just wish to clarify the record.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: What page?
2	MR. MANDERVILLE: Bates page 7063750.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Three seven five zero
4	(3750).
5	MR. MANDERVILLE: So ending at 3750, and it
6	should be Constable Sebalj's notes for 25 February 1993.
7	Down the bottom of the page at 1455:
8	"Telephone call from Malcolm
9	MacDonald"
10	Go on to the next page:
11	"counsel for the suspect, Father
12	Charles MacDonald, advises Jacques
13	Leduc is lawyer for the Diocese. Gave
14	history of his file. States Monsignor
15	Schonenbach met with Silmser in Ottawa
16	on December 9, 1992 at Archdiocese.
17	Schonenbach is in charge of [something]
18	investigating offences. Schonenbach
19	wrote letter to Monsignor McDougald on
20	December 11, '92, advising about the
21	allegations against MacDonald.
22	McDougald in charge of investigations
23	for this area. McDougald wrote letter
24	to MacDonald on December 12, 1992,
25	advising him of allegations made

request. Present at the meeting was

I	McDougald"
2	Looks like it says:
3	"in charge, Leduc lawyer and one
4	unknown from Glen Walter. States they
5	have talked about getting the victim
6	some psychological help through Royal
7	Ottawa without committing liability.
8	Victim was satisfied at the time.
9	However, called the next day to tell
10	them he was going through the police.
11	Advises victim has retained Tom Swabey
12	and Don Johnson, both, and has parted
13	ways with both a couple of days later.
14	Advises the Church's files are open and
15	they are willing to cooperate. Advised
16	he would get go-ahead from McDougald to
17	provide me with a copy of V [for
18	victim's] allegations to the Church.
19	States Church believes victim wants
20	money as he has made certain demands,
21	for starters. Advises Father MacDonald
22	is prepared to take a polygraph.
23	Bishop for area is LaRocque. MacDonald
24	gone on holidays for one week
25	commencing 27 Feb. Will contact me on

1	his return."
2	And then he gives a and then it goes on
3	to another phone call.
4	The next entry, Mr. Commissioner, is at
5	Bates page ending 3818.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
7	MR. MANDERVILLE: It's dated March 17, 1993,
8	11:28:
9	"Telephone call to Malcolm MacDonald.
10	Asked him to confirm the years Father C
11	was at St. Columban's. Confirm dates
12	victim was an altar boy. Confirm dates
13	of any retreat in St. Andrew's. Asked
14	if he knew how to reach"
15	A word I can't make out, sir.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: "How to reach" oh, I
17	don't know. "Monsignor" maybe?
18	MR. MANDERVILLE: Okay, could be:
19	"States he also is unable to locate.
20	Unknown if dead or alive. Knows he is
21	no longer a priest. Mentioned that"
22	And there's another name there:
23	"had sent a copy of his statement,
24	left his card at Christmas time and"
25	I think it's Meilleur, sir.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh.
2	MR. MANDERVILLE: "has called. Will be
3	sending him a copy of their statement
4	as well. Very cooperative. Will call
5	with info ASAP."
6	And then at Bates page ending 3820, later
7	that same day, March 17, 1993, at 1334 Constable Sebalj
8	notes another call from Malcolm MacDonald:
9	"Advises Father C at St. Columban's
10	from July '69 to July '75. Silmser was
11	an altar boy definitely in 1972, maybe
12	for part of '71 and '73."
13	THE COMMISSIONER: There's a Father
14	MR. MANDERVILLE: It's another name.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
16	MR. MANDERVILLE: "Left in 1976. Has not
17	been heard of or seen since. Left the
18	priesthood while in"
19	THE COMMISSIONER: "In the States"?
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: "In the States," perhaps.
21	Thank you, sir:
22	"Was in Apple Hill from June '75 to
23	August '82. People that helped him
24	move include"
25	And a number of names there. And then

1	10 minutes later on the same page, at 1355 Constable Sebalj
2	records another call from Malcolm:
3	"Advises Father Charlie only supervised
4	one retreat in States [perhaps] and was
5	in June of '73."
6	And the last recorded call is at Bates page
7	3835, dated August 23, 1993 at 9:30 a.m.
8	"Telephone call from Malcolm MacDonald.
9	States file diarized for this date.
10	Looking for update. Advised I was
11	waiting to meet with Crown. Asked that
12	his client be summonsed and he would
13	escort, as opposed to being handcuffed,
14	et cetera. Suggested I would try to
15	accommodate. Asked to be kept abreast
16	of situation."
17	Mr. Commissioner, those are all the notes
18	regarding contacts with Malcolm MacDonald by Officer Sebalj
19	and, Mr. MacDonald, I take you'd agree that there's no
20	indication in what I've recorded that she is advising
21	Malcolm MacDonald of any cooperation or lack thereof on the
22	part of Mr. Silmser; correct?
23	MR. MacDONALD: It appears not.
24	MR. MANDERVILLE: I'm sorry to have to go
25	through that, Mr. Commissioner.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: It's okay.
2	MR. MANDERVILLE: Next area, Mr. MacDonald.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: You spoke yesterday that
5	you were of the impression that Heidi was Heidi Sebalj
6	was kept at work during a weekend in October to create her
7	notes, and I got up and objected. And if Officer Staff
8	Sergeant Brunet gave evidence that on a weekend in October
9	1993 Officer Sebalj was ordered to generate her OMPPAC
10	reports from her notes.
11	MR. MacDONALD: Maybe that's what I'm
12	thinking of.
13	MR. MANDERVILLE: And that she spent the
14	whole weekend doing so; that Officer Brunet reviewed them
15	and that they were presented to Chief Shaver on the Monday
16	in the form of a Crown brief that you looked at yesterday.
17	I'm going to suggest to you is it possible
18	you were mistaken in expressing the view that she had
19	created her notes on that weekend, as opposed to OMPPAC
20	reports from her notes?
21	MR. MacDONALD: I had the impression that in
22	late September or October she had made an attempt to
23	package everything she'd done up to that point together.
24	Is that is that what you mean?
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: Yes. I'm suggesting to

1	you that it is more likely you agree with me it's more
2	likely she was generating her OMPPAC reports from her notes
3	on that weekend, as opposed to creating her notes for the
4	first time?
5	MS. McINTOSH: I'm sorry to interrupt my
6	friend but my distinct impression was that it was
7	acknowledged that what we call the dedicated notes were not
8	contemporaneous, and maybe that's what the witness is
9	thinking about.
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: Perhaps we're into
11	semantics. I'm not sure what is meant by "dedicated
12	notes."
13	Would you agree with me, Mr. MacDonald, that
14	the notes we've been looking at of Officer Sebalj
15	recording, for instance just now, her conversations with
16	Mr. MacDonald; there is other instances where they record
17	meetings or conversations with you you would have no
18	reason to feel they were not contemporaneous?
19	MR. MacDONALD: The notes you've just gone
20	through appear to be all contemporaneous.
21	MR. MANDERVILLE: Yes.
22	MR. MacDONALD: I don't think that's I
23	don't
24	THE COMMISSIONER: No, but there's another
25	set of notes.

1	MR. MANDERVILLE: Correct, sir.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Right, and that's the one
3	that wasn't contemporaneous.
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: Correct, yes.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: So we've got OMPPAC,
6	we've got that other set of notes and we've got
7	MR. MANDERVILLE: And then we've got the
8	contemporaneous
9	THE COMMISSIONER: the police officer
10	notes. Let's call them that.
11	MR. MANDERVILLE: Okay.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: And there's no
13	suggestion, I don't think, that Exhibit 295 is anything but
14	day-by-day notes.
15	MR. MANDERVILLE: Thank you, sir.
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir, and I'm not I'm
17	not I don't in any way wish to imply that she was
18	cooking her notes.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no.
20	MR. MacDONALD: I think she was with the
21	the second set of notes was, I'm sure, adding time
22	you know, putting information together that would tie
23	pieces of the notes together, you know. This would have
24	been, I think, appropriate under those circumstances.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: The next area I want to

1	speak with you briefly about, Mr. MacDonald, is you've been
2	using the terminology for the past couple of days of "CYA
3	letter."
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
5	MR. MANDERVILLE: And it's your terminology
6	and you used it in
7	MR. MacDONALD: It wasn't Luc's terminology.
8	MR. MANDERVILLE: Pardon me?
9	MR. MacDONALD: It was not Luc Brunet's
10	terminology; it was mine.
11	MR. MANDERVILLE: No, I know that. You used
12	it in connection with your letter of September 14, 1993,
13	and I take it you did not mean to imply that the letter was
14	sort of written cavalierly by you without regard to its
15	accuracy.
16	MR. MacDONALD: Oh no. No, it was I used
17	strong language, particularly in the last two sentences,
18	that I would use differently knowing what I know today.
19	But none of it was cavalier and none of it was trying to
20	stretch the circumstances, but I knew Luc Luc asked for
21	it because he knew he had to answer to the brass, and so I
22	wanted to give something that sufficiently clearly laid out
23	the situation.
24	MR. MANDERVILLE: And it went a little
25	beyond that, I'm going to suggest to you, because you and

1	he both understood that you exchanged some potentially very
2	important information.
3	MR. MacDONALD: In the phone call?
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: Yes. He recognized the
5	importance of perhaps having you confirm your views in
6	writing so he could show it to the Chief and others that,
7	"Look, here's the opinion I've secured from Crown
8	MacDonald."
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, possibly. Yeah.
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: And your letter was, at
11	the time you wrote it, as accurate as you thought it could
12	be; correct?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
13 14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.  MR. MANDERVILLE: And lastly, sir, yesterday
14	MR. MANDERVILLE: And lastly, sir, yesterday
14 15	MR. MANDERVILLE: And lastly, sir, yesterday in your recommendations you spoke quite eloquently about
14 15 16	MR. MANDERVILLE: And lastly, sir, yesterday in your recommendations you spoke quite eloquently about the fact that participants in the justice system, including
14 15 16 17	MR. MANDERVILLE: And lastly, sir, yesterday in your recommendations you spoke quite eloquently about the fact that participants in the justice system, including Crowns, are obliged to refrain from commenting on matters
14 15 16 17 18	MR. MANDERVILLE: And lastly, sir, yesterday in your recommendations you spoke quite eloquently about the fact that participants in the justice system, including Crowns, are obliged to refrain from commenting on matters which are <i>sub judice</i> or pending before the courts; correct?
14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. MANDERVILLE: And lastly, sir, yesterday in your recommendations you spoke quite eloquently about the fact that participants in the justice system, including Crowns, are obliged to refrain from commenting on matters which are <i>sub judice</i> or pending before the courts; correct?  THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I believe that
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. MANDERVILLE: And lastly, sir, yesterday in your recommendations you spoke quite eloquently about the fact that participants in the justice system, including Crowns, are obliged to refrain from commenting on matters which are sub judice or pending before the courts; correct?  THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I believe that would likewise apply to the police and the legislature.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. MANDERVILLE: And lastly, sir, yesterday in your recommendations you spoke quite eloquently about the fact that participants in the justice system, including Crowns, are obliged to refrain from commenting on matters which are sub judice or pending before the courts; correct?  THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I believe that would likewise apply to the police and the legislature.  MR. MANDERVILLE: That was the next point I

MR. MacDONALD: I would say even -- it would

1	have to be more as cautious as any of those three
2	agencies I've just mentioned.
3	MR. MANDERVILLE: And unlike the situation
4	we sometimes see in the United States where a press
5	conference may be held at the time of arrest, and opinions
6	expressed as to the guilt of the person arrested, a person
7	our Crowns attorneys and our police services simply
8	don't do that here, do they?
9	MR. MacDONALD: No, they don't. That was
10	what I that's what I was trying to that's what I'm
11	inviting the Commission and the Commissioner to think about
12	because I don't have a perfect answer.
13	This was one of those times when maybe we should have done
14	something different or maybe we should have found a way to
15	circumvent or, comply with sub judice and still correct
16	the misinformation out there.
17	MR. MANDERVILLE: For good or for ill, we
18	have a time-honoured tradition of awaiting the outcome of
19	court proceedings; correct?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Correct.
21	MR. MANDERVILLE: Thank you very much, Mr.
22	MacDonald.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you, sir.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
25	Mr. Kozloff?

1	STATEMENT BY/DÉCLARATION PAR MR. KOZLOFF:
2	MR. KOZLOFF: Good afternoon, Mr.
3	Commissioner.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Good afternoon, sir.
5	MR. KOZLOFF: I don't have any questions for
6	you, Mr. MacDonald. I'd like to thank you for coming.
7	On behalf of my client, I'd like to
8	recognize your courage and your integrity over the past 15
9	years, the fact that you were the subject matter of an
10	investigation on two occasions notwithstanding.
11	And, Mr. Commissioner, I would like to wish you and
12	everybody else in this room, or at least those remaining
13	here, all the best of the Season.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr.
15	Kozloff.
16	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Carroll. He's gone.
18	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Please make the record
20	note that Mr. Carroll is gone.
21	MR. KOZLOFF: He sends you his very best,
22	Mr. Commissioner.
23	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Carroll has left the
25	room.

1	Ms. McIntosh?
2	MURRAY MacDONALD, Resumed/Sous le même serment:
3	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR
4	MS. McINTOSH:
5	MS. McINTOSH: Good afternoon, Mr.
6	MacDonald. You know me, but for the viewing public who are
7	trapped inside on this day, I guess, and watching the
8	Cornwall Public Inquiry, I'm Leslie McIntosh for the
9	Ministry of the Attorney General.
10	I wanted to start by asking you a few
11	questions about your letter of September $14^{\mathrm{th}}$ , 1993 to Staff
12	Sergeant Brunet, as he then was, which is Exhibit 301.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, ma'am.
14	MS. McINTOSH: Document 101560.
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I'm there.
16	MS. McINTOSH: All right.
17	Now, as I read this letter, you're
18	addressing two, would it be right to say, separate issues
19	here, the policy and the RPGs. Is that correct?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
21	MS. McINTOSH: And as Mr. Manderville just
22	said to you, the policy against compelling reluctant
23	victims of sexual assault is based on the rationale of not
24	re-victimizing them?
25	MR. MacDONALD: That's correct.

1	MS. McINTOSH: And what about the policy
2	about domestic violence? Is my understanding correct that
3	you will compel a reluctant victim in a case of domestic
4	violence to testify? Is that is that correct?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Only where there's a
6	reasonable prospect of conviction and it's in the public
7	interest to do so, and it usually is in the public interest
8	to do so in our view, but for very different socio
9	social and substantive criminal reasons.
10	MS. McINTOSH: All right. And is the
11	rationale for that that the reason that they might not be
12	testifying is, you know, because of their economic or
13	emotional dependence and so on in the situation, in the
14	abusive situation? Is that one of the rationales in any
15	event?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, that's correct.
17	Emotional, social, financial. There are a number that
18	commissions of inquiry in this province have brought to the
19	attention of the police and prosecution service earlier in
20	the nineties.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: This isn't a this
22	isn't just your decision, this is mandated from the
23	Attorney General's office, is it not?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir, policy as well as
25	confidential legal memoranda to us.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
2	MS. McINTOSH: All right.
3	Now, with respect to the policy issue in
4	your letter, how would you characterize what you're saying
5	about the policy issue? Would you call it a legal opinion
6	what you were saying about the policy in your letter?
7	MR. MacDONALD: I think it can be said that
8	I was. I was trying to stay away from giving legal
9	opinions on RPGs, but I think this was a standalone one
10	that I was comfortable in giving.
11	MS. McINTOSH: But on the policy part of it
12	you know, saying, our policy is not to compel reluctant
13	victims, was that, in your mind, giving a legal opinion,
14	that part of it?
15	MR. MacDONALD: I think so because I'm
16	not sure of your question, but they were asking what the
17	Crown's position was in respect to this application of
18	policy and, you know, I suppose policy and legal would
19	commingle at that point.
20	MS. McINTOSH: Okay. What I was really
21	getting at is whether there was sort of an application of
22	judgement or discretion or whatever in terms of the
23	application of the policy to the facts
24	MR. MacDONALD: No, no
25	MS. McINTOSH: in this case.

1	mr. macDONALD: I didn't apply the
2	policy apply a discretion to it, I just explained to him
3	what it meant.
4	MS. McINTOSH: Okay. And with respect to
5	the RPGs issue, why was it that you addressed the RPGs
6	issue in this letter?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Because I'm trying to
8	recall. It was related to the context of our telephone
9	call as well as the letter. And seemingly Luc was
10	enquiring and asking for a back my global sense of
11	things that in order that he could answer back to his
12	supervisors, and that's why I wanted to show that this case
13	didn't turn on whether or not the individual opted to or
14	could be forced to testify, but also it turned on the fact
15	that it had not yet reached the reasonable grounds stage.
16	MS. McINTOSH: All right.
17	And in response to a question from Mr. Manderville just a
18	minute ago, you said, "We now have a practice to offer
19	opinions on objective RPGs", and I wondered whether you
20	were suggesting that there was a different practice at some
21	point-in-time.
22	MR. MacDONALD: I cut my teeth in this
23	business on the instructions from supervisors in
24	particularly in Sudbury, that reasonable grounds are none
25	of your business except to the extent of assisting with

1	providing legal essentially legal elements to the
2	charge. And at that point beyond that, you should stay
3	away.
4	And it was only until I conferred with Mr.
5	Griffiths in 1994 and as '94 went by, that I learned that
6	he on behalf of the division, Criminal Law Division, felt
7	comfortable in wading into comment on the objective
8	component of the test.
9	MS. McINTOSH: Okay.
10	And did you ever talk to Peter Griffiths about this letter,
11	you know, the issues that you were going to address in this
12	letter before you wrote it, do you recall?
13	MR. MacDONALD: No, ma'am, Peter didn't
14	Peter wasn't in the loop at that point.
15	MS. McINTOSH: Okay.
16	And also in response to Mr. Manderville
17	asked you some questions about the need for corroboration
18	pre-1988, and I think you
19	MR. MacDONALD: Eighty-five ('85)?
20	MS. McINTOSH: Nineteen eighty well, he
21	was asking
22	MR. MacDONALD: In in
23	MS. McINTOSH: about in '85.
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
25	MS. McINTOSH: And you were careful to say

1	you would have needed corroboration to charge in 1985. And
2	I was wondering whether you were suggesting that there was
3	a even if the offence occurred pre-1988, that it would
4	be different post-1988 in terms of the requirement for
5	corroboration.
6	MR. MacDONALD: I believe it was settled law
7	at that point that corroboration was no longer a legal
8	threshold bar or threshold to reach, but corroboration
9	could still, in the formulation of evidence for
10	consideration on the RPGs analysis, corroboration may or
11	may not become necessary, depending on the nature of the
12	case and the for example, credibility problems that may
13	arise with the complainant's version of events.
14	MS. McINTOSH: And is that true even with
15	offences was it your view that that was true even with
16	offences pre-1988, that if you were charging post-1988, you
17	didn't need corroboration?
18	MR. MacDONALD: That was my impression.
19	MS. McINTOSH: All right.
20	Back to your letter, you were asked by Mr. Engelmann about
21	the expression "so-called" and then "settlement" in quotes
22	and what you meant by that. And I I know you couldn't
23	come up with anything a couple of days ago. I wondered
24	whether this was expressly this was a reference to the
25	bad taste for backroom settlements that you had expressed

1	in the Ecclesia 2000 process?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I thought that's what I said
3	to Mr. Engelmann.
4	MS. McINTOSH: I could be wrong. I thought
5	you said you I thought you couldn't you didn't offer
6	him an explanation for that, so I'm I apologize if I've
7	mistaken that. But is that correct or
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
9	MS. McINTOSH: All right.
10	MR. MacDONALD: I recall I recall
11	initially not it being clear in my mind why I put it in
12	there, and I speculated as to that being the reason.
13	MS. McINTOSH: Okay, thank you.
14	And in the last line you put the word
15	"crucified" in quotes, and I wondered whether you were
16	quoting someone there or why you why you put that in
17	quotes in the last in the last line?
18	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall.
19	MS. McINTOSH: Okay.
20	Now, I wanted to take you next to Exhibit
21	2932, which I think was entered yesterday,
22	Document Number 129638. Have you got it there?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, thank you.
24	MS. McINTOSH: And you'll recall that this
25	was the case that Mr. Engelmann, I think, suggested to you

1	was the same as Mr. Silmser's case; right? And I wanted to
2	ask you to look at a couple of factors that would have been
3	known to Ms. Robinson at the time that she indicated that
4	this victim should be compelled to testify, and ask you
5	whether you think those factors distinguish this case from
6	Mr. Silmser's case.
7	Now, because we've got a monikered
8	individual here, I just want to direct your
9	attention, and also there's other information
10	that could tend to identify this individual, so I
11	don't want to read it into the record.
12	I just want to direct your attention to the
13	seventh line down, beginning with the name of C-54.
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
15	MS. McINTOSH: All right.
16	And if you would just read the next couple
17	of lines and see what C-54's situation was there, please?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I've read as far as the
19	release by way of recognisance.
20	MS. McINTOSH: Okay, that's what I wanted
21	you to read.
22	And then the other entry that I wanted you
23	to look at is Document Number 129705. I'm not sure if this
24	is an exhibit or not; I apologize if I've missed it.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: We'll check it.

1	Thank you. Exhibit 2938 is is this an
2	email it's an email message?
3	MS. McINTOSH: It's I think it is, yes,
4	I'm not exactly sure what kind of about the police
5	internal messaging but it looks like it's from Kevin Malloy
6	to Sergeant Snyder, some kind of messaging system.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: And copied to Staff
8	Sergeant Brunet and the date of this correspondence, the $9^{\text{th}}$
9	of July, 1998, just to identify the exhibit.
10	Okay, here we go.
11	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2938:
12	(129705) - E-Mail from Kevin Malloy to Sgt.
13	Snyder re: C-54 dated 09 Jul 98
14	MS. McINTOSH: Thank you. And the reference
15	I wanted you to look at, and again without reading it into
16	the record because it could tend to identify the
17	individual, if you could just look at the p.s. at the
18	bottom of the page?
19	I think the "Lynn" there is talking about
20	Lynn Robinson?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, that would be Lynn, I
22	presume. That's safe to presume, yeah.
23	MS. McINTOSH: All right.
24	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you. I've read it.
25	MS. McINTOSH: All right.

1	So Lynn Robinson would have known these two
2	things prior to her note to Kevin Malloy which we've seen
3	at 29 Exhibit 2935 telling him that he'll subpoena
4	he should subpoena this particular victim to testify if
5	he's reluctant; right.
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
7	MS. McINTOSH: In your mind does that
8	distinguish this case that I've showed you these entries
9	from Mr. Silmser's case?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I think that's one of
11	the reasons why it distinguishes it, yes.
12	MS. McINTOSH: All right. And are there
13	others that you would like to suggest to us?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I mentioned the main
15	one last time I testified on the topic of
16	THE COMMISSIONER: So let's just other
17	than the ones you've already other than the ones you've
18	already told us
19	MS. McINTOSH: Yes, sorry, if you've already
20	
21	THE COMMISSIONER: and this one here
22	MS. McINTOSH: Yes, yes.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: is there anything
24	else?
25	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.

1	MS. MCINTOSH: All right, thank you.
2	Now, the next topic I wanted to take you to
3	was some questions that Ms. Daley asked you about Chief
4	Shaver and your discussion with Chief Shaver.
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, ma'am.
6	MS. McINTOSH: And I think Ms. Daley took
7	you to Exhibit 1789, which is Document 715814.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: And what kind of document
9	is that?
10	MS. McINTOSH: That is a statement by Chief
11	Shaver, as I understand it.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Well, that's not
13	what we have here. That's not this would be David
14	Silmser's statement.
15	MS. McINTOSH: Oh no, I think it's Chief
16	Shaver's statement, if I'm
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, that's not what's
18	on the oh, maybe it is. Oh yeah. Yeah, I'm sorry. I'm
19	sorry.
20	MS. McINTOSH: Okay.
21	Now, first of all, when Chief Shaver I
22	think she pointed out to you that Chief Shaver said
23	something like he didn't like your opinion; right? Was
24	your understanding that he didn't like your what part of
25	your opinion didn't he like? Was it the policy or the RPGs

1	or both, or
2	MR. MacDONALD: Well, it was the policy
3	about trying to I think he was also I think there
4	were two pieces to it, as I recall. One of them was the
5	inability to force the the disinclination to force the
6	complainant, and secondly was the perceived interference,
7	as he articulated it, by the Diocese in the course of a
8	police investigation during the course of a police
9	investigation.
10	MS. McINTOSH: Okay. So Chief Shaver wasn't
11	questioning the RPG part of it, if I can put it that way.
12	He wasn't suggesting
13	MR. MacDONALD: No.
14	MS. McINTOSH: there were RPGs and
15	MR. MacDONALD: No, no, no.
16	MS. McINTOSH: All right. Okay.
17	MR. MacDONALD: I'm sure he wasn't.
18	MS. McINTOSH: All right.
19	And on the first page of that statement in
20	the paragraph:
21	"I became aware that the D.S. case for
22	all intents and purposes was over when
23	the Crown attorney"
24	THE COMMISSIONER: So that's one, two,
25	three, fourth paragraph down.

1	MS. McINTOSH: Sorry. Thank you,
2	Mr. Commissioner.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, ma'am.
4	MS. McINTOSH: Right. You never advised
5	that the police could not proceed with the investigation
6	because he had D.S. had withdrawn his complaint, I take
7	it?
8	MR. MacDONALD: No.
9	MS. Mcintosh: Okay.
10	And I think that Ms. Daley also asked you
11	about the two persons whom you became aware of late in the
12	process who tended to corroborate Mr. Silmser's
13	allegations.
14	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
15	MS. McINTOSH: And I wondered whether either
16	of them, to your knowledge, was willing to be a complainant
17	against
18	MR. MacDONALD: I understood
19	MS. McINTOSH: Father MacDonald?
20	MR. MacDONALD: neither was inclined to
21	be a complainant had the wherewithal. Not lack of
22	cooperation; I think it was personal wherewithal.
23	MS. McINTOSH: Okay. Now, just a couple of
24	more areas.
25	On the outside Crown issue, I wanted to be

1	clear whether Constable Sebalj actually had to have laid a
2	charge before you would refer the matter to an outside
3	Crown, or whether she had to be ready to lay a charge.
4	MR. MacDONALD: Well, it didn't really
5	matter if the Information was signed or not. You know, the
6	point was was she were they ready to lay a charge or was
7	the charge about to be laid, or had it just been laid? In
8	neither instance in either of the three instances, what
9	it turned on is when they're ready to proceed with a
10	charge.
11	MS. McINTOSH: Okay. And what were you
12	going to refer to Mr. Pelletier? Were you going to set up
13	a meeting with
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
15	MS. McINTOSH: Constable Sebalj?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
17	MS. McINTOSH: All right.
18	And what were you going to refer to
19	Mr. Pelletier? Were you going to set up a meeting with
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
21	MS. McINTOSH: Constable Sebalj?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
23	MS. McINTOSH: All right. All right.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: What? Okay, a meeting
25	with Constable Sebalj, would you be involved in that?

1	MR. MacDONALD: You mean with Bob Pelletier?
2	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
3	MR. MacDONALD: I don't know if I would have
4	been or not. I haven't hadn't really thought about
5	that.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
7	MS. McINTOSH: And did you expect that she
8	would do a brief, a police brief, in preparation for that
9	meeting?
10	MR. MacDONALD: For the meeting, for sure,
11	yes.
12	MS. McINTOSH: Okay.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
14	MS. McINTOSH: So you weren't going to refer
15	her until a police brief had been done?
16	MR. MacDONALD: And I don't think I
17	wasn't expecting a police brief until it's not like I
18	had told Heidi, "Prepare one." I didn't expect she was
19	going to going to until her investigation was
20	completed
21	MS. McINTOSH: All right.
22	MR. MacDONALD: until she was at the
23	stage to charge, ready to charge.
24	MS. McINTOSH: All right. So she never said
25	to you, "I'm ready to lay a charge"?

1	MR. MacDONALD: NO.
2	MS. McINTOSH: And she never prepared a
3	brief, we know, except after the fact.
4	MR. MacDONALD: I presumed that she had a
5	file, but not in a I suppose, in a global form, I don't
6	know.
7	MS. McINTOSH: Okay. And she never asked
8	you to set up a meeting with an outside Crown?
9	MR. MacDONALD: No.
10	MS. McINTOSH: All right. So when Ms. Daley
11	said to you, you know, "There's a disconnect between you
12	and Ms. Sebalj," would it be in your viewand you said
13	you didn't think so at the time. Is it fair to say that
14	the disconnect is between what you understood and what her
15	notes say at the at this point in time?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Well, that's all I've got to
17	go on, is her notes.
18	MS. McINTOSH: All right. Now, did you ever
19	consider in respect of this Diocesan Committee issue,
20	did you ever consider that you had an actual or even
21	a there was a reasonable perception of bias on your
22	part? In other words, did you think there was really a
23	"conflict of interest," to use that term?
24	MR. MacDONALD: No, if I use the term
25	"conflict of interest" I don't recall using it. I don't

AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE

1	think I did, but I may have.
2	I should have what was in my mind, in
3	terms of the legal definition, was a bias, or perceived
4	bias, and that bias I thought could only come about after
5	the police had laid the charge and the matter was in the
6	discretion of the prosecution.
7	MS. McINTOSH: But, at that stage did you
8	consider that would you would have either an actualit
9	would be in a case of actual bias or
10	MR. MacDONALD: No.
11	MS. McINTOSH: that there would be a
12	reasonable perception of bias at that stage even?
13	MR. MacDONALD: When the police well, had
14	I been prosecuting it, I think there would have been a
15	reasonable perception of bias
16	MS. McINTOSH: Okay, thank you.
17	MR. MacDONALD: if I had I been seen
18	to champion the the prosecution.
19	MS. McINTOSH: Okay. Now, turning to the
20	Nelson Barque case, you referred in your previous
21	testimony, I think, to Mr. Engelmann, to the Spied case,
22	and said that because Mr. Johnson was not going to be
23	cross-examining anyone, you didn't see a problem with him
24	participating in the plea of guilt. Did I understand your
25	evidence correctly?

l	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. I didn't see how you
2	could how you could articulate a legal relationship and
3	conflict therein, based on the Spied test.
4	MS. McINTOSH: And when you're saying that,
5	are you saying that Mr. Johnson would not be using
6	confidential information gained from
7	MR. MacDONALD: One client, to use adversely
8	in the course of his acting on behalf of a second client.
9	MS. McINTOSH: Okay. And I think that
10	Ms. Daley asked you how Peter Griffiths would know that Mr.
11	Barque had a previous had a previous record, and I just
12	wanted to draw your attention to it's Exhibit 916,
13	Document Number 703133.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Is it a lengthy document,
15	Ms
16	MS. McINTOSH: No, it's it's a three-page
17	letter from Constable Sebalj to this witness, and it's just
18	a paragraph on the first page that I
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure. That's fine.
20	MS. McINTOSH: And I just wanted to draw
21	your attention to the second paragraph, beginning, "You may
22	recall."
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, ma'am.
24	MS. McINTOSH: All right. So you see right
25	in the letter that you forwarded to Peter Griffiths

1	well, let me ask you that, first of all; did you forward
2	this letter, together with the material that was attached,
3	to Peter Griffiths?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
5	MS. McINTOSH: All right. So right in the
6	letter, in the second paragraph, there's a reference to the
7	fact that Nelson Barque was charged the previous year,
8	right?
9	THE COMMISSIONER: For sexual offences.
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
12	MS. McINTOSH: Yes, thank you.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
14	MS. McINTOSH: You said turning to
15	another area of the Sabourin prosecution, and I think
16	Mr. Engelmann was telling you about some victims who were
17	unhappy with, you know, the degree, or lack thereof, of
18	contact from the Crown's office, and you mentioned a
19	case a police officer who was a case manager. I think
20	you said that was Kevin Malloy?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
22	MS. McINTOSH: And you talked about his role
23	in contacting victims in those days?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Preview yes.
25	MS. McINTOSH: Yes. And I wanted to just

1	take you to one example of that, which I think is not yet
2	an Exhibit either. It's Document Number 114209.
3	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Exhibit 2939.
5	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: These are notes of can
7	you help me out, Ms
8	MR. MacDONALD: I think
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Whose notes would no,
10	no
11	MR. MacDONALD: I think they're my notes,
12	sir.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
14	MS. McINTOSH: I think that at least some of
15	the notes on the first page are Mr. MacDonald's notes of
16	the I think the judicial pre-trial of Mr. Sabourin if
17	I'm not mistaken, and then on the back there is the I
18	think the back side of that judicial pre-trial note, and
19	also, attached to this page, a phone an exchange of
20	phone messages.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. So that will
22	be Exhibit 2939.
23	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-2939:
24	(114209) - Handwritten Notes of Malcolm
	(11120) Hallawi i coch of Halloim

1	MS. McINTOSH: All right. So am I right
2	about that, Mr. MacDonald, that some of the writing on this
3	first page, Bates page 582, is your handwriting
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
5	MS. McINTOSH: at the judicial
6	pre-trial?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. I'm sorry about that.
8	I've improved I've quite improved my hand my
9	penmanship since then, I'm sorry.
10	MS. McINTOSH: Yes, I was saying, Mr.
11	MacDonald, that I'm expecting you to take responsibility
12	for global warming and the economic collapse any time soon,
13	so but, all right, so I really wanted to direct your
14	attention to the second page, a couple of entries on the
15	second page.
16	You'll see just above the phone message,
17	which seems to be attached to this page, there's a
18	27 November '98, entry. Do you recognize that handwriting?
19	MR. MacDONALD: That's Kevin Malloy's.
20	MS. McINTOSH: All right, and
21	MR. MacDONALD: Affectionately known as Kev.
22	MS. McINTOSH: Okay. And it looks like he's
23	saying:
24	"I returned a call to a victim to
25	update and sent date. Also called

1	another victim and left a message to
2	return my call re: victim impact
3	statement."
4	Am I reading that more or less
5	MR. MacDONALD: That's what
6	MS. McINTOSH: correctly?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, that's what it says.
8	MS. McINTOSH: All right. And then "Kev."
9	That's "Kev"?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
11	MS. McINTOSH: All right. And then, in the
12	phone message, it looks like, in the shaded part, there's a
13	message to you from a victim
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
15	MS. McINTOSH: and above that, on 26
16	November, '98, it says:
17	"Kev, find out why we didn't get a VIS
18	from victim. If he wants to give one I
19	have to get it to counsel prior to"
20	MR. MacDONALD: "Sentence." So I
21	wanted I wanted I had to disclose it.
22	MS. McINTOSH: Okay, "prior to sentence, and
23	that's your initial there, the "M" there? Is that right?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, that's obviously an
25	"M."

1	MS. McINTOSH: All right. So you're
2	directing Constable Malloy to get in touch with this victim
3	and make sure that the victim impact statement is is in
4	order in time for the sentence, is that correct?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, ma'am.
6	MS. McINTOSH: All right.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I I understand
8	your your point. That's an example of the way it was to
9	work, and, you know, it worked most of the time, but Mr.
10	Lee knows of some occasions when, perhaps, it didn't.
11	MS. McINTOSH: Okay. And then, just if you
12	turn the page sideways, this also looks to be your
13	handwriting here, "Note to sentencing Crown," is that your
14	handwriting?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
16	MS. McINTOSH: And it says:
17	"Victim impact statements have been
18	filed, facts were read in"
19	I'm not sure what that says.
20	MR. MacDONALD: Sorry, which
21	MS. McINTOSH: "Read in/filed?"
22	MR. MacDONALD: Been filed. "Facts were
23	read in and filed," which is which means you don't have
24	to go through the a finding of guilt process over again.
25	MS. McINTOSH: Okay. "Crown seeking two

1	years less a day," I guess that is.
2	MR. MacDONALD: That's what that means,
3	maximum reformatory.
4	MS. McINTOSH: Right, thank you.
5	MR. MacDONALD: Section 8 section 110
6	refers to a firearms prohibition.
7	MS. McINTOSH: Okay. I just wanted to
8	without taking you to the report, but just for the
9	reference of everyone, it's Exhibit 1207. I just wanted to
10	give you an opportunity to agree or disagree with the
11	conclusions of Officer Skinner's report from the Ottawa
12	Police. What would you say about that?
13	MR. MacDONALD: I'm sorry, can you can
14	you direct me to that again?
15	MS. McINTOSH: Yes, sure, if you want to
16	look at it. It's Exhibit 1207 and I think it's Document
17	Number 101536. And it's the conclusions concerning you,
18	obviously, that I'm interested in.
19	MR. MacDONALD: And that's on page?
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Four five zero (450)?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know. I'm
23	asking; question mark.
24	MS. McINTOSH: Oh, I'm not sure. I can't
25	read my own writing here, I'm sorry, Mr. Commissioner. I

1	think it's 8870 but I could be wrong.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: No, it's a different
3	thing. Is it:
4	"my opinion that the Crown Attorney
5	Murray MacDonald was less than
6	effective in his support of the
7	Cornwall Police Service"?
8	MS. McINTOSH: It's that and
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, so that's 5450
10	450. So for counsel, 1025450. So we're straight.
11	MS. McINTOSH: I don't need to read that
12	into the record or anything.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: No.
14	MS. McINTOSH: I just wanted to have the
15	witness look at it and give a response if he was inclined
16	to.
17	MR. MacDONALD: Sir, you know, this
18	paragraph is based on five lines of notes in one of the
19	officer's notebooks. The other officer didn't even make
20	notes about this exchange, an exchange that I invited them
21	to tape-record.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry, what are you
23	talking about? What exchange?
24	MR. MacDONALD: The meeting that I had with
25	these officers, there are five lines of notes in a small

1	notebook that were recorded, and from that he's summarizing
2	in detail what he his version of the explanation I gave
3	him.
4	And I don't know if he understands it or
5	not. There's no reference to the point that I was trying
6	that I've always been trying to draw, that seemed to me
7	a rather straightforward one, and that is that the
8	appearance of bias would come about when it appeared that I
9	was spearheading or championing this charge myself as Crown
10	attorney, based on my earlier comments in a personal
11	context at Ecclesia with the Ecclesia 2000 exercise.
12	I don't think that this his comments are
13	fair and I'm that's all I'll say.
14	MS. McINTOSH: So you didn't think there was
15	any issue at the stage of advising Constable Sebalj about
16	steps that she was taking?
17	MR. MacDONALD: I don't I haven't heard
18	anybody articulate otherwise, based on the real facts, and
19	I don't believe anybody can.
20	MS. McINTOSH: All right.
21	MR. MacDONALD: I think that to tie in that
22	perceived bias potential that I saw to a concept of a
23	conflict of interest that could be construed as in terms of
24	my efforts to cover up a charge are
25	THE COMMISSIONER: No. No, no, sorry,

1	sorry. It wasn't an effort to cover up a charge.
2	MR. MacDONALD: Or to participate as Crown
3	fully; right?
4	THE COMMISSIONER: No. No. Let's go back
5	to your perceived conflict; all right?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: You thought that if you
8	prosecuted the priest, the Church would say, "Oh, because
9	your recommendation wasn't followed, you're punishing us by
10	doing this, by going after a priest."
11	MR. MacDONALD: "You've already shown your
12	personal "
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Exactly.
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Exactly. So the only
16	question and maybe it wasn't well expressed there, and I
17	probably won't express it very well either is if the
18	Church found out that you had been consulting or the
19	police had been consulting, don't you think they would say,
20	"Yeah, and he's the one who pushed for these charges"? And
21	wouldn't it be the same conflict, the same perceived bias
22	if you had any involvement with the file?
23	MR. MacDONALD: That bias would I'm
24	confident that that bias would be the door would be
25	closed on that perceived bias as soon as it was disclosed

1	to the Church, to criminal counsel acting for the priest,
2	that another Crown attorney, Robert Pelletier, who was
3	experienced in the area of institutional abuse, had taken
4	carriage of the prosecution and was champion he was the
5	champion of the prosecution; he reviewed the file.
6	I didn't I don't it didn't cross my
7	mind, sir, that that could be it didn't worry me that
8	the Church could take it into that area, take it I was
9	quite convinced that the very fact that an outside
10	prosecutor was exercising the Crown's discretion in terms
11	of determining that we proceed today we call it a
12	prospect of conviction analysis
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
14	MR. MacDONALD: would answer the
15	question that whatever initial steps MacDonald took can all
16	be revealed in the notes of Heidi Sebalj or Luc Brunet or
17	whomever.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
19	MS. McINTOSH: All right. And doesn't this
20	go back to the division of responsibility between the Crown
21	and the police that at the investigative stage it's
22	ultimately the police who are exercising the discretion, if
23	you like, or making the decision about whether a charge
24	will be laid?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Of course.

1	MS. McINTOSH: Yeah, all right.
2	Now, also it's suggested here that you had
3	reservations about the abilities of Constable Sebalj and
4	that arising out of that you should have reported that to
5	the Chief or his deputy.
6	MR. MacDONALD: Can you show me that?
7	MS. McINTOSH: Yeah, it's just under the
8	paragraph you just read.
9	MR. MacDONALD: "Also mentioned". Well, I
10	said that she was a new officer, she was of average ability
11	because she was a new officer, and I don't believe I had to
12	report to the Chief that she was a new officer who was
13	who had her hands full with this file.
14	I thought that I could help her and their
15	hands would be sufficiently freed up to manage the case.
16	Maybe I should have gone to Luc Brunet earlier; I agree
17	with that. But to the Chief? I mean that could have
18	ruined her career for unnecessary reasons.
19	MS. McINTOSH: All right. You weren't
20	critical of Constable Sebalj to Skinner and I think it
21	was Russell.
22	MR. MacDONALD: No, I never called her
23	you know, I called it as I guess what he's referring to
24	is exactly what I said. I used different language, but I
25	didn't accuse her of being incompetent or unreliable. I

just said that this was -- she was new and therefore of average experience in an extra -- what turned out it be an above-average or extraordinary case.

MS. McINTOSH: All right.

Now, just two more things. I wondered whether you would end, Mr. MacDonald, by telling us, you know, why you became a Crown in the eighties and why you stayed in Cornwall all these last few years, if you're inclined to today.

MR. MacDONALD: Well, why I became a Crown is -- I mean, it's my calling. It's why I -- sometimes when we say it's our calling it's hard to articulate in one, you know, line or the other that -- your calling, the calling of our colleagues, the calling of His Honour. We're there because that's where our passions and our philosophy and our interests draw us.

And when did I choose to be a Crown relates to first year of law school, when I was impressed with the criminal law right off the bat and I was struck with the -- in a free and democratic society, the degree of liberties of the citizen as against the State. And I was always respectful and impressed by the individual's rights in a society, and I was surrounded by future or potentially future criminal lawyers, so it seemed, who shared a very keen philosophy in protecting the individual against the

1 State, which is necessary.

But I was the -- I was the guy in the back row that -- or sometimes front row -- that felt that the State, on the other hand, still needed protection of its citizens. And so I sort of drew a line philosophically as I'll -- as letting the other lads protect the individual, qua accused person, and if I was going to get into the criminal justice system, I saw myself on the side of the State protecting Her Majesty's realm, so -- and citizens -- so there's the -- there are two of us in my law school class ultimately became Crown attorneys; me right after I left the bar and the other lady who's now a senior homicide prosecutor in Montreal, spent two years on Wall Street and that convinced her to come back and be a prosecutor. So what more can I say to that.

But why did I choose to stay in Cornwall?

Because I was not asked to leave by my superiors, and

therefore I felt I had their support in staying here. This

was my jurisdiction and I did not have any -- I had done -
conducted myself in any way that would cause me to appear

to shuffle off to Buffalo in the middle of the night. And

I intended to -- I took an oath in 1992 and I intended to

stick to it.

MS. McINTOSH: Those are my questions.

25 Thank you.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
2	Now, I Mr. Horn, I take it you didn't
3	want to cross-examine?
4	STATEMENT BY/DÉCLARATION PAR MR. HORN:
5	MR. HORN: I've had extensive discussions
6	with my friend, Mr. Dallas Lee, and
7	THE COURT: I think you should be up at the
8	
9	MR. HORN: Oh, I'm sorry.
10	THE COURT: I just want to keep the record
11	clear here.
12	MR. HORN: For the last week or so we've had
13	extensive discussions with Mr. Lee in regards to some of
14	the questions that and our interests are very close, and
15	Mr. Paul and I have been involved in some issues at Court
16	last couple of days
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
18	MR. HORN: and so we weren't able to be
19	here. But Mr. Lee did a fine job representing us. Thank
20	you.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
22	All right. Well, then, on that note, sir,
23	thank you very much for spending the days that you did. I
24	have appreciated your testimony. I will certainly consider
25	everything, and whatever the recommendations may be, I

1	think that I thank you for your cooperation in attending
2	and giving your testimony as you did.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Best wishes for the
5	holidays. Come back happy and rested. We have another
6	month to go. Thank you.
7	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
8	veuillez vous lever.
9	This hearing is adjourned until Tuesday,
10	January 6, 2009, at 9:30 a.m.
11	Upon recessing at 4:49 p.m./
12	L'audience est suspendue à 16h49
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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