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 326

Held at: Tenue à:

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

Thursday, December 18, 2008

Jeudi, le 18 décembre 2008

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

ii

Appearances/Comparutions

Mr. Peter Engelmann Lead Commission Counsel

Ms. Brigitte Beaulne Registrar

Ms. Suzanne Sinnamon 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. Peter Chisholm The Children's Aid Society of

the United Counties

Ms. Helen Daley Citizens for Community Renewal

Mr. Dallas Lee Victims' Group

M^e 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. Larry O'Brien Mr. Randy Millar

Mr. Murray MacDonald

Table of Contents / Table des matières

	Page
List of Exhibits :	iv
MURRAY MacDONALD, Resumed/Sous le même serment	1
Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoire en-chef par Mr. Peter Engelmann(cont'd/suite)	1
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Ms. Helen Daley	251

LIST OF EXHIBITS/LISTE D'EXHIBITS

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO
P-2921	(110261) - Letter from Robert Pelletier to Tim Smith re: Investigation concerning Father Charles MacDonald dated 15 Sep 94	107
P-2922	(109360) - Fax cover sheet from Crown Attorney L'Orignal to Murray MacDonald dated 03 Apr 97	156
P-2923	(109262) - Letter from Pat Hall to Murray MacDonald re: Assignment of a Crown Attorney to Project Truth dated 13 Jul 98	169
P-2924	(109273) - Memorandum from Robert Pelletier to Murray MacDonald dated 05 Aug 98	172
P-2925	(111694) - Letter from Pat Hall to Murray MacDonald re: Order for the Release of Video Taped Statements for Disclosure Purposes dated 22 Oct 98	173
P-2926	(109267) - Letter from Don Johnson to Murray MacDonald re: Disclosure dated 20 Jul 98	174
P-2927	(702428) - Letter from Murray MacDonald to Robert Pelletier re: Harvey Latour dated 23 Jul 98	175
P-2928	(109271) - Letter from Don Johnson to Murray MacDonald re: Regina vs Harvey Latour dated 04 Aug 98	176
P-2929	(109276) -Letter from Don Johnson to Murray MacDonald re: Regina vs. Harvey Latour Project Truth dated 26 Aug 98	176
P-2930	(114256) - Letter from Guy Simard to Don Johnson re: R. v. Nelson Barque	208

LIST OF EXHIBITS/LISTE D'EXHIBITS

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO
P-2931	(114255) - Letter from Don Johnson to Murray MacDonald re: R. v. Nelson Barque dated 27 Feb 95	210
P-2932	(129638) - Crown Brief Synopsis re: Earl Landry Jr. dated 03 Sep 97	226
P-2933	(129702) - Letter from Don Johnson to Lynn Robinson re: Regina vs Earl Landry Jr. dated 11 Jun 98	229
P-2934	(129714) - Memo from Kevin Malloy to Lynn Robinson re: C-54 dated 29 Jan 98	230
P-2935	(129699) -Letter from C-54 to Lynn Robinson dated 26 Jul 98	232
P-2936	(715999) - Letter from Murray MacDonald to Robert Wakefield re: R. v. Malcolm MacDonald dated 15	

1	Upon commencing at 9:33 a.m./
2	L'audience débute à 9h33
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, sir; Mr.
11	Engelmann.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Good morning,
13	Mr. Commissioner. Good morning, Mr. MacDonald.
14	MR. MacDONALD: Good morning, sir.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All set?
16	THE COMMISSIONER: All set.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Got the glasses? All right.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Just taking attendance
19	right now.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
21	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
22	MURRAY MacDONALD, Resumed/Sous le même serment:
23	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE IN-CHEF PAR
24	MR. ENGELMANN (cont'd/suite):
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, we established

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 yesterday some of what you knew before writing your brief 2 opinion in mid-September of '93, and that the facts you learned principally came from Heidi Sebali and Luc Brunet, 3 4 perhaps somewhat from Malcolm MacDonald and Jacques Leduc, 5 and I was reviewing a few of the facts that you may not 6 have been aware of when we left off. 7 But before continuing with this, I wanted to 8 just briefly return to something that we touched upon 9 yesterday afternoon, and that was that you told us -- and, 10 again, whether it was the first meeting or the second 11 meeting with Heidi Sebalj, at one of those meetings she had the handwritten statement which we have as Exhibit 262, and 12 13 we might want to just turn that up. 14 This is the eight-page statement from 15 Mr. Silmser. And you mentioned, when I asked if you had 16 any concerns at that time about ---17

MR. MacDONALD: The judge ---

MR. ENGELMANN: --- the hearing, and you mentioned a judge, you mentioned a probation officer and you mentioned a priest, and you agreed with me that there was no allegation against a judge but you were concerned that a judge might have witnessed something -- is what I understood. And that was a concern you said you wanted more detail about the probation officer because there was really nothing in the statement, and you ---

1	MR. MacDONALD: Well, the statement I
2	either the statement or Heidi's I recall either Heidi's
3	words or my reading of the statement caused me to believe
4	that the probation officer was alleged to be a child
5	abuser, however, there was no elaboration except for that
6	one phrase.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Right, so I want to go to
8	that.
9	And, thirdly, you said that although there
10	was some elaboration on the priest, you were giving her
11	sort of investigation advice as to how to get more
12	information.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
15	And let's just start with the instructions
16	on the investigation of the priest, if we can. Do you
17	recall what sorts of things you would have asked her to do
18	either at that meeting or subsequent meetings to get more
19	detail?
20	MR. MacDONALD: The first direction that I
0.1	
21	gave her and I can't get I can't recall the order or the
22	gave her and I can't get I can't recall the order or the specific direction, but it was in the certainly in the
22	specific direction, but it was in the certainly in the

1	whens and with whoms", and I'd mentioned or you and I
2	had briefly touched upon the statement validity analysis
3	techniques that I'd
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh yes, you had learned
5	about in 1989?
6	MR. MacDONALD: In respect to which I'd been
7	educated, and statement validity analysis requires that you
8	receive details among other things, statement validity
9	analysis teaches us to look for details that can internally
10	corroborate an allegation a statement.
11	So that's what I sent her for, and I may
12	have given her more specific items to seek collaboration on
13	but that was the gist of it.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you knew
15	that there were four separate allegations that Mr. Silmser
16	was making vis-à-vis the priest? Or there were several, in
17	any event?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Several. I mean, I know now
19	there were four.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah.
21	MR. MacDONALD: I don't but there were
22	several.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
24	MR. MacDONALD: As she reported to me
25	ultimately.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. There were four set
2	out. I reviewed this in some detail last night just to
3	remember what was in the initial statement in her notes,
4	but there are four separate incidents that he refers to in
5	this statement. So you would have asked her to get some
6	more details to try and corroborate somehow
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: when these things would
9	have happened, and a bit more detail on what happened?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Is that fair?
12	MR. MacDONALD: One incident didn't really
13	describe a crime per se. It could have been, but it may
14	also have been accident or innocent touching, so I would
15	have I likely asked for details on that. I would have
16	asked for details on there were two others that were
17	that would have been clear criminal misconduct that I
18	needed more details on in terms of the where and when.
19	There were other persons that were I
20	think other persons were made reference to, or you could
21	presume other persons were made reference would have
22	been involved in one place where there were a number of
23	people situate. I think it was a
24	MR. ENGELMANN: That was a retreat
25	MR. MacDONALD: Something.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: allegation, something
2	that happened at a retreat?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, and I would have sent
4	her for I don't think that I believe that I my
5	focus on corroboration evidence, what I call drilling out,
6	would have followed after we initially tried to drill down
7	it with him in terms of what he could detail for us.
8	And she reported back to me some details,
9	probably from the interview that Ronny Lefebvre and Kevin
10	Malloy had conducted with her, I presume now, as well as
11	other information that she'd received from other sources.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: And would you have at one
13	time suggested anything in the way of seeking out other
14	altar boys?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, more than once.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So that would
17	have been some advice you would have given her?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
20	MR. MacDONALD: And that's, frankly as I
21	recall, it was advice that was in the context of we agreed
22	upon she knew Heidi was not bereft of ideas. She
23	knew that that would be one context and I was just sort of
24	helping her focus in the areas such as exploring interviews
25	with other altar boys.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: And what about documentary
2	evidence of any sort? Had she already taken steps in that
3	regard, whether they be school records or tried to get some
4	records from the Diocese or parishes?
5	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall if she had
6	records of her own initiative at our first or second
7	meeting, but I do recall recommending that she seek out
8	other records, particularly his school records and some
9	information from his family as to where they lived and
10	when, addresses and times that they were at particular
11	addresses et cetera.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: And would she have advised
13	you or would you have been aware that the suspect, the
14	alleged perpetrator, Father Charles MacDonald, would you
15	have been aware that he was an active priest in the
16	Diocese?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I didn't know him and
18	I didn't recognize the name, but in fairness to me there
19	are a number of MacDonalds in Glengarry County.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, there are a number.
21	MR. MacDONALD: And
22	MR. ENGELMANN: He's not in any way related
23	to you?
24	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.
25	But I knew or presumed that he was an active

1 priest because he was still in the community. 2 MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So given the 3 allegations that you discussed with Ms. Sebalj, given 4 Mr. Silmser's statement, were you at all concerned that you 5 have a suspect who's a priest in a -- as such, a person in 6 a position of trust or authority with children, with altar 7 servers? 8 MR. MacDONALD: It concerned me that there 9 may be a -- the allegation was of a child abuser, perhaps a 10 predatory abuser, and so Heidi wanted to get to the bottom 11 of that and so did I. I mean, there wasn't enough to report to the CAS yet, if that's what you're referring to, 12 13 but there was enough to dig deeper vigorously. 14 MR. ENGELMANN: Well, I'm wondering -- I was 15 wondering about the CAS and the issue of when an individual 16 could be considered to be in a caregiver-type position, 17 have access to children. I'm wondering if either you or 18 Officer Sebalj would have discussed the possibility of 19 contacting the CAS so that they could also do some work to 20 determine whether there was any risk of current abuse? MR. MacDONALD: Well, I didn't think that --21 frankly, that the CAS -- with all due respect to their 22 mandate and their personnel, I didn't think that the CAS 23 24 would have the success that the Cornwall Police could have.

I didn't specifically address my mind to

1	when do I do the statutory notice or do 1? That really
2	didn't even that discussion didn't come up until Luc
3	Brunet and I were conferring and, more specifically, when
4	Chief Shaver and I conferred.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Because at or about
6	that point in the fall, I think at or around the well,
7	early October, the CAS did take on an investigation to
8	determine if there was any concern about present abuse with
9	Father MacDonald.
10	MR. MacDONALD: I know of that through the
11	media and subsequent
12	MR. ENGELMANN: You weren't direct
13	MR. MacDONALD: recent news, but I
14	you know, Chief Shaver was contemplating to whom he should
15	notify, and the CAS was one of them but, frankly, Chief
16	Shaver and I were more focused on alerting the Church to
17	the concern for the safety of the public.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: And did you consider a
19	report under the duty-to-report provision at the time at
20	all?
21	MR. MacDONALD: No, I considered it a
22	necessity for the police to probe and see whether there was
23	sufficient evidence to make an allegation.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, with respect to the
25	probation officer, I think we've heard evidence that he

1	would not have had individuals, at least at that time, on
2	his caseload that would have been under the age of 16; the
3	youngest would have been 16 and 17.
4	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I knew that I knew
5	Ken Seguin professionally.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
7	MR. MacDONALD: And I knew him to be an
8	adult probation worker.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So you wouldn't
10	have had a concern about reporting him to the CAS because
11	that would involve children under 16?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Well, there's no there
13	was no allegation against him.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
15	Well, just on that score, if you have the
16	Silmser statement handy, that's Exhibit 262, the very last
17	page, and you're right there's no details, sir, of what
18	happens. He says:
19	"I was placed on probation at 14 or
20	just are the beginning of 15 with Ken
21	Seguin. Later, Seguin repeatedly
22	sexually assaulted me. Also, I learned
23	he was MacDonald's best friend."
24	And it goes on, but there's no detail of
25	that allegation, at least in this statement.

1	MR. MacDONALD: No, and I asked her to get
2	detail and he specifically declined to do so. And there's
3	no obligation to make notice of a to notify Children's
4	Aid of a of an unsubstantiated, unfounded and undesirous
5	allegation such as this, in my view.
6	There still was cause to investigate further
7	as to whether an incremental disclosure would come through
8	the police, but at that time at that point, I would have
9	been nothing we would have been reporting nothing more
10	than a well, we had there was nothing substantive to
11	report.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, there wasn't enough in
13	this statement is what you're saying.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: With respect to Mr.
15	Seguin.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: With respect to Mr. Seguin.
17	MR. MacDONALD: Nor with respect to Mr
18	you mean as far as the details of any crime that Mr. Seguin
19	may have committed?
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes. It's just a general
21	allegation on the
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: part of Mr. Seguin. He
24	does give details of four allegations involving Father
25	Charles

1	MR. MacDONALD: Father Charles, but there's
2	no allegation of any kind other than, I think, "he abused
3	me, too", or a word to that effect.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: With respect to Ken Seguin?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah, okay.
7	Now, were you informed by so you say you
8	tell Officer Sebalj to get more details on Ken Seguin when
9	you meet sometime in February.
10	MR. MacDONALD: And the judge and the
11	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sorry?
12	MR. MacDONALD: And the judge and the
13	clergyman.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Let's just stick with one at
15	a time. With respect to Seguin
16	MR. MacDONALD: But I sent her off for the
17	three.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Fair enough, fair enough.
19	But with respect to Seguin, did she not tell
20	you, sir, that during that initial interview in January
21	with her, Malloy and Lefebvre, did she not give you some
22	indication that Mr. Silmser had given some detail about Ken
23	Seguin at that time?
24	MR. MacDONALD: I recall I don't recall
25	her ever referring to the Kevin Malloy/Ronnie Lefebvre

1	interview
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
3	MR. MacDONALD: with her, but she
4	clearly made reference to parts of it from time-to-time.
5	Because she told me we you have to realize that her
6	notes and are not at all reflective of the number of
7	contacts and the detail of conversation we had.
8	So I'm sure she told me at some point that
9	I told her to go back and probe with Mr. Silmser on the
10	Seguin details, and she did so, and I'm sure that part of
11	what she must have used as probe was what she'd garnered in
12	January.
13	And it was reported back to me that he just
14	did not have the wherewithal to proceed now, and she was
15	encouraged on more than one occasion to see if she could
16	get because this is not this is normal incremental
17	disclosure, right? Or so it oftentimes is what we see.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
19	MR. MacDONALD: And I thought that maybe he
20	would eventually be inclined to disclose, but he didn't
21	have the wherewithal and so we sort of left that piece in
22	abeyance.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, just to get back to my
24	question, then.
25	You've got this statement, you've got just a

1	general allegation on Seguin. She's not telling you at
2	that meeting, "Murray, there's more. We spoke to him two
3	or three weeks ago and he gave us some details; the details
4	include these various sexual acts"? You don't remember
5	getting that information?
6	MR. MacDONALD: I don't remember details of
7	sexual acts.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
9	MR. MacDONALD: I remember the messages, "I
10	don't want to go any further, I don't have the
11	wherewithal".
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, and we'll come to
13	that. There is a note at a meeting on March $10^{\rm th}$, where
14	they meet with him and he says one at a time, so to speak,
15	and I'll come to that.
16	Sir, with respect to the judge, if you have
17	a concern about a judge or suspected wrongdoing or possible
18	wrongdoing of a judge, were there procedures in place at
19	that time that you were supposed to follow?
20	MR. MacDONALD: There was no written policy
21	on point, but public interest and concern for the
22	administration of justice, concern for the independence of
23	judiciary would require that I'd seek immediately seek a
24	legal opinion from the director, the regional director of
25	Crown Attorneys. And I presumed then, and certainly now,

I	that would even go off to the assistant.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, so, and I just
3	want to make sure, what was the issue that you were
4	informed about with respect to a judge?
5	MR. MacDONALD: The judge maybe a criminal
6	or a party to at that crime or of witness to crime. If
7	a prosecutor or a judge or a senior police officer witness
8	a crime and just let it go on without intervening, whether
9	or not there's a Criminal Code positive duty to act, there
10	are other statutory and professional obligations to do
11	something about it.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
13	MR. MacDONALD: And it appeared, from what
14	we initially read, that there was if there was a judge
15	who was involved in this, this would be something that
16	would take on a a case that would take on a different
17	tone right from the start.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So what was your
19	understanding? Not that a judge allegedly did anything as
20	far as a sexual act, but that a judge was present when a
21	sexual act was performed?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Can you go to the words that
23	were written?
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, I've tried. I
25	reviewed the statement last and I didn't see anything in

1	the statement.
2	MR. MacDONALD: What about the statement
3	that he gave Mr Ronnie Lefebvre and Kevin Malloy?
4	MR. ENGELMANN: I went through that, too,
5	sir, and I didn't see any reference in
6	MR. MacDONALD: That it would have
7	MR. ENGELMANN: in either, so
8	MR. MacDONALD: Then that would have been a
9	verbal from
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Heidi Sebalj?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Heidi Sebalj.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Because the only
13	reference that I saw to a judge of any sort was much later.
14	There was a statement, a telephone call, that presumably
15	Mr. Silmser made to a Staff Sergeant Dupuis, and this is
16	it's Exhibit 372, but it's on the eve
17	MR. MacDONALD: Whose note?
18	MR. ENGELMANN: This is a note by Staff
19	Sergeant Dupuis, dated November 24 th , 1993.
20	MR. MacDONALD: No, I knew about it I
21	knew reference to the judge in right at the, I believe,
22	the first meeting.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Because in
24	and if you have Exhibit 262 handy, which is his handwritten
25	statement and I did review it thoroughly last night with

1	respect to your reference in Mr. Silmser's allegations,
2	there are three allegations where it's just Mr. Silmser and
3	Father MacDonald. And there's a fourth where there's a
4	retreat and so there are other people who would be around
5	so presumably there's some ability to get some
6	corroboration.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Heidi had information that
8	a judge was very much present on site, according to Mr.
9	Silmser, and I sent her back to ask the name of the judge.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: At the retreat, sir?
11	MR. MacDONALD: I don't know where
12	possibly, but Heidi told me at that first meeting that
13	there was reference to a judge being present when the
14	MacDonald misconduct was going on.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: And she suggested to you
16	that Mr. Silmser had told her that?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, because you had
19	thought that it was in this statement
20	MR. MacDONALD: I thought I
21	MR. ENGELMANN: in his words.
22	MR. MacDONALD: I thought I read it.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Because if we look at page
24	2 of the statement and I'll just do this quickly if I
25	may he talks about a first incident, and I think this is

1	the Sacristy incident. It's near the bottom of the second
2	page of Exhibit 262 and that's Bates page 8614. And this
3	is about:
4	"squeezed my knee then fully moved
5	up my leg to my personals"
6	Et cetera. It's about seven or eight lines
7	from the bottom of that page. So and that appears it's
8	just the two of them. Then there's a second incident that
9	he starts at the bottom of page, a retreat in St. Andrews -
10	
11	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: and that carries on to
13	the third page and he talks about something that happens at
14	night when the lights are out. And again, that's down
15	towards the bottom of the third page; Bates page 8615.
16	MR. MacDONALD: M'hm.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Doesn't appear there's any
18	witnesses to that fact, but, you know
19	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I presumed that there
20	were several people, a retreat
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
22	MR. MacDONALD: involved.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: No, he mentioned there were
24	40-plus kids there.
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: The third incident starts to
2	be described on the fifth page, Bates page 8617, where he
3	talks about towards the bottom of that page again,
4	it's an allegation of fondling or grabbing the as he
5	calls them his personals and that's right towards the
6	bottom of the page and that's in allegedly in Father
7	MacDonald's office.
8	And then the fourth incident is described
9	starting on the next page, 8618. And this is they go for a
10	drive into the country and it continues to be described on
11	the next page, 8619, but it wouldn't
12	MR. MacDONALD: Looks like there's no
13	witnesses to that.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Right, right, to three of
15	the four at least, so I'm just wondering and there was
16	no reference to a judge here and there's no reference to a
17	judge in her notes; either her notes of the first interview
18	the January 28^{th} interview which I'm going to take you to
19	in a minute, nor in the long notes that are set out in
20	Exhibit 295.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
22	I wouldn't concern yourself with the fact
23	that they were not in her contemporaneous notes because her
24	contemporaneous notes were bereft of a lot of detail that I

know for a fact had gone on.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: When you say "her
2	contemporaneous notes," do you mean let me just show you
3	an example, sir, if I can. We have her long notes that set
4	out the whole period the dedicated notes, if I can call
5	them that and that's Exhibit 295.
6	MR. MacDONALD: That was drafted, I think,
7	in September or October
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
9	MR. MacDONALD: of '93.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
11	Does the witness have the binder with
12	Exhibit 295? And that has that's an important binder.
13	MR. MacDONALD: I can tell you while he's
14	while she's being kind enough
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
16	MR. MacDONALD: to do that, I can tell
17	you with certainty that Heidi knew in February or early
18	March that a judge had been implicated because that was the
19	first person that I instructed her to get more information
20	on or about.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: And were you ever told about
22	the name of a judge or the court of the judge or anything
23	of that nature?
24	MR. MacDONALD: No level of court; no name
25	of the judge and that's what I wanted to know.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
2	MR. MacDONALD: As well as, when you with
3	his being present, I had the impression Heidi had the
4	impression that he would have had to witness misconduct.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
6	And she suggested to you that she had this
7	information from Mr. Silmser, presumably?
8	MR. MacDONALD: I presume so.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Right, okay. All right.
10	So what we have on the screen and what you
11	should have in front of you are what I call the dedicated
12	notes. And these may well have been notes that were
13	prepared from other notes. We're not sure. We didn't have
14	her here.
15	MR. MacDONALD: And memory this was
16	prepared, as I've since learned, over a weekend when she
17	was under great pressure from the Chief to put an
18	Occurrence Rep together an Occurrence Report together.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: How would you know that,
21	sir?
22	MR. MacDONALD: I've heard that I don't
23	recall when I heard that, but I I looked at the notes
24	and I knew that I may have garnered that from the Chief
25	when I first met him, but I'm only speculating. But I knew

for a fact when I read these notes, it was always -- it was already known to me that she'd been under a lot of pressure that weekend when the Chief blew his stack and wanted to get a full occurrence in here.

MR. MANDERVILLE: Mr. Commissioner, as we know, there's a fair amount of evidence to the contrary, but I'm happy to address it when it's my turn.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, just to give you an example of the different notes, we have -- if we just turn to page -- it's Bates page 731 of the document we have on the screen; Exhibit 295, and you might just want to turn to the hard copy because you'll see there's quite a difference. So we see at the bottom of the page, there's reference to the meeting in the youth office and these are the dedicated notes that we have; a compilation. And then if we look at Exhibit 314, sir -- and you might want to take the hard copy of this one; it should be in your binder -- these are the contemporaneous notes from the meeting of January 28th. These are her notes, which appear she has summarized in Exhibit 295.

So I guess my point, sir, is if you're concerned that she might have left things out of Exhibit 295 in putting that together, we have the full notes that she has of the January 28th meeting here at Exhibit 314; all

1	right? And I indicated to you earlier just you told us
2	earlier, you never saw these notes.
3	MR. MacDONALD: No.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And you didn't see her notes
5	of that meeting
6	MR. MacDONALD: No, I had
7	MR. ENGELMANN: nor did you see Officer
8	Malloy's, nor did you see Officer Lefebvre's.
9	MR. MacDONALD: No, I had her report
10	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
11	And let's just look at that quickly if we
12	can. You'll see, for example, on the very first page of
13	her notes of the meeting these are the detailed notes,
14	the contemporaneous notes:
15	"Father McDougald asked for a letter
16	of apology."
17	It says:
18	"Father McDougald asked for a letter
19	of apology."
20	This is Silmser. Do you see that about
21	three quarters of the way down the page? Malcolm
22	MacDonald, lawyer for priest
23	MR. MacDONALD: M'hm.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: "All I want and I drop the
25	whole thing."

1	Okay? This is apparently Silmser telling
2	them that all he wants is a letter of apology; all right?
3	And again, you weren't aware of that.
4	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
6	And then on the second page, he at the
7	bottom of the page starts to describe the first
8	incident; the first allegation that he also has in his
9	handwritten statement a couple of weeks later.
10	Then at the bottom of the next page which is
11	Bates page 504, or page 3 of her contemporaneous note, it
12	talks about going on a retreat. It talks about knowledge
13	that Father McDougald is also in charge of sexual assaults
14	for Diocese.
15	On Bates page 505, he continues about the
16	second incident at the retreat and he says at the middle
17	of the page, or her notes indicate he said:
18	"I just remember Father MacDonald and a
19	woman, none questioned, no parents, two
20	supervisors."
21	So there's no reference to a judge here at
22	all, and that would be the one where there would be other
23	people present. It talks about the Act.
24	The third allegation is set out at the
25	bottom of page 4, and that's going into his office, and it

1	goes on to the next page, Bates page 507.
2	The fourth incident, the drive, is set out
3	at the bottom of the page and on to the next page, and,
4	again, no suggestion that there's anybody present; it's the
5	two of them.
6	And those are the allegations dealing with
7	Father MacDonald, so there's no reference to any judge.
8	And the, if we turn over to Bates page 510, he starts
9	talking about Seguin.
10	And this is what I mean about some detail on
11	these allegations. You'll see about a third of the way
12	down the page, "Started in his office". He talks about the
13	feeling of his leg; he talks about being grabbed. He says,
14	"He's an out-and-out child molester."
15	He talks about being in the hospital,
16	towards the bottom of the page. He talks again about his
17	leg being rubbed. He talks about being at his house, at
18	the bottom of the page, and what happens there.
19	At the top of the next page, 511, he talks
20	about sexual acts that Ken Seguin does on him and, again,
21	talks about it on the next page as well, 512, about sexual
22	acts that Ken Seguin's performing.
23	And then, on the very last page, he
24	describes in some detail what Seguin's house is like on
25	Alguire. No doubt, the police officers are asking if he

1	can describe the house and eve	rything else, so there's
2	quite a bit of detail here abo	ut Ken Seguin.
3	MR. MacDONALD:	Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN:	You never got that, did you?
5	MR. MacDONALD:	I didn't get that degree of
6	detail.	
7	MR. ENGELMANN:	Did you ever get that detail
8	about Seguin?	
9	MR. MacDONALD:	No.
10	MR. ENGELMANN:	All right.
11	MR. MacDONALD:	No.
12	MR. ENGELMANN:	All right. And, again, that
13	detail is not set out in	
14	MR. MacDONALD:	The first statement.
15	MR. ENGELMANN:	in the it's not set
16	out in the handwritten stateme	nt
17	MR. MacDONALD:	Right.
18	MR. ENGELMANN:	that you would have
19	seen	
20	MR. MacDONALD:	Right.
21	MR. ENGELMANN:	at the meeting with
22	Constable Sebalj?	
23	MR. MacDONALD:	Right.
24	MR. ENGELMANN:	And it's not really set out
25	in any detail in these dedicat	ed notes that we've looked at

1	or certainly not not as it is in the notes of the the
2	contemporaneous notes of the initial interview. All right?
3	But, again, there's no reference to a judge
4	there, there's no reference to a judge here, and I'm just
5	wondering, are you absolutely sure
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: that she mentioned
8	something about a judge?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I'm certain. From the
10	very first time that I was asked to comment officially on
11	this matter, post-revelation of the of the civil
12	settlement and the unlawful clause, I recall that you'll
13	note it's clearly laid out in my statement and I
14	didn't it's not the type of thing that you misconstrue
15	or make up.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And was that a concern of
17	yours from a credibility point of view with Silmser,
18	that the fact that he was apparently alleging that a
19	judge was present and actually witnessed this? Did that
20	cause you to have some concerns about his credibility?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Only when I learned that he
22	couldn't describe the judge or name the judge or give any
23	other detail, and my concern was when you make reference to
24	any person, especially an individual who'd be likely of
25	some would likely cause persons to recall some

l	particular detail just because of whom they are, it
2	did I did consider it one of the shortcomings of his
3	credibility.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. And so you were of
5	the view that he'd made that allegation, and you were of
6	the view that he hadn't been able to elaborate on it?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Correct, that was what I was
8	told.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. All right, so let's
10	just look at the we don't have
11	MR. MacDONALD: As I read Heidi's notes, I
12	should note that there are pieces of it that she had told
13	me.
14	Heidi was Heidi and I had a number of
15	conversations, at length, and I'm sure that components of
16	this would have been told to me. I don't recall any
17	details though about the Seguin criminal acts.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you'll agree
19	with me, sir, and we just looked at that, that not only
20	were you not told about that, but the detail that's in 314,
21	which are the contemporaneous or long-form notes from
22	January 28^{th} , much more than what we see in 295, the
23	dedicated note?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I guess.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.

1	Because in the dedicated note, we really see
2	no reference at all to any detail on Ken Seguin; correct?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
5	MR. MacDONALD: This can be contrasted with
6	other entries in the dedicated notes where there's no
7	front-line notes.
8	You know, Heidi was doing her best, and I'm
9	not speaking in a derogatory way when I say that when she
10	put her dedicated notes together, she was doing her best
11	to, you know, lay out chronologically and events
12	specifically, things that had gone on over several
13	weeks you know, months. And so I'm not being critical
14	of her, I'm just saying she was writing it with that frame
15	of mind, I'm sure.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, you said she was
17	doing her best.
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Did she tell you that?
20	MR. MacDONALD: I believed she was.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. You believed she
22	was, but that's based on what?
23	MR. MacDONALD: My dealings with Heidi prior
24	to
25	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

1	MR. MacDONALD: on this case, and
2	subsequent to.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. So will you be
4	carrying on with
5	MR. ENGELMANN: I want to look at these
6	notes, these dedicated notes, and just I'm going to be
7	asking him whether he was informed about this or that,
8	because this all goes back to my concern that Mr. MacDonald
9	may not have had some information when he wrote his opinion
10	letter in mid-September.
11	MR. MacDONALD: Well, you can presume I
12	didn't have all the information.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes. I'm just going to give
14	you some examples, sir, because I want to ask you at the
15	end whether or not that might have
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Are we going to close the
17	loop on the judge issue, is what I
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, I thought I was there,
19	but
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
21	So, sir, the way I understand it is this, is
22	that early on you get wind that there may be a judge
23	involved in this somehow?
24	MR. MacDONALD: As witness, at least.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Right. You tell Heidi,

1	"Go and find out". She comes back and says to you
2	MR. MacDONALD: "Can't give a name, can't
3	give a position, can't describe him physically."
4	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Did you just
5	leave it drop there or was there anything further?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I don't know what
7	I what further there could be for a person who couldn't
8	be described in any way or I wasn't so sure that it was
9	a judge, frankly, at that point.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: I know, but we don't have
11	a written statement from Silmser on that issue. It's
12	important because it's a judge and if it's a judge, we have
13	to do things properly.
14	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: What about telling her,
16	"You go back and get him to write a statement on this
17	issue, once and for all," so that you have something in
18	your hand to document it? That's number one, I guess.
19	MR. MacDONALD: I told I told her to go
20	back and get the details.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm?
22	MR. MacDONALD: I presume she would have
23	done it in writing, in her notes, so if not the statement,
24	but I didn't direct her to take a formal standalone
25	statement on that point.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm? Okay. And so,
2	after that, did you just forget about it? Like
3	MR. MacDONALD: I came to the I concluded
4	there, as did Heidi, that he really didn't know if this
5	person was a judge or some other an individual from
6	another calling.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, when you met with
9	Constable Sebalj for the first or second time in mid- to
10	late February of 1993, you indicated I think yesterday that
11	you would have asked her to do some work on school records?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And it appears that as early
14	as February $3^{\rm rd}$, she had actually done something on that.
15	I just want to show that to you. If you
16	have Exhibit 295 either on the screen
17	MR. MacDONALD: I'm not saying that I gave
18	her the idea to go there for the first time, but I I'm
19	saying I wanted I recall asking for elaboration.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Fair enough. So we'll
21	look and you can either read these are the dedicated
22	notebook notes, Exhibit 295. I'm at Bates page 733,
23	towards the bottom, and this is her next note after her
24	note about the January 28 th meeting.
25	She's saying that she called Silmser,

1	requested that he contact the school board and obtain his
2	school records, and I'm just wondering if you were aware,
3	from her, that she would have asked him to do this back in
4	early February?
5	MR. MacDONALD: I can't
6	MR. ENGELMANN: If you can't remember, sir,
7	that's fine.
8	MR. MacDONALD: I think I recall, but I
9	can't say with certainty. I think that I told her that if
10	he didn't want to get them voluntarily we could consider a
11	search warrant.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Well, sir, do
13	you know if this was sort of normal practice? I don't
14	know, with your dealings with police officers, whether they
15	would ask the alleged victim to go and obtain his own
16	records.
17	MR. MacDONALD: Well, these would be
18	confidential records that school boards are not inclined
19	at least not always inclined to disclose to the
20	authorities without prior judicial authorization
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Or consent.
22	MR. MacDONALD: But if you get consent you
23	don't need the search, and that's why she was wise, I
24	think, in first asking him to get the documents.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, she could have had him

1	sign a consent form and then she or a police officer could
2	have gotten them; correct?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, but she obviously
4	thought it would be more expeditious, I well, I'm
5	presuming that anyway.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, all right.
7	Sir, the other thing that's mentioned here,
8	and I don't think this is something that was indicated to
9	you, because you certainly didn't mention it, that:
10	"The victim advised that he had been
11	contacted by the Diocese and they want
12	to have a meeting with the victim.
13	Stated he wasn't sure if he was going.
14	Thought they should know"
15	And I'm not sure what it says after that.
16	"That way it's out. Stated he wanted
17	to see what they"
18	And I'm not sure what it says after that.
19	"Advises the meeting is on Tuesday,
20	February 9 th ."
21	Okay? So she has a note in her notes, and
22	this is the dedicated notebook, that she's been advised by
23	Mr. Silmser that he's been contacted by someone from the
24	Diocese and that they want to meet with him on the 9^{th} of
25	February. Now, sir, is that something that you would have

1	been told about by Ms. Sebalj?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall that.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
4	And, sir, if you'd been told that something
5	it's likely something you'd remember; right? The
6	employer of the suspect wanting to meet
7	MR. MacDONALD: In my conversations with
8	Heidi I had the impression that it was the complainant who
9	intended to seek, you know, civil redress.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Right, that it was his
11	initiative.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I don't know about
13	initiative but that was his intention.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, you weren't then told
15	that the Diocese had contacted Mr. Silmser and wanted to
16	meet with him on the 9 th ?
17	MR. MacDONALD: No.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And in fact,
19	sir, we know that he attended a meeting at the Diocese
20	where their lawyer, Mr. Leduc, and two priests were present
21	and asked him questions about his allegations.
22	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't know about that
23	meeting.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: That would be important for
25	you to know about, would it not?

1	MR. MacDONALD: It certainly would, in
2	retrospect.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, sir, if we just go a
4	little further in her notes, Bates page 734 again, on the
5	9^{th} of February she notes a meeting with the victim in the
6	Youth Office:
7	"Victim has no statement. Advises he
8	has not completed it yet. Asked him
9	about names of people present at the
10	meeting."
11	This was the meeting at the Diocese.
12	"Could only name McDougald and knows a
13	lawyer was present. Advised they
14	wanted victim to provide details of the
15	assault. States, 'They believed me.'
16	Was offered psychological help,
17	et cetera."
18	Again, you weren't advised of this fact?
19	MR. MacDONALD: No.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, were you aware at
21	the time that there was and I'm going to ask you about
22	some of the work you did for the Diocese a bit later, but
23	were you aware at the time of a protocol they had in place
24	for dealing with allegations against clergy?
25	MR. MacDONALD: No.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
2	MR. MacDONALD: I don't.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: But you were not told
4	certainly between the timeframe of February when you were
5	first involved in this, and September 14^{th} when you wrote
6	your opinion, you were not told about the Diocese
7	conducting any form of internal investigation?
8	MR. MacDONALD: No, I didn't know.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Or any use of a protocol?
10	MR. MacDONALD: No. I mean, I recall from
11	the Alfred boys' school, you know, there were processes in
12	place when the Church received complaints of criminal
13	misconduct by their by their personnel.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
15	MR. MacDONALD: And, you know, I'm not
16	surprised to hear that there was a process in place here.
17	I'm just saying that I wasn't made privy to it, how it
18	operated.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
20	And, sir, I just want to take you to the
21	next page of the notes then, and this is the dedicated
22	notebook, page 735, 16 February '93. I believe it's 9:55
23	in the morning:
24	"Unscheduled visit from victim.
25	Provided statement."

1	And this is that handwritten statement we've
2	looked at.
3	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: "States Father McDougald
5	called last night, 15 February. Wanted
6	to discuss a settlement."
7	Okay, and this is the fellow who's in charge
8	of sexual assault or sexual abuse for the Church, and this
9	is Ms. Sebalj reporting the victim saying that Father
10	McDougald called him, wanted to discuss a settlement:
11	"Victim did not entertain conversation.
12	I advised him I would be
13	interviewing"
14	And it goes on. So again this is an
15	indication, sir, at least in Constable Sebalj's notes, that
16	the victim is being contacted by a priest responsible for
17	the sexual assault for the Diocese and wanting to discuss a
18	settlement. You weren't informed of that, were you?
19	MR. MacDONALD: No. I see from the gist of
20	the notes that she was obviously trying to stall him on
21	this.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: As in, "Don't go," that
23	kind of thing?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I presume that's where
25	she's noting down the not attended. He wouldn't attend

1	the meeting. I presume that she would have encouraged him
2	not to attend the meeting.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Which meeting are we talking
4	about, sir?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Some meeting with the
6	priest, McDougald.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, the note says if
8	we're on the same page, Bates page 735, February 16 th :
9	"Unscheduled visit from victim.
10	Provided statement. States Father
11	McDougald called last night,
12	15 February. Wanted to discuss a
13	settlement. Victim did not entertain
14	conversation. I advised him I would be
15	interviewing family"
16	I can't make out the next word.
17	"Victim satisfied."
18	It doesn't appear
19	MR. MacDONALD: What's the last line? "I
20	requested"
21	MR. ENGELMANN: "School records."
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay? So it appears that
24	the victim is advising presumably Mr. Silmser is
25	advising Constable Sebalj that he's been contacted by this

25

1	priest, that the priest wanted to discuss a settlement and
2	the victim did not entertain the conversation. It doesn't
3	appear she's writing anything about advice to him there.
4	MR. MacDONALD: She added that she'd be
5	interviewing family. I have the impression that she never
6	urged him to do any of these to follow any of the steps
7	that were recommended by the Church.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, but you weren't in the
9	loop about the Church; right? She wasn't telling you about
10	the contact
11	MR. MacDONALD: No, her
12	MR. ENGELMANN: that he was getting from
13	the Diocese.
14	MR. MacDONALD: No, but her impression was
15	that he was inclined in thinking about he was
16	entertaining civil recourse.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, and that's what
18	you were told.
19	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. But you've
21	already told us, and we've looked at her notes, that he
22	calls her on February $3^{\rm rd}$ and says he's been contacted by
23	the Diocese and they want him to come to a meeting on the
24	9 th . She didn't tell you that.
25	

MR. MacDONALD: No, she didn't.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: No, and her notes don't
2	suggest that she's telling him not to go. But again,
3	you're not told this?
4	MR. MacDONALD: No, I
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. You're told at
6	some point that it's Silmser that's seeking redress from
7	the Diocese. That's what you're told.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Well, Heidi told me I
9	don't remember the words but she told me that she was,
10	especially in March, trying to stall him in terms of
11	getting his attention as opposed to having him focus his
12	attention on a civil settlement. So, you know, I think
13	it's fair to conclude from what I heard from her there
14	it's safe to conclude that she did she certainly wasn't
15	actively urging him in any way, tacitly or openly, to
16	pursue the civil settlement and get back to me. She was
17	trying to do the opposite and she told me that in I
18	can't remember the quote but that was what she told me.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. At least at this
20	time it doesn't appear he's entertaining it either early
21	on, February 16 th .
22	MR. MacDONALD: No.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: From her note.
24	MR. MacDONALD: No.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.

1	MR. MacDONALD: And that reference to the
2	family means that she's continuing, you know, her
3	investigation.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
5	MR. MacDONALD: And encouraging him so, if
6	not asking him to. That part I'm speculating on.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
8	So if we look ahead a little later in her
9	notes, the dedicated notes, on Bates page 751, she's
10	describing a telephone call she gets from Malcolm
11	MacDonald, and I don't know if she would have told you that
12	from time-to-time she had contact from Malcolm MacDonald?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, she told me that. I
14	don't recall
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
16	MR. MacDONALD: how early in the
17	process, but she told me that.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
19	And here, at least at the bottom of page 750
20	and on to 751, she's saying:
21	"Telephone call from Malcolm MacDonald,
22	counsel for the suspect, Father Charles
23	MacDonald. Advises Jacques Leduc is
24	lawyer for the Diocese."
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, I never knew until

1	Jacques Leduc phoned me
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
3	MR. MacDONALD: that he was on for the
4	Diocese.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: So that's another thing that
6	you didn't know from her?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
9	And there's a reference to this Monsignor
10	Schonenbach and the meeting with Silmser on December $9^{\rm th}$,
11	1992. You weren't informed about that?
12	MR. MacDONALD: No.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: We talked about that
14	yesterday.
15	And you weren't informed about the fact that
16	he had written a letter, and that's referenced here as
17	well?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I was informed of it
19	all in the global sense that there were civil discussions
20	going on. That's the way Heidi summarized all of this.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. Okay.
22	Now, at Bates page 753 again, this is
23	still the conversation with Malcolm MacDonald. On that
24	page it says:
25	"Advises Father MacDonald is prepared

1	to take a polygraph."
2	I'm wondering if Constable Sebalj would have
3	ever provided you with that information, that Malcolm
4	MacDonald had told her that his client was prepared to take
5	a polygraph?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I recall she did. I
7	believe she did.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: And did you again, if you
9	were providing investigational advice at this stage, would
10	you have suggested that they should in fact take him up on
11	his offer?
12	MR. MacDONALD: I believe, but can't say
13	with certainty, but I believe her told her not to do it.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
15	Because we've heard from some of the police
16	officers that have testified here that often it's a good
17	investigational technique to have the person come in, not
18	for the purposes of the polygraph, but to gain information
19	from them when they're in.
20	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Again, that wouldn't have
22	been advice, perhaps, you would have known about.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Polygraph, in my view, if
24	it's like a wine, it's got to be every wine has its time
25	and so does a statement from an accused person. And if a

25

1 polygraph is taken and the individual passes and you don't 2 get -- you have nothing to pin him on, literally, 3 figuratively, then all you get is more stuff on the no RPG 4 side of the roster. 5 MR. ENGELMANN: We've heard ---6 MR. MacDONALD: Of the line, rather. 7 MR. ENGELMANN: And we know that polygraphs 8 aren't admissible, et cetera, but we heard that the reason 9 for taking someone up on that is to just get an opportunity to talk to them and see if you can gain other information, 10 11 either before or after they do the polygraph. I just don't know if you ---12 13 MR. MacDONALD: The only time I've ever seen 14 defence counsel offer a polygraph is when they knew that 15 the police didn't have enough to pin him on it and that 16 he'd be able to do exactly what I believe Malcolm was 17 trying to create, and that's another point against grounds 18 to charge, i.e. he passed the polygraph. 19 If you imagine the officers and the way they 20 do RPG assessments, is they think of pro evidence and con 21 evidence and sometimes I'll even have them put a line down the middle of the page whenever they're doing the 22 23 calculation and have them address their minds to what's on 24 the pro and side [sic], and this would be a very weighty

one on the con side, on the negative side, as far as

1	formulation of RPGs are concerned.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, at Bates page 760 of
3	those same notes, this is the only reference to a meeting
4	with you.
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: In the dedicated notes.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Perhaps that's that point
8	you've just raised speaks volumes in terms of demonstrating
9	why I know a number of contacts we had and issues we
10	discussed were never recorded.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Fair enough.
12	MR. MacDONALD: And that's okay because
13	Heidi was getting you know, she was talking to the
14	Crown, and they don't usually tend to detail the
15	instructions they're receiving.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And these were informal
17	meetings, typically. It was a hallway meeting or something
18	where perhaps she didn't have her notebook and you weren't
19	taking notes and
20	MR. MacDONALD: Well, it was informal, but
21	that was the way that we did business.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Crowns were in court four
24	and five days a week then, and the only way that coppers
25	could get in touch with us was to meet us up there. I

1	didn't have the practice of a nine-Crown office is
2	different from that of a two and a half-Crown office.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Your work was a lot
4	different in 1993 than it is today.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, and so was the work of
6	the police.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Fair enough.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Such that when they needed
9	me, they necessarily had to come up the stairs because
10	otherwise they'd have to wait forever to get an
11	appointment.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: But back then, during the
13	course of her investigation of the Silmser matter, you
14	would be in court probably daily?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Just about.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah, all right.
17	MR. MacDONALD: And that's where she knew
18	she'd find me.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
20	So on Bates page 760, she references at
21	15:35, "Meet Crown MacDonald in CIB". Do you see that?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And it appears,
24	therefore, this is a bit more structured than a hallway
25	meeting, if I can call it that.

1	MR. MacDONALD: To the extent that she came
2	up to see me, reporting back on information that she she
3	presented it to me and I recall the meeting I was tied
4	up upstairs in the back room of the fourth floor
5	courthouse, trial going on, had a recess, and she basically
6	said words to the effect that, "I have bad news about some
7	follow-up".
8	And I was just too busy to get into this on
9	a you know, this was an important investigation, a CIB
10	investigation, so I simply said, I'll see you at lunch or
11	at what time is that?
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Fifteen-thirty-five (15:35).
13	MR. MacDONALD: So it was probably after the
14	court closed for the day.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And in her
16	notes, she's certainly suggesting that you:
17	"Asked how investigation was going and
18	advised re. certain names, denial,
19	someone not being present. Became
20	concerned about my grounds. Suggested
21	meeting with victim. Advised
22	scheduling difficulties. Asked to be
23	kept up-to-date."
24	So it would be appear, at least from that note,
25	that you've clearly had a meeting before then?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Because you're asking her
3	how the investigation is going.
4	MR. MacDONALD: We had more than more
5	than one.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. Okay. And you're
7	
8	MR. MacDONALD: Before that.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: According to the note, at
10	least, you're suggesting that she follow up and have
11	another meeting with the victim?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I would have given her
13	instructions on what to follow up on. I just forget the
14	details of what they were.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Fair enough. And we know,
16	at least from these dedicated notes, that she in fact does
17	meet with the victim about eight days later, the alleged
18	victim, on March the $10^{\rm th}$.
19	MR. MacDONALD: And she had a number of
20	phone call contacts with him, too.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes. And some of these
22	referenced here, so
23	MR. MacDONALD: M'hm.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: You don't recall any of the
25	specific detail of this particular meeting though, do you,

1	sir?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I don't remember the meeting
3	but I remember her coming up to see me about the meeting,
4	about my attending CIB after court.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sorry, about?
6	MR. MacDONALD: I remember the reason why I
7	went to CIB.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
9	MR. MacDONALD: And it's because I didn't
10	have time to see her upstairs.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Fair enough. Fair enough.
12	But as far as the detail, can you give us
13	any more than she gives us here on this page?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I can tell you that our
15	meetings always consisted of strategy in the context of
16	investigation. It would not have been, as this note
17	suggests, a two-minute in-and-out, hi, how's it going; keep
18	digging; have RPGs yet; no, I don't.
19	You know, keep it was it was detailed
20	and I can say that with certainty.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. You can't get
22	into the specifics but you can say that it wasn't a two- or
23	three-minute meeting. You would have had an exchange of
24	information, you would have given her some advice?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, the specifics would be

50

1	speculation now and it would be encumbered it would be
2	clouded by 20/20 vision.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
4	And we know from at least these notes that
5	she has a number of interviews in March and that one of the
6	individuals she interviews is a person known here as C-56.
7	And I would have shown you that name yesterday and you
8	couldn't recall that particular individual, which is fair.
9	MR. MacDONALD: I couldn't remember the
10	name.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes. And on page just to
12	give you a sense
13	MR. MacDONALD: Can I just ask a question?
14	I know that there's
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, absolutely.
16	MR. MacDONALD: procedures with respect
17	to sobriquets and can you alert me when there's a name
18	that I may
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
20	MR. MacDONALD: that I may blurt out
21	accidentally?
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, so we have monikers
23	here, sir, and I'll make every effort to do that, and
24	that's why I'm referring to this particular individual as
25	C-56. But his name is set out on

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Madam Clerk, could you
2	show him C-56 again?
3	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall that name.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
5	MR. MacDONALD: She may have used it; I
6	don't recall.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So if we if
8	we actually look at Bates page 791
9	MR. MacDONALD: Do you know what tab it
10	would be in, in my book?
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, it's well, we're in
12	Exhibit 295. You should have Exhibit 295; these are the
13	dedicated notes.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: And if you look at to
15	make it easier, it's page 370
16	MR. MacDONALD: Okay, thank you.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: on the top right
18	corner
19	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: in Magic Marker.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: And it's on the screen,
23	about a third of the way down the screen.
24	MR. MacDONALD: Okay, thank you.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: That's the name that you

1	just saw, right?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And so it's a
4	telephone call from him, and he's giving some background,
5	and if we flip over the page to 792, he talks about an
6	incident with Father Charlie MacDonald, at about the middle
7	of the page. And the description is, simply:
8	"Placed his hand in my groin
9	area."
10	And it goes on and talks about
11	MR. MacDONALD: He thought it was an
12	accident.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: how he felt about it.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sorry; who felt it was
15	an accident?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Somebody thought it was an
17	accident?
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Where do you see that, sir?
19	MR. MacDONALD: "I got the car back into
20	my parents' house. He did this in the
21	driver's driveway. I thought it was
22	an accident."
23	MR. ENGELMANN: "Advised I thought it was
24	an accident."
25	Is that what you're referring to?

1	MR. MacDONALD: "Advised I thought it was
2	an accident."
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. I haven't seen this
5	with this note before, sir.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, no, no, fair
7	enough. And there's a reference to it on the next page,
8	"and so it was a complete surprise," can't remember a
9	conversation. He talks about the fact "confirmed only an
10	incident," and then he disassociated himself, at the bottom
11	of the page.
12	And we'll come back to C-56, but this was
13	March the 9 th . You weren't informed about this at the time?
14	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes. And on March the
16	10th
17	MR. MacDONALD: Was this
18	MR. ENGELMANN: and this is
19	MR. MacDONALD: Was this the person who
20	refused to give a refused to be a witness?
21	MR. ENGELMANN: No. We'll come back to
22	C-56, okay?
23	On March the $10^{\rm th}$, which starts on page 798,
24	Bates page 798, we have the follow-up meeting with
25	Mr. Silmser, and this she has written is advice you

1	gave her on March the 2^{nd} , and she's acting upon it here on
2	March the 10 th .
3	And, sir, these notes go on for a couple of
4	pages, in fact, several pages, and at the end of them, on
5	Bates page 802, at the very end of the interview and
6	they've been describing in some detail there's
7	detail some detail on the these four allegations of Mr.
8	Silmser's, about Father MacDonald, nothing about Ken
9	Seguin.
10	Then, at the very end, at 14:00, there's a
11	note that says:
12	"I don't think I can deal with this
13	right now."
14	And then, right next to that, says, "Re:
15	Sequin."
16	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you see that?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: And might that have been
20	related to you?
21	MR. MacDONALD: She told me that he was not
22	in a position to deal with it at the time. She
23	didn't he didn't want to elaborate, he would deal with
24	it later, I think, is what she said, and I that's what I
25	wanted her to encourage him not to do.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
2	MR. MacDONALD: It would have been a
3	disclosure, you know, issue. The minute that we proceeded
4	against Priest MacDonald, counsel would then be seeking
5	elaboration on Probation Officer Seguin.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: It would be fair to say that
7	at that next meeting, that they were to have with the
8	alleged victim, you wanted them to try and get more detail
9	on Ken Seguin?
10	MR. MacDONALD: I believe she tried.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And it appears that
12	the answer was:
13	"I don't think I can deal with this
14	right now."
15	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: But you had hoped that she
17	would come back with some information on him?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Correct.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Now, if we turn
20	a couple of more pages, Bates page 808, the date is the $12^{ m th}$
21	of March '93. We see at 1450 a telephone call and, the
22	individual whose name is set out there at 1450, that's C-3.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Okay.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right? And this person
25	alleged, at the bottom of that page, that he was sexually

1	molested by Father MacDonald, and I'm assuming, sir, if you
2	were told about this individual, it was not at this time.
3	MR. MacDONALD: I was told about four
4	individuals; two early on and two in June, July or August.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. I thought
6	MR. MacDONALD: I can't be more specific in
7	time.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, we went through our
9	OPP statement yesterday, and I thought you were you told
10	us you were told about one or two
11	MR. MacDONALD: Early on, yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: No. Your statement is very
13	clear; it was at the eve of the settlement.
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. I was well, at the
15	eve of the settlement? Maybe in the summer, late late
16	in the process, and two early in the process. It may not
17	have been on the eve. I shouldn't have I don't know if
18	it was the day before, but I don't think I meant
19	the this meaning of "eve" literally, but I just meant
20	late in the process.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
22	MR. MacDONALD: I believe it was in the
23	summer, and perhaps in August. Likely in August.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Well, yesterday,
25	and I thought we'd gone over this, one or two alleged

1	victims, one who who was only willing to be a witness,
2	or similar fact, and the other who wasn't willing to be
3	involved?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Well, who right, who
5	didn't have the wherewithal to
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
7	MR. MacDONALD: get involved.
8	MS. McINTOSH: My recollection,
9	Mr. Commissioner, is that Mr. MacDonald also referred to
10	knowing about two individuals early on who names that
11	Mr. Silmser had given Ms. Sebalj, Constable Sebalj, who did
12	not pan out, or something. I think that's what he said.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. Oh, yes, that's
14	right, yes.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: That I remember, sir. Is
16	that
17	MR. MacDONALD: That's what I mean, yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh, okay, all right. So as
19	far as anything that was confirmatory
20	MR. MacDONALD: It was I learned of
21	confirmatory stuff late in the process.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Right; right at the end?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. You know, I may
24	have I think I used "the eve" literally to imply late in
25	the process. I it may not have been the day before; it

1	may not have been the week before. I thought it was
2	August. I believe it was sometime in the summer.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Well, you'd
4	agree with me, what we have set out here on March the 12^{th}
5	would be confirmatory or supportive?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I don't know what
7	she you know, I don't know where this information went
8	after March. Was this one of the two fellows that she told
9	me about in the summer?
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, I can't help you there.
11	I'm assuming it was because this is one that's
12	confirmatory.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Because, remember, she would
14	have received names, got some information, followed
15	information up, determined that the information was
16	not you know, consistent with other external
17	information, so there may have been a reason why she didn't
18	tell me about this in March.
19	I don't want to say I don't want you to
20	be left with the impression that it was just, you know,
21	negligence on her part to hold it off until the summer.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All I'm suggesting, sir, is
23	it appears that C-3 and C-56
24	MR. MacDONALD: Are the two?
25	MR. ENGELMANN: are two that are

1	confirmatory or supportive.
2	MR. MacDONALD: M'hm.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: And it appears that she's
4	finding out about them in the first half of March, and
5	you're not finding out about anything anythingthat's
6	supportive of or confirmatory
7	MR. MacDONALD: No. We were hearing
8	more
9	MR. ENGELMANN: until very late?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, the information that
11	she kept reporting to me, tended all tended to be non-
12	confirmatory or neutral.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And, sir, just
14	to follow up on C-3, at Bates page 811, there's a reference
15	to statement, "Yes it's gone this far. Testify? I don't
16	know."
17	And then at Bates page 821, March $18^{\rm th}$,
18	another call with C-18, at which point he advises he's
19	decided against giving a statement:
20	"Stated it was a difficult decision.
21	He discussed it with his lawyer."
22	So that's C-3; okay?
23	MR. MacDONALD: So that must be one of the
24	persons I was told earlier wasn't inclined to make any
25	allegations. I'm just speculating there, sir.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah, okay. Please, sir,
2	do not speculate.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, no.
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. But it appears
7	that within a week or so of your telling her to go out and
8	get more information on March the 2^{nd} , at least if her notes
9	are accurate, within a couple of weeks in any event she has
10	contacted a couple of individuals who have talked about
11	being molested or indicated some kind of sexual touching,
12	and she's also talked with Mr. Silmser, right?
13	MR. MacDONALD: M'hm.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And you've advised us that
14 15	MR. ENGELMANN: And you've advised us that the only thing that was confirmatory or was supportive or
15	the only thing that was confirmatory or was supportive or
15 16	the only thing that was confirmatory or was supportive or corroborative, if I can use any of those terms, was
15 16 17	the only thing that was confirmatory or was supportive or corroborative, if I can use any of those terms, was something about homosexual tendencies, Father MacDonald,
15 16 17 18	the only thing that was confirmatory or was supportive or corroborative, if I can use any of those terms, was something about homosexual tendencies, Father MacDonald, that you're told and the words that were used in your
15 16 17 18 19	the only thing that was confirmatory or was supportive or corroborative, if I can use any of those terms, was something about homosexual tendencies, Father MacDonald, that you're told and the words that were used in your statement were, "Eve of settlement, perhaps sometime in
15 16 17 18 19 20	the only thing that was confirmatory or was supportive or corroborative, if I can use any of those terms, was something about homosexual tendencies, Father MacDonald, that you're told and the words that were used in your statement were, "Eve of settlement, perhaps sometime in August". That's the only thing that's positive, that's
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the only thing that was confirmatory or was supportive or corroborative, if I can use any of those terms, was something about homosexual tendencies, Father MacDonald, that you're told and the words that were used in your statement were, "Eve of settlement, perhaps sometime in August". That's the only thing that's positive, that's supportive of Mr. Silmser's allegations?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the only thing that was confirmatory or was supportive or corroborative, if I can use any of those terms, was something about homosexual tendencies, Father MacDonald, that you're told and the words that were used in your statement were, "Eve of settlement, perhaps sometime in August". That's the only thing that's positive, that's supportive of Mr. Silmser's allegations? MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, that's my general

1	neutral or, you know, slightly positive piece, I don't
2	recall them but, you know, this may well have been reported
3	to me, and I presume it was and I'm not supposed to
4	presume. I won't say any more.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
6	And, sir, just so we know, at Bates page 824
7	of the dedicated notes she confirms a meeting with C-56 and
8	he goes into some detail about this over the next few pages
9	and ends up providing a statement.
10	On Bates page 833, there's a reference to
11	another individual who's not monikered but I'm not going to
12	use his name just under the date, April $29^{\rm th}$
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, I see it. Yeah.
	1210 1120 211122
14	MR. ENGELMANN: '93. All right.
14 15	
	MR. ENGELMANN: '93. All right.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: '93. All right. And this individual says some positive
15 16	MR. ENGELMANN: '93. All right. And this individual says some positive things about Father MacDonald, doesn't allege any abuse,
15 16 17	MR. ENGELMANN: '93. All right. And this individual says some positive things about Father MacDonald, doesn't allege any abuse, but tells her at Bates page 834:
15 16 17 18	MR. ENGELMANN: '93. All right. And this individual says some positive things about Father MacDonald, doesn't allege any abuse, but tells her at Bates page 834: "I even went up to his room once and
15 16 17 18 19	MR. ENGELMANN: '93. All right. And this individual says some positive things about Father MacDonald, doesn't allege any abuse, but tells her at Bates page 834: "I even went up to his room once and under his bed there was a box full of
15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. ENGELMANN: '93. All right. And this individual says some positive things about Father MacDonald, doesn't allege any abuse, but tells her at Bates page 834: "I even went up to his room once and under his bed there was a box full of skin mags. Pat and I laughed about it.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. ENGELMANN: '93. All right. And this individual says some positive things about Father MacDonald, doesn't allege any abuse, but tells her at Bates page 834: "I even went up to his room once and under his bed there was a box full of skin mags. Pat and I laughed about it. We were only 12. He said he was only
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. ENGELMANN: '93. All right. And this individual says some positive things about Father MacDonald, doesn't allege any abuse, but tells her at Bates page 834: "I even went up to his room once and under his bed there was a box full of skin mags. Pat and I laughed about it. We were only 12. He said he was only human"

1	Were you told about this at all, sir?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I might have been. I don't
3	recall.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
5	Sir, so with the exception of Silmser's
6	handwritten statement which we've looked at, 262, your
7	information about the case is coming from these verbal
8	updates from Constable Sebalj in the main; correct?
9	MR. MacDONALD: In the main, yes. Yeah.
10	Yeah, by far.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Right, and then you have
12	some brief discussions, some with Staff Sergeant Brunet?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And you have these brief
15	discussions, a couple with Malcolm MacDonald and one with
16	Jacques Leduc?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
19	MR. MacDONALD: I believe there was a mixed
20	communication. I told Garry Derochie late in '93, I think,
21	that there are two names I didn't know about, but we were
22	mixing up who those names were and this maybe part of it
23	is because when initially they came to Heidi's attention,
24	how she followed up and ultimately when she told me, there
25	seems to have been a nexus in time.

1	So I think I left Garry with the impression
2	that those two names weren't that the two allegations
3	weren't disclosed to me, when in fact they were. Just the
4	timing was out.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: You're referring to
6	something that you've heard or read about Garry Derochie
7	and a comment about you?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, we'll come to
10	that.
11	MR. MacDONALD: I think that was I think
12	I read Garry's statement in the course of my preparations.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
14	So if we want, we can look very briefly.
15	There was a Crown brief prepared by her. This was after
16	the fact now a police brief, Crown brief. It's Exhibit
17	1249. So that would be in the same binder with your OPP
18	statement, which is 1233, and I hope you have that.
19	Counsel, it's Document Number 728535.
20	MR. MacDONALD: Twelve-thirty-nine (1239)?
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Twelve-forty-nine (1249),
22	sir.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Four-nine (49).
24	MR. MacDONALD: Four-nine (49). Thank you.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Again, sir, this isn't

1	something you had the benefit o	f when you prepared your
2	brief opinion in mid-September.	
3	MR. MacDONALD:	No, sir.
4	MR. ENGELMANN:	This was, as we know,
5	prepared over a weekend in earl	y October. This is in the
6	form of what you would normally	get by way of a police
7	brief?	
8	MR. MacDONALD:	Earlier, prior to charges
9	being laid. We usually get occ	urrence reports and
10	statements now.	
11	MR. ENGELMANN:	All right.
12	MR. MacDONALD:	Back then, it would have
13	been summaries verbal summar	ies of the occurrence report
14	and statements by the officer.	
15	MR. ENGELMANN:	Okay, well, this is back
16	then. This is October 6, 1993.	
17	MR. MacDONALD:	Yeah.
18	MR. ENGELMANN:	Wasn't this how a police
19	brief or Crown brief looked at	the time?
20	MR. MacDONALD:	Only after charges were
21	laid.	
22	MR. ENGELMANN:	Only after charges were
23	laid?	
24	MR. MacDONALD:	Yeah.
25	MR. ENGELMANN:	So they never sought advice

1	before?
2	MR. MacDONALD: When they occasionally
3	would before, but I wouldn't see an occurrence I
4	wouldn't see a Crown brief until it was before the court.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, if they were seeking
6	advice on whether or not they had reasonable and probable
7	grounds, they wouldn't give you a police brief with a
8	synopsis and statements and things of that nature?
9	MR. MacDONALD: They would not have made the
10	brief by that point. They would be they would have
11	components of the brief, like an occurrence report and
12	statements.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
14	MR. MacDONALD: And that's the stuff that
15	the Crown the instructions for Crown Attorney is the
16	Crown brief post-charge.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, but that's what
18	we have here, right? We have a general occurrence report
19	and we have statements.
20	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: So this is something that
22	you might have received at the time if they were seeking
23	advice on RP&G?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Not likely in '93. I would
25	have received verbal summaries of them or details of them.

I	MR. ENGELMANN: So let I'm trying to
2	understand.
3	MR. MacDONALD: The practice in 1993 was not
4	to receive a prepared package of materials prior to charges
5	being laid. We occasionally would, you know, look at a
6	statement or an officer's occurrence report, but for the
7	most part it was verbal report-back as opposed to a package
8	like this. This was not the common practice in 1993.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, was it a common
10	practice in 1993 to ask a Crown for advice on whether or
11	not there were reasonable and probable grounds? Was that
12	something they usually did themselves?
13	MR. MacDONALD: In 1993 we seldom get
14	questions that really are RPG decisions. The questions are
15	more are virtually always investigative direction, which
16	was the scenario here, or a prospect of conviction, which
17	is what we now call it. We didn't have that policy
18	standard identified but we back in 1993. As you know,
19	that's a creature you and I talked about the policy
20	evolution of prospect of conviction earlier.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: The prospect of conviction
22	is a bit later than 1993. I realize that.
23	MR. MacDONALD: It's an exercise of Crown
24	but we still had to exercise Crown discretion at some
25	you know, that was done after charges were laid.

1	MR. ENGELMANN:	But, sir, in sensitive cases
2	or in cases where there might	be some doubt or they may be
3	tentative on RP&G, did they no	ot provide you with either an
4	occurrence or statements	
5	MR. MacDONALD:	Usually
6	MR. ENGELMANN:	in the typical sense?
7	MR. MacDONALD:	Usually not. Homicides
8	would have been the exception	
9	MR. ENGELMANN:	All right.
10	MR. MacDONALD:	in '93.
11	MR. ENGELMANN:	Well, we know in this case
12	that you didn't get an occurre	ence report
13	MR. MacDONALD:	No.
14	MR. ENGELMANN:	and statements before
15	you were asked to give your op	pinion in this particular
16	case.	
17	MR. MacDONALD:	Opinion on what?
18	MR. ENGELMANN:	The letter you wrote on
19	September 14 th , 1993.	
20	MR. MacDONALD:	With right.
21	MR. ENGELMANN:	You did not get the
22	occurrence and the statements?	
23	MR. MacDONALD:	No.
24	MR. ENGELMANN:	Right.
25	MR. MacDONALD:	No. Oh, one statement.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. And you had seen the
2	statement several months earlier.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And, presumably, it would
5	have been helpful for you, in actually writing an opinion,
6	to have something like this 1249.
7	MR. MacDONALD: I was comfortable in relying
8	on Heidi's summaries back then, verbal. You know, you're
9	asking me in 2008 with 20/20 vision, and I have to answer
10	that by noting as well that had I known the baker's
11	assistant had put strychnine in the pie, I wouldn't have
12	eaten the apple pie.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Sir, at Bates
14	page 698, she summarizes the interview with C-3 and it goes
15	on to Bates page 699. This, I would suggest to you, is one
16	of them that would have been corroborative or supportive of
17	Mr. Silmser, not the other way around. Correct?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Not necessarily, no.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: How would this
20	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I think that, for
21	instance, without repeating it in detail, essentially, you
22	know, another colleague of mine made the same reviewed
23	the same materials and drew an opinion similar to what I
24	did about credibility concerns and need for follow-up, and
25	that speaks to the fact that when an officer formulates

1	RPGs, there are factors more so than just there's the bare
2	bones allegation, lay the charge.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: But, sir, what I'm
4	suggesting to you is this: This would have been one of the
5	one or two that you're saying late in the day might be
6	helpful towards what he's saying.
7	MR. MacDONALD: It might be helpful. It
8	would have gone into the officer's RPGs assessment, I'm
9	sure.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, then we have a
11	reference at Bates page I'm just showing there were
12	references to these three that we looked at in the in
13	her notes. At Bates page 710 we have the Will-Say
14	statement for C-56, and at 715, the Will-State for the
15	other fellow we looked at.
16	MR. MacDONALD: Sorry, what's your question?
17	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm just confirming, sir,
18	that the three that we looked at briefly from her notes we
19	see in this we see the Will-Say statements, and you'd
20	expect them to be here in this brief document that she
21	prepares in October.
22	MR. MacDONALD: I expect them to be in a
23	brief document today that would have been presented to me.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Now, going back
25	to her notes for a minute, if we can, and these are the

1	dedicated notes, if you turn to page
2	MR. MacDONALD: Is that 249 again?
3	MR. ENGELMANN: At 295. If you turn to page
4	н 834
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Hold on, Mr. Engelmann.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh, you should keep that
7	binder there.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Eight three four (834)?
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Two ninety-five (295).
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Eight three four (834).
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, perfect.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: In fact, if you want to just
14	back up a minute, if we go back to Bates page 824, we have
15	a telephone call from C-56, and that's set out over the
16	next five or so pages, and that's on April
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Third (3 rd).
18	MR. ENGELMANN: 3 rd
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Nineteen ninety-three
20	(1993).
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Then on April 13 th , we have a
22	reference to picking up a statement and another phone call
23	or two. Then on April $15^{\rm th}$ and this is Bates page 832
24	we have another phone call.
25	Then April 29 th , on the next Bates page, 833,

1	we have a phone call. And then on the following page
2	sorry, and that phone call goes on to page 834. And then
3	after that, we don't have anything until a note at the top
4	of Bates page 835, "telephone call from Malcolm MacDonald,'
5	and that's in late August.
6	So, from April 29 th to August 24 th , a period
7	of some four months, we don't have anything in these
8	dedicated notes. And in the month of April we have the
9	three or four telephone conversations.
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, we have a lot of
12	March.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So would it be
15	fair to say that if you were talking to Constable Sebalj
16	between late April and late August
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, there wasn't much
18	
19	MR. ENGELMANN: it wouldn't have been
20	about active investigation.
21	MR. MacDONALD: I don't think it's fair to
22	say that. I think that it would be follow-up that had gone
23	nowhere. That's my sense of sort of the quieter time in
24	terms of our exchanges. There is a I'm sure there must
25	have been two months where either she was on vacation, I

1	was on vacation or she was at police college. I know she
2	was at police college, because we spoke about it.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
4	MR. MacDONALD: You'd know when; I don't.
5	But it I think it would probably have been something
6	like May or June.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: No, we know she was at
8	police college for some time, we also know she was on
9	vacation for some time
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: but we have
12	MR. MacDONALD: That's what
13	MR. ENGELMANN: a period of four months
14	
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, and that
16	MR. ENGELMANN: sir, where it doesn't
17	appear there's any action
18	MR. MacDONALD: And.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: at least according to
20	her notes.
21	MR. MacDONALD: If Heidi was here today, she
22	would tell you that there was contact with me for some of
23	those four months.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
25	MR. MacDONALD: During some of those four

1	months. There just wasn't a lot of news to report.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, from the contact,
3	at least in her dedicated notes on 835, she's getting
4	called by Malcolm MacDonald and she's also getting called
5	by David Silmser.
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you see the note from
8	him?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: "Returned telephone call
11	to Dave Silmser requesting progress
12	report."
13	MR. MacDONALD: M'hm.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay? It's been some time.
15	We know, if we look at her notes, they haven't met since
16	March the 10th.
17	MR. MacDONALD: Well, yeah, you can't
18	extrapolate that they haven't spoken in between, though.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
20	MR. MacDONALD: I wouldn't recommend you do
21	that.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, hold on a minute.
23	Are you telling me that a police officer would not put in
24	her notebook conversations that she had with a victim?
25	MR. MacDONALD: There are a number of

1	conversations that she's made reference to in one line, so
2	I think it's I believe that she had more contact with
3	him, just from my conversation with her; that's the sense I
4	had, sir.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And, sir, you
6	believe that you would have had one or two updates from her
7	sometime between April 29th and August 24th?
8	MR. MacDONALD: They would they I
9	wouldn't describe them as they would be issue-specific
10	updates.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And, sir, we've
12	looked at a number of things that you weren't not aware of
13	prior to your writing your letter of September 14^{th} . And
14	that letter's Exhibit 301 that you have, but we know you
15	hadn't seen any police officer notes, so you weren't aware
16	of the details that had been given about Ken Seguin on
17	January 28 th . We know you weren't aware of whether or not a
18	civil suit had been started. We know you weren't aware of
19	
20	MR. MacDONALD: I presumed I presumed it
21	had started.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Fair enough.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: But you know in fact it
24	hadn't now. Do you know in fact that
25	MR. MacDONALD: I know a Notice of Action

1	hadn't been filed.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: So no action.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Well, if you're negotiating,
4	you're negotiating in contemplation of litigation, so
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, at the time, you had no
6	information about whether a civil suit had been filed.
7	MR. MacDONALD: No, I
8	MR. ENGELMANN: And you now know that none
9	ever was.
10	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. You didn't know
12	that Mr. Silmser was unrepresented throughout those
13	negotiations, if I can call them that, with Malcolm
14	MacDonald?
15	MR. MacDONALD: I presumed that he was
16	represented when serious civil resolution discussions took
17	place.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: You presumed, but you were
19	wrong. You didn't know that. You didn't know it at the
20	time.
21	MR. MacDONALD: I thought I was I saw
22	Sean Adams' name in the loop, which seemed to suggest that
23	he
24	MR. ENGELMANN: He was there for the IL
25	

1	MR. MacDONALD: at some point, yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. You never saw the
3	settlement documents?
4	MR. MacDONALD: No, never did.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. You didn't know
6	about Monsignor Schonenbach.
7	MR. MacDONALD: I don't believe so, no.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: You didn't know about the
9	Diocese initiating a meeting with him or that the meeting
10	took place.
11	MR. MacDONALD: My impression was that he
12	initiated them, that the complainant initiated them.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: I know, I'm just telling you
14	things that we've now found out that you didn't know about.
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
17	You didn't know that Monsignor McDougald had
18	suggested they engage in settlement discussions that Mr.
19	Silmser didn't want to entertain at the time?
20	You didn't know about anything that was
21	confirmatory or corroborative at all until late; whether
22	it's the eve of the settlement or some time in August?
23	MR. MacDONALD: I knew of some elements of
24	corroboration but not that were, you know, not the ones you
25	pointed out to me. I don't recall either of those two

1	letters or references in the notes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
3	Would it be fair to say, sir, if you had
4	known some of these facts and just take a look at your
5	letter, Exhibit 301 would it be fair to say that your
6	opinion might have been somewhat different?
7	MR. MacDONALD: I doubt it.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sorry?
9	MR. MacDONALD: I doubt it. I would have
10	drafted the letter perhaps differently, but the conclusion
11	that I drew, others in my other members of the Criminal
12	Law division have drawn the same conclusion with knowledge
13	of all this stuff, so I would presume that I would have
14	drawn the same conclusion as Mr. Griffiths.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, sir, let's just go to
16	the letter. I've asked you to look at it and I thought
17	maybe you wouldn't have written it the same way, so let's
18	look at it.
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, I would have I
20	would have written it dramatically differently, you know
21	_
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Whether or not your advice
23	would have been different on reasonable and probable
24	grounds, okay, I'm suggesting to you that your letter would
25	be quite different.

1	MR. MacDONALD: Well, my letter would have
2	made reference to an RPGs assessment.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Well, your
4	letter, have a look at it, sir. It's on the screen.
5	The sentence:
6	"Grounds are now even further
7	obfuscated by the fact that he has
8	evidently used this threat of criminal
9	prosecution as a means of furthering
10	his efforts to gain monetary
11	settlement."
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Would you have used that
14	sentence, sir, if you had known some of these facts?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Well, if you're asking what
16	conclusions I would have drawn on RPGs, I would have drawn
17	the same I think, the same conclusions would have been
18	drawn by anyone in 1994 as Mr. Griffiths had done.
19	But I wasn't dealing with RPGs in this
20	letter, I was dealing with the a CYA letter for Luc
21	where I included the fact that I made those references
22	to his unreliability as a witness and I would have that
23	sentence or those two sentences, I would have drafted
24	differently.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. You would not

1	have written that sentence?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Would have drafted it
3	differently.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: You certainly wouldn't have
5	said you wouldn't
6	MR. MacDONALD: It was a very harsh that
7	sentence was a very harsh indictment on poor Mr. Silmser.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. And it was based on
9	the facts as you knew them, not as some of the facts that
10	we looked at from her notes.
11	MR. MacDONALD: Right. I don't know if, you
12	know, I'm speculating now.
13	Would I have written the letter or had I
14	known everything I know, would I have shifted off
15	shifted it off to Peter Bob Pelletier by that point?
16	You know, that's speculation.
17	Remember we're just we're not dealing
18	with RPGs. Luc and Heidi knew they didn't have RPGs.
19	That's why I make reference in my CYA letter and try to
20	help them both by referring both to the inability to force
21	the victim to testify against his wishes, as well as their
22	conclusions on RPGs.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, the sentence:
24	"The case is fraught with, due to his
25	own conduct, a very non-credible

I	complainant saddled with an evident
2	ulterior motive for making these
3	allegations."
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, I wouldn't have I
5	wouldn't have written the sentence that way.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, particularly if
7	you had seen the settlement document, I assume this letter
8	would be completely different?
9	MS. McINTOSH: You know, with respect, I
10	think the witness has already said that he wasn't writing
11	an RPG opinion. That was sort of if I can put it in
12	lawyer's language an alternative argument. He was
13	confirming a Crown policy and he was adding a reference to
14	the officers' own tentative RPGs in order to cover off that
15	issue at the request of the officers.
16	So I don't think it's fair to say the letter
17	would have been completely different. He's already said he
18	would have redrafted some of these provisions, but the
19	letter wouldn't have been completely different.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, but
21	MR. ENGELMANN: But, sir, the letter and
22	I'll just go from what Ms. McIntosh just said the letter
23	was primarily to address this policy about compelling
24	victims, right?
25	MR. MacDONALD: When I spoke to Luc on the

25

telephone, he wanted a CYA letter and he wanted me to -- in 1 2 both the CYA letter because the -- his brass, if I can use 3 that term, were looking for answers about where this investigation was at, why is it -- why had it taken so 4 5 long. I think that was sort of the pressure Luc was under 6 or at least if he wasn't, he expected to be under it. 7 And so that's why I made reference to both 8 the practice of not forcing a victim to testify on a sexual 9 assault case if he didn't have the desire or wherewithal to 10 do it and, secondly, that he had done an investigation and 11 still, irrespective of the desires of the complainant, was 12 still lacking dramatically in RPGs. And if I had known some of the stuff you've 13 14 just outlined to me in the last hour or so, I would have --15 that would have been drafted differently; that last --16 those last two -- that last paragraph. 17 MR. ENGELMANN: But, sir, just on the policy 18 -- let's forget about the RPG because I want to ask you 19 about that because there's some discussion here with other 20 witnesses about it being tentative and about seeking the 21 advice of an outside Crown -- but with respect to you, you're being written to -- it's the exhibit before, Exhibit 22 23 300. 24 "It's my understanding after our

conversation, your office does not

1	prosecute without the full cooperation
2	of the victim."
3	And, of course, he's sending you not the
4	civil not the release document itself, just this
5	direction that he doesn't want to proceed and you're saying
6	it is our policy not to compel.
7	If you had known about the illegal provision
8	in the settlement, you would have said something
9	differently about that policy not to compel as well?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, that's not Luc Brunet's
11	fault for not telling me. You should presume that I should
12	have told Luc to ask for it. I didn't ask for it because
13	you will recall my evidence from yesterday.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. He didn't have it
15	and you didn't have it?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: And I'm suggesting that this
18	policy about victims would have been different if you'd
19	known?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
22	MR. MacDONALD: I'd be writing to the Law
23	Society instead of to Luc Brunet.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, one question before
25	we leave.

1	Did you say that:
2	"by the fact that he has evidently
3	used this threat of criminal
4	prosecution as a means of furthering
5	his efforts to gain monetary
6	settlement."
7	Isn't that a criminal act?
8	MR. MacDONALD: No. I mean, if he has an
9	ulterior motive and then that's to use the criminal case
10	for extra heat on the civil action. I mean, are you
11	referring to obstruction of justice, sir? I didn't I
12	don't think that it may or may not be, but I don't think
13	that that's dispositive (sic) of an act of using leverage
14	alone, I don't think it would constitute a it's it
15	would cause me to hold my nose, but I don't think that I
16	could go to trial before Your Honour with with just
17	that.
18	I'd need an admission from him that of his
19	intention to to lead the police astray and I didn't have
20	any of that. I just had Heidi and Luc and I held the
21	view that maybe we'd been taken for a patsy or maybe this
22	poor man had just decided that he had enough with the whole
23	thing.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you. Let's
25	take a break.

1	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
2	veuillez vous lever.
3	This hearing will resume at 11:30 a.m.
4	Upon recessing at 11:12 a.m./
5	L'audience est suspendue à 11h12
6	Upon resuming at 11:31 a.m./
7	L'audience est reprise à 11h31
8	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
9	veuillez vous lever.
10	This hearing is now resumed, please be
11	seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Go ahead, Mr. Engelmann.
13	MURRAY MACDONALD, Resumed/Sous le même serment:
14	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR.
15	<pre>ENGELMANN (cont'd/suite):</pre>
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. MacDonald, before the
17	break, you mentioned a reference to Staff Sergeant
18	Derochie's notes. I thought I'd take you there if I could.
19	MR. MacDONALD: Okay.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: It is Exhibit 1293 and it
21	may be in the binder with your no? The Clerk is shaking
22	her head. We're going to have to pull out another one.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Okay.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: The Bates page reference
25	that I believe you were referring to, sir, is 7113426. It

1	is also page 54 of his handwritten notes.
2	MR. MacDONALD: I was trying to I brought
3	it up in the context of trying to apologize to him for
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, we'll just take a look
5	at it.
6	THE REGISTRAR: Bates page is?
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Sorry, the Bates page is
8	THE REGISTRAR: The exhibit?
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Exhibit is 1293. Document
10	Number is 728438.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: And what page?
12	THE REGISTRAR: Bates page last three
13	digits, please?
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Four two six (426).
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: So if we have a look at it,
17	sir, it says this is by the way, the context is he's
18	having a meeting with then-Chief Shaver. The note is
19	November 4^{th} but it's actually from earlier in October. And
20	he says:
21	"The Chief again informed me that the
22	Crown, Murray MacDonald, had not been
23	fully informed when he gave an opinion
24	to Sebalj on proceeding with charges
25	against the wishes of the victim. He

1	did not know that other victims of
2	Father MacDonald had been located. The
3	Chief has since confirmed that the
4	Crown's advice may have been different
5	if he had possessed all information."
6	So apparently this is the Chief
7	communicating to Staff Sergeant Derochie his conversations
8	or conversation with you.
9	MR. MacDONALD: Right, yeah.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So do you recall
11	having a conversation, not with Staff Sergeant Derochie but
12	with Chief Shaver?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I do, yeah.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you recall telling
15	Chief Shaver that your advice might have been different if
16	you had possessed all information?
17	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall but I might
18	have said that, yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
20	MR. MacDONALD: I wouldn't be surprised if I
21	did.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And we know that
23	you were not fully informed.
24	MR. MacDONALD: Not in all the details, no.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, with respect to

1	MR. MacDONALD: I never asked Heidi to, you
2	know, itemize for me every detail. I did not ask her for a
3	report you know, an Occurrence Report or something.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
5	MS. McINTOSH: Mr. Commissioner, I just I
6	don't know if the witness's attention was drawn, and I
7	apologize for I was still getting organized to the
8	portion of the statement where it says:
9	"an opinion on proceeding with
10	charges against the wishes of the
11	victim."
12	So I just wanted to make sure that the
13	witness had his attention drawn to that part.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: I can assure my friend I
15	read the full paragraph.
16	Mr. MacDonald, I understand that you had a
17	number of contacts with several individuals in the fall of
18	1993 about this matter, after your letter of September $14^{\rm th}$;
19	correct?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: And they include, for
22	example, Chief Shaver. You would have met with him?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Cornwall Police personnel,
24	yes.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. You would have met

1	with Perry Dunlop?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: You might have met with
4	Staff Sergeant Lortie?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: So we'll get into some of
7	those interviews in just a minute, but what I wanted to ask
8	you first was I understand that there was an issue about
9	consulting an outside Crown, and it's referenced in
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: in your statement.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: It's also referenced in
14	other people's notes.
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And, as I understand it,
17	there was an issue of a possible conflict or perceived
18	conflict, and I just want to explore that a little bit with
19	you.
20	MR. MacDONALD: Okay.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Because it appears that you
22	spoke, at some point between February when you find out
23	about this '93 and September $14^{\rm th}$, '93 when you write
24	your letter, you spoke to another Crown attorney by the
25	name of Robert Pelletier.

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: And you either met him
3	somewhere or you contacted him to advise him about this
4	case?
5	MR. MacDONALD: I think we spoke at the
6	Spring Education Conference, the Crown attorneys' Spring
7	Education Conference.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: And your reason for
9	contacting him about this matter, what would that have
10	been?
11	MR. MacDONALD: To let him know that if the
12	police developed a case, charges against the priest, that I
13	would have him review the case for, I guess what we would
14	today call prospect of conviction.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: And did you explain to him
16	why you would want him to do that?
17	MR. MacDONALD: I don't I just know it
18	was a very brief from my recollection it was a very
19	brief heads-up, "By the way, I may send you something."
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
21	MR. MacDONALD: "Yeah, whatever. Thanks a
22	lot. Have a" you know, "How about those Canadiens?"
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. You would not have
24	told him anything about work you might have done on a
25	Diocesan committee?

1	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: What was your perceived -
3	- why did you say that?
4	MR. MacDONALD: About a Diocesan committee?
5	THE COMMISSIONER: No. Why did you think
6	you might have to send it over to him?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Because if it was coming to
8	charge I I didn't I just wanted to give him as much
9	heads-up as I could, I guess.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, no, no. Never
11	mind that. What was the reason for your conflict?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Oh. I didn't have a
13	conflict. I don't know if I used the word "conflict." I
14	didn't have a legal conflict but I was concerned about an
15	appearance of bias by me.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Well, whether
17	it's a real conflict or whether it's real bias or a
18	perception of bias, what was your concern? Why another
19	Crown?
20	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't I was concerned
21	that if I took on a case, especially if it was of a sort
22	of a high-profile member of the community, and it appeared
23	that I was witch-hunting, that it would cast on me
24	personally and on the Crown Attorney's Office an appearance
25	of witch-hunting.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Why would there be any
2	appearance of witch-hunting if you're prosecuting a priest?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Because two and a half years
4	ago, or a year and a half prior to that, I guess, I had
5	recommended on a committee that I was sitting on, a
6	volunteer committee with the Diocese, to do exactly the
7	opposite of what the Church did in this instance.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. So can you just very
9	briefly give us a sense as to you were on a community
10	advisory committee? Is that correct?
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Just a minute.
12	MS. LEVESQUE: Mr. Commissioner, I object to
13	questions being asked of what recommendation I assume
14	Commission counsel will want to ask questions of the
15	witness as to what recommendations were done as a result of
16	sitting on the a Diocese committee. Our clients were
17	not asked any questions regarding this committee when they
18	testified here.
19	Commission counsel was aware of the document
20	or the recommendations and my position is that it's unfair
21	as our clients were never asked any questions when they
22	testified here
23	THE COMMISSIONER: So
24	MS. LEVESQUE: regarding
25	recommendations.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Regarding
2	recommendations?
3	MS. LEVESQUE: From a committee which this
4	witness would have sat on.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: And would this be
6	controversial?
7	MS. LEVESQUE: Possibly.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Possibly. Mr. Engelmann?
9	MR. ENGELMANN: This appears to be a
10	we've had these comments before. I just want to repeat
11	this is not a trial. It's not an adversarial process.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: I believe this is a
14	reference to Browne v. Dunn or perhaps a backhand reference
15	to it. I'm asking the witness what he did. I mean this
16	can be addressed in submissions if necessary. I don't
17	actually understand, quite frankly, the objection right now
18	other than I didn't, I guess, put it or we didn't,
19	counsel team, put it to a Diocese witness whether Murray
20	MacDonald was on a committee and whether or not the
21	committee made recommendations.
22	I certainly didn't think this was
23	controversial but I'll let my friend speak more if she
24	wishes.
25	MS. LEVESQUE: The evidence was not

1	canvassed with our clients when they testified here,
2	although Commission counsel were aware of the document and
3	its recommendations.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, you see, I don't
5	know
6	MS. LEVESQUE: It's unfair that we have not
7	had an opportunity to respond.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Unfair?
9	MS. LEVESQUE: Commission counsel, I
10	suspect, is going to lead viva voce evidence regarding
11	recommendations that were made by this witness.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, no. Well, maybe.
13	I think what we're looking at really is not for necessarily
14	the truth of its contents but how it affected his mind and
15	how he perceived it as a conflict for him to continue on in
16	a criminal case.
17	MS. LEVESQUE: If it relates only to the
18	conflict then that's appropriate.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I think that's
20	where we're at.
21	MS. LEVESQUE: But if any evidence is to be
22	led regarding recommendations that were made, then
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, fine, thank you.
24	Go ahead, Mr. Engelmann.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Why don't we just see where

l	this goes? I'm not intending to put a document in with
2	respect to this, if that's my friend's concern. There were
3	some documents in the list but
4	MR. MacDONALD: The document you showed me
5	wasn't my document either.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, all I'm trying to
7	understand is and I think the Commissioner asked you a
8	question as well is why you thought your work on a
9	Diocesan was it a committee or a subcommittee?
10	MR. MacDONALD: It was I think it was a -
11	- be fair to describe it as a subcommittee of Ecclesia
12	2000, which was a pre-Y2K review of a number of Diocesan
13	and Canadian Catholic Church practices. I was called upon,
14	not for my legal advice, but I was asked by my parish
15	priest if he was trying to round up some folks who he
16	thought could give meaningful or different you know,
17	different insights and contexts, and so he asked my spouse
18	and I to sit on committees. She sat on one; I sat on
19	another subcommittee.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So what is the
21	issue with respect to your involvement? What were you
22	concerned about or what did you do?
23	MR. MacDONALD: I was concerned that the
24	Church would have the impression that I was leading the
25	charge or advocating a position that I had commented on and

l	was and had recommended it was not adopted at Ecclesia
2	2000. I didn't want to be perceived as a witch-hunter.
3	I didn't want the Ministry division to be
4	encumbered by that potential appearance of bias, so I would
5	have, at the point where police had a charge I would
6	have asked another Crown Attorney, and I thought Bob
7	Pelletier, given Alfred and his knowledge of the operations
8	of the institution of the Church, would be the best Crown
9	to go to for that.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So this is
11	somewhat cryptic. I'm just trying to understand. You
12	MR. MacDONALD: Can I tell you about the
13	MR. ENGELMANN: You were taking a position
14	that was contrary to a Canada-wide position by the Catholic
15	Church or a local Diocese position?
16	MR. MacDONALD: I thought it was a local
17	Diocese position.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
19	MR. MacDONALD: I don't want to be cryptic.
20	I just didn't want to go any further than perhaps I'm
21	allowed to, but I will elaborate if you wish, sir.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Maybe I can help you out
23	here.
24	If I understand you correctly, what you're
25	saying is, "Look, this committee took a position with

1	respect to civil settlements with respect to abuse
2	victims", that you were in the minority on?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Well, the subcommittee made
4	a recommendation and when it got to the day of vote
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
6	MR. MacDONALD: that recommendation was
7	not on the ballot.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, so, and that
9	recommendation generally dealt with victims of sexual abuse
10	and civil settlements, generally speaking?
11	MR. MacDONALD: It dealt with the primary
12	in the context of, you know, the greater public interest as
13	this is just I'm not giving a legal opinion now. I'm
14	just giving a
15	MR. ENGELMANN: No, just your personal view.
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, and I thought that it
17	was concern for the public's impression of shuffling people
18	off in the dark of the night that we should very much show
19	we as Catholics should very much show the public that we
20	were being what's the word I'm looking for?
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Open, transparent?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Transparent.
23	And therefore the recommendation was allow
24	the police cooperate with and allow the police
25	investigation to transpire at the outset.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, and so because of
3	that, you were afraid or concerned that the Diocese would
4	say, "Well, look at him now. He's taken one of our poor
5	priests and he's getting back at us by, instead of
6	prosecuting, persecuting."
7	MR. MacDONALD: Well, yeah. "This man and
8	his personal" well, they would have mixed up my
9	professional and personal opinions
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.
11	MR. MacDONALD: potentially and said,
12	"This man has already advocated that
13	the police investigation/Crown should
14	trump other proceedings and, therefore,
15	he is biased and he's already in
16	writing confirmed this bias by way of
17	signing that".
18	And, frankly, not only did I was a
19	signatory, I was the main mover on our subcommittee when it
20	came to that particular recommendation that we sent off.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So this was
22	something you were outspoken on and you thought might be
23	known.
24	MR. MacDONALD: I felt very strongly about
25	it and when it didn't make the ballot, my spouse and I

1	walked out of the session.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: And how did you think this
3	would how did you think this would possibly impact your
4	prosecution or your office's prosecution of a case?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Appearance of bias.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, and that this could be
7	raised by a defence counsel or
8	MR. MacDONALD: There are certain counsel in
9	the room who would have had a field day with that point.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
11	MR. MacDONALD: Certain counsel in this
12	room. Names are not important.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Okay.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Ms. McIntosh would never
15	do that to you.
16	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
17	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
18	And this concern about wanting transparency
19	so presumably you wanted any settlements to be
20	transparent, not have gag orders or confidentiality
21	provisions?
22	MR. MacDONALD: The lawyer in me knew that
23	it was lawful.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
25	MR. MacDONALD: The citizen in me, the

1	moralist in me I'm not the most moralist person in the
2	world, don't get me wrong but at least on that point I
3	was offended at a philosophical level. Even though the
4	lawyer in me said I know it's allowed, I just didn't think
5	it was a wise thing to do.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: And you talk about this a
7	little bit in your statement to the OPP, if we could look
8	at it briefly. It's 1233.
9	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: I'll just be a moment, sir.
11	MR. MacDONALD: This is the '94 statement?
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, it's your statement in
13	July of '94. It starts at Bates page 851 which is page 17.
14	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: And is this what you refer
16	to, the middle of the page where you talk about "Ecclesia
17	2000 paper"?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: And you claim you expressed
20	a bad taste for certain types of settlements.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Well, yes. It's there,
22	yeah.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah, okay.
24	And, sir, then you go on and you say at the
25	following page

1	MR. MacDONALD: Bates 5 852?
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah, 852:
3	"I told her"
4	And I believe that's Ms. Sebalj, Constable
5	Sebalj:
6	"that I sat on the committee, that I
7	wanted to cover my tail if this case
8	went to a trial or went to charge, if
9	it went to trial and if I prosecuted,
10	I'd want an outside Crown to confirm
11	the charge or review the charge after
12	it was laid or it was about to be laid
13	with the officer."
14	MR. MacDONALD: I told her there was a
15	potential for bias and that's why I'd farm it out. I don't
16	know what words I used. I may have used those words or
17	at any rate, I relayed to her the concern for bias. She
18	knew it and Luc Brunet knew it too.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: So I guess my question
20	is, you have an honest belief that there is a maybe a
21	bias, an appearance of bias. Why did you get involved in
22	this file at all? Why didn't you give it either to
23	Mr. Simard in your office or farm it out right away and
24	wash your hands of it, so to speak?
25	MR. MacDONALD: The concern about giving

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

advice to the police didn't relate to the bias. I was simply waiting to turn it over -- I mean, our office may well have even prosecuted the case ultimately. I don't know that the bias -- once Bob Pelletier had reviewed the prospect of conviction, if I can use the current term.

102

THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.

MR. MacDONALD: But I saw no difficulty with assisting in the investigation. Who would possibly suggest -- in my mind, the last thing that I ever expected, if I can refer back to the strychnine in the pies analogy, is that for anybody would think that I was going easy on the Church.

THE COMMISSIONER: No, but the Church may still say, "Look, who was working in the background of all of this was this Crown Attorney, and he worked directly with the police to make sure that the charges were going to get laid".

MR. MacDONALD: Help with the investigation. I didn't see that as the same as the Crown taking carriage of the file after we had it in our shop and I had to apply, you know, discretion on decisions about prosecuting it. I wasn't deciding on whether or not to prosecute it. I was assisting on seeing if there's enough evidence for the police to make that decision.

THE COMMISSIONER: And you don't see ---

1	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't I didn't I
2	don't think I don't think that they would have had much
3	hay to make when it came to counsel, like some of whom in
4	this room would say, "The Crown has a bias."
5	Well, you know, an independent Crown,
6	Robert Bob Pelletier, reviewed the matter and said RPGs
7	were there. I mean, I didn't invent any of the I didn't
8	invent any evidence or suggest to Heidi that she do so.
9	I don't think that they can really criticize
10	a Crown attorney for before we send files out on
11	potential bias or other issues conflict or bias or
12	whatever Crowns oftentimes have to do the initial, you
13	know, stick-handling to get it to the point where a file
14	can be created, and that that's what I perceived to be
15	doing, and I don't think that my colleagues in the criminal
16	Bar would have had a much hay to make with that point.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: But, if they'd known about
18	your involvement in the pre-charge issues, and, in fact, in
19	this case your involvement, really, in investigative steps,
20	would you not be concerned whether it's pre- or post-
21	charge, that this might be an issue?
22	MR. MacDONALD: No, it's very I see it as
23	radically different, pre- and post-charge.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: And this concern about
25	transparency and openness, just to look back to Exhibit 301

1	for a minute, which is your letter of September $14^{\rm th}$, I mean
2	you're certainly, at this point and I realize you don't
3	have complete facts but are very negative about Mr.
4	Silmser
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: and his, you know,
7	getting this monetary settlement. If you were concerned
8	about transparency in the Church getting involved in these
9	issues, to avoid full police work or prosecution, why are
10	you not also negative towards the Diocese? Why is it
11	all this seems to all be directed towards the
12	complainant.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Well, we're talking about
14	evidence collection here, and in the last paragraph $\mathrm{I'm}$
15	referring to the fact that Luc and Heidi couldn't
16	articulate RPGs, and that spin on it was partially caused
17	by not knowing all those details that you earlier, before
18	the recess, laid out, but it was also coloured by my desire
19	to give Luc a solid CYA letter.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Now, sir, your
21	intention with Mr. Pelletier; was he to review the case
22	prior to a charge being laid, that he would be the Crown to
23	recommend a charge, or advise the police about laying a
24	charge, or only review the case after a charge is laid?

MR. MacDONALD: I don't know, after or

1	before the Information is laid was not that important. It
2	was when the police determined that they had RPGs and were
3	either about to swear an Information, or had sworn the
4	Information.
5	It was at the point where, you know, Luc and
6	Heidi, or whomever, had said, "We think we've got enough;
7	we're ready to go. We're ready to lay the charge now."
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Is it possible, sir, you're
9	mistaken on this, and that, really, the referral to the
10	outside Crown was for an opinion as to whether or not RP&G
11	existed, or whether or not a charge should be laid?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Well, the Crown doesn't
13	determine RPGs; the officers do.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: No, but often and we've
15	seen it in this case, often the officers are seeking some
16	confirmation, particularly if there's some tentativeness
17	or
18	MR. MacDONALD: There was never any
19	tentativeness about RPGs on this file.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: So it's your evidence then
21	that Mr. Pelletier wasn't to be consulted about whether a
22	charge was to be laid, or whether there were RP&Gs?
23	MR. MacDONALD: I don't know what Bob
24	thought, but I can tell you that there was no there was
25	never any question about RPGs.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: The only reason I ask is,
2	there is something from him and there's something in
3	Sebalj's notes which would almost indicate that it was to
4	be sent out for a review on the RP&G issue, about whether
5	charges should be laid.
6	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I'm not I'm not
7	sure about what Bob says on the point.
8	In fairness to Heidi, the delineation
9	between, you know, the concept of prospective conviction
10	and the Crown exercising its discretion on a case that is
11	at the threshold of proceeding or has just been laid, is
12	something that I'm I probably didn't articulate as
13	clearly as and fundamentally as I could have and so, you
14	know, I don't recall what Heidi's references to it, but
15	I asked Luc and Heidi on a number of occasions, and
16	we and they agreed, and I didn't have any subjective
17	reason to disagree, that they weren't even near RPGs.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, we don't have
19	Ms. Sebalj here to ask, but
20	MR. MacDONALD: Didn't you ask Luc Brunet?
21	MR. ENGELMANN: He was here as a witness,
22	sir.
23	I'd like to show you a document from
24	Mr. Pelletier, if I can, and it was in your materials, but
25	it's not addressed to you, so, if you've seen it, it's only

1	recently, I'm sure.
2	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: It's Document Number 110261.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: It's a new one, sir.
5	MR. MacDONALD: Okay, thank you.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: This is a letter from
7	Mr. Pelletier, dated September $15^{\rm th}$, 1994, to Detective
8	Inspector Smith.
9	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Exhibit 2921
11	is a letter dated September 15 th , 1994, addressed to
12	Detective Inspector Tim Smith from Robert Pelletier, Crown
13	attorney.
14	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-2921:
15	(110261) - Letter from Robert Pelletier to
16	Tim Smith re: Investigation concerning
17	Father Charles MacDonald dated 15 September
18	94
19	MR. ENGELMANN: So, very briefly, if we can,
20	he states that in the summer of 1993 he was contacted by
21	you in relation to this matter?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: You agree with that?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, that's right.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.

1	MR. MacDONALD: I thought it was May,
2	but
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
4	MR. MacDONALD: I think I think I'm
5	right and he's wrong, but whatever.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Well, whether
7	it's May or June
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: you have a discussion
10	with him?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: In the second paragraph he
13	says he's informed that the investigation was being
14	conducted concerning Father MacDonald:
15	"and that it may become necessary at
16	some point for me to review the matter
17	with a view to determining if charges
18	should be laid."
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. That was what we now
20	just call describe as a "prospect of conviction
21	analysis."
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, sir, I thought there
23	were two steps: One is whether or not a charge should be
24	laid
25	MR. MacDONALD: No, there's RPGs

1	MR. ENGELMANN: and that's RP&G
2	MR. MacDONALD: at the police
3	discretion.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: and then whether or not
5	it should be proceed, actually, is the Crown's, and that
6	RPC?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: And that's something that
9	comes out in '95 or thereabouts?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Right. If it should be
11	laid, I don't believe he well, I'll let him answer that.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
13	MR. MacDONALD: I think that it thatI
14	thought that I relayed that message to him.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, that's how he's
16	setting it out to Detective Inspector Smith, you agree?
17	But you may not share that view, is what you're saying.
18	MR. MacDONALD: No, I may have caused him to
19	think that, though.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. He then says:
21	"I was informed by Murray MacDonald at
22	this time that he felt he may possibly
23	be in a position of conflict of
24	interest."
25	That's why I used that term, sir,

1	because
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: whether it's perception,
4	bias, or conflict of interest, I think we're talking about
5	the same thing.
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. I think legally I
7	think legally it's "bias." Bias has a much broader
8	perspective than
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
10	MR. MacDONALD: than conflict, you know,
11	as between counsel and former clients, and current clients.
12	
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And, fourthly,
14	he says:
15	"I'm given to understand that
16	eventually charges were never laid."
17	And he's writing of course we know
18	charges are laid, but that's much later
19	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: in '96? And then he
21	says:
22	"I was never consulted by the
23	investigators in this matter."
24	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right? So with the

1	exception of pernaps a disagreement on the part of
2	paragraph 2, you agree with that?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Sir, then going
5	back to Officer Sebalj's note, the dedicated note, just
6	right near the back, Bates page 835.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Can I can I have the
8	MR. ENGELMANN: It's Exhibit 295, sir.
9	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: About three or four pages
11	from the back, and we've looked at this page before; it's
12	835.
13	This is August $23^{\rm rd}$. She gets a call from
14	Malcolm MacDonald and she also gets a call from
15	Mr. Silmser, and she's advising Mr. Silmser she's
16	he's requesting a progress report:
17	"Advised simply awaiting meeting with
18	out-of-town Crown to review."
19	So at least from the note, she appears to be
20	indicating to Mr. Silmser that she's waiting for an
21	external Crown.
22	MR. MacDONALD: She never asked she never
23	asked for one. It's news to me, but I have a theory as to
24	why she wrote that.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. You're telling

1	us that she never asked you to set up a meeting for her
2	with
3	MR. MacDONALD: No.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Bob Pelletier?
5	MR. MacDONALD: No.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Or anyone else, an outside
7	Crown?
8	MR. MacDONALD: No. No.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, that's apparently what
10	she says in her notes she was going to do.
11	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I think that's what
12	she told Mr. Silmser.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. But that wasn't
14	true?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I think she may have
16	wanted to I have a theory that she was trying to relay
17	to him that she was still supportive of the investigation
18	or of him or something, but she you know, she never
19	asked for an outside ground because they were still the
20	investigative stage clearly in her mind, as in Luc's.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Then, sir, if we can look
22	briefly at Exhibit 1219, which I hope is in the binder with
23	your OPP statement, 1233.
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, thank you 1219.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: These are notes of Staff

1	Sergeant Brunet. And perhaps you didn't want to tell Mr.
2	Silmser the full truth, but here this is to her supervisor.
3	She's saying on this date and this is August 24^{th} , the
4	day after:
5	"I had a follow-up interview with
6	Constable Sebalj to the interview of
7	June 29^{th} . She was questioned as to her
8	evaluation which she still had. It was
9	made by Staff Inspector McDonald. She
10	was asked about the status of the David
11	Silmser investigation. She advised
12	that she is waiting for the Crown
13	Attorney's office to get back to her.
14	Mr. MacDonald is trying to get her an
15	outside Crown Attorney that she can
16	meet."
17	So she seems to be saying the same thing to
18	David Silmser as she's saying to her boss
19	MR. MacDONALD: M'hm.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: that you're setting this
21	up for her.
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, that's she hadn't
23	asked me for an outside Crown.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Could it be that she took

I	it from your perceived conflict that that's what you were
2	going to do?
3	MR. MacDONALD: I told her that an outside
4	Crown would be ready when we needed one. You know, I
5	believe, sir, that message was clear in her mind. So I'm
6	not really sure maybe I'm wrong in terms of perceptions,
7	but it was only left at I'll you know, when the time
8	comes I'm going to have an outside Crown because of that
9	concern for bias.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: There's another reference,
11	sir, and it's in I think it might be in the same binder.
12	It's Exhibit 1242. Counsel, it's Document Number 715433.
13	And this is a brief interview that Constable
14	Sebalj has with I think it's Officer Fagan. Yes, I believe
15	it's an OPP officer on June 14 th , '94; I believe it's
16	Constable Fagan, Detective Constable Fagan.
17	And there's just it's just a page and a
18	bit but on the first page:
19	"When I was getting close to the end of
20	the investigation, I spoke with Crown
21	MacDonald. He told me he had a
22	conflict but did not expand upon it.
23	He wanted to be kept up-to-speed and
24	indicated when it came down to a final
25	review and decision, an outside Crown

1	would be contacted but I never spoke to
2	an outside Crown."
3	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: So, again, there appears to
5	be, at least from Mr. Pelletier, Ms. Sebalj, Mr. Brunet,
6	this common view that an outside Crown is going to be
7	consulted on this matter for the final review because of an
8	apparent conflict on your part, and we know there was never
9	an opinion given by an outside Crown.
10	MR. MacDONALD: Right. It the prospect
11	of conviction analysis was never reached as we would now
12	describe it.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: But, sir, it appears they're
14	looking at pre-charge review.
15	MR. MacDONALD: They didn't need any advice
16	on RPGs. Also, it wasn't late in the investigation that
17	she spoke to me and that I spoke to her about a potential
18	bias or conflict, whatever language I used, it was early in
19	the investigation.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: So she's mistaken on that?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
23	MR. MacDONALD: And she had a lot this
24	was, I'm sure, you know well, anyway, it must have been
25	a difficult time for her and if there's a combination of my

1	not clearly articulating the reason for my perceived bias
2	that, you know, that's my fault, that's not Heidi's.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: But just in retrospect, sir,
4	would you agree it would have been prudent, given your own
5	concerns about perception bias for the reasons you've
6	indicated, that perhaps it should have been an outside
7	Crown looking at this?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I didn't anticipate
9	that Perry Dunlop would commence a conspiracy allegation
10	that you know, the clan of paedophiles and all that.
11	The last thing I ever expected is any lawyer or officer or
12	otherwise would suggest that I was trying to cover up for
13	the priest.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And I understand that, but
15	just quite aside from that, let's assume that had never
16	happened and that this had proceeded to charge.
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Your concern about this
19	being raised, wouldn't it have been better just to have
20	someone else look at it?
21	MR. MacDONALD: I had to you know, that's
22	a 20/20 vision piece that I don't know is fair to leave
23	that simply, Mr. Engelmann, because I'm the local Crown who
24	His Honour had mentioned earlier why didn't Guy take it.
25	Guy was in the midst of a tricky homicide case and he was

1	likewise in court four and five days a week like I was. I
2	was the senior Crown. This was a potentially, you know, a
3	significant case. It wasn't a shoplift case.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: No.
5	MR. MacDONALD: So I thought it appropriate
6	to continue managing it until such a time as a Crown's
7	opinion was discretion was required. And what little
8	discretion I had at that point was to decide exercise my
9	discretion in trying to help Heidi, which, as I say, in
10	retrospect I should have turned it over to Luc a lot
11	sooner.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
13	Sir, let's go back to some of the people
14	that you would have met with then. We've heard that you
15	may have met with a Perry Dunlop.
16	MR. MacDONALD: I did.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: And I believe the date is
18	September 29 th , 1993. And do you recall
19	MR. MacDONALD: I'm not sure.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Well, that's a
21	date certainly that's been indicated by it's certainly
22	in his will state.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I would say it was
24	late September.

117

MR. ENGELMANN: Late September. Fair

1	enough.
2	And you talk about it in your OPP statement,
3	Exhibit 1233
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: at Bates page 892.
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you recall where you
8	met with him?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, it was at the the
10	back room is at the courthouse. It's a pejorative phrase.
11	It was in the Crown's room at the fourth floor. I better
12	not refer to it as a back room. It's got a
13	MR. ENGELMANN: What you're indicating on
14	the screen about a third of the way down:
15	"Court during recess, back room, 340
16	Pitt Street."
17	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And you've described
19	it as sort of a chance meeting. Do you not was there a
20	possibility he might have called you the day before to set
21	this up?
22	MR. MacDONALD: No, if he called, I didn't
23	get any message from him. I didn't speak to him.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
25	MR. MacDONALD: I can't say he didn't call

1	my office but I can tell you that he came up it was a
2	complete surprise to me when he came up and raised this
3	case.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And you've set out, sir, in
5	the OPP interview, to the best of your ability no doubt at
6	the time, what would have been discussed?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Engelmann, will you
10	be covering what relationship or non-relationship these two
11	had?
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, I'm going there.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And it comes up in Mr.
15	Dunlop's will state that I'm about to go to, sir.
16	So you say that he brings up concerns about
17	a cover-up downstairs, presumably meaning at the Cornwall
18	Police Service?
19	MR. MacDONALD: He was concerned about the
20	skill of Heidi's investigative techniques combined with the
21	senior management or the Chief. I can't say he quoted the
22	Chief, but that's my impression from his concerns
23	articulated to me, was that the senior management knew it
24	wasn't properly investigated and appeared to be he
25	thought that they were trying to cover that fact, that it

1	wasn't properly investigated.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
3	And you're also indicating here that some
4	procedures that were done that were inappropriate, the
5	inputting into the computer, they didn't put it under the
6	normal entry system, things of that nature.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Well, that's how he started.
8	He said, "I found something hidden away in the projects
9	file" I think they called it back then.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And you're also
11	saying, sir, at the bottom of the page, that you stopped
12	him. Then you said:
13	"Wait a second, if you're suggesting
14	some kind of cover-up, the Chief is
15	aware of the allegation".
16	MR. MacDONALD: That I was aware of the
17	allegation?
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, you're saying, I'm
19	aware of it, the Chief is aware of it, there's no cover-up.
20	I'm looking at the top of the next page.
21	MR. MacDONALD: He wanted me, the Crown, to
22	know that a case had been investigated and that the Crown's
23	office was not privy to this.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
25	MR. MacDONALD: And I told him I knew about

1	it, and I guess I must have referred to the Chief. I don't
2	recall.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. And you did have a
4	personal relationship with Mr. Dunlop.
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I would say I did,
6	yeah.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: You hunted together.
8	MR. MacDONALD: He was, at the time, a
9	colleague of my brother-in-law, Randy Millar, who you know.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
11	MR. MacDONALD: And Randy invited him to
12	join our deer gang and he did so for a couple of years, and
13	I knew him to be a very keen sort of a gung-ho detective
14	as well as a very comical guy in the deer gang.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And he was
16	coming to you to express concerns about a cover-up and he
17	wanted you to know about it. He didn't think you were
18	aware of it.
19	MR. MacDONALD: He didn't think the Crown
20	had any clue about it. So I said that's when I directed
21	him to Luc.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And he knew your
23	brother-in-law Randy Millar because they had been on joint
24	taskforce work together?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, they either were at

1	the time or had been.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. All right. And
3	your involvement with Mr. Dunlop socially, was it only the
4	fall hunting trip or were there other
5	MR. MacDONALD: No, it
6	MR. ENGELMANN: occasions where you'd
7	get together?
8	MR. MacDONALD: It was those two occasions,
9	and we would professionally bump into one another in the
10	proverbial fourth floor Crown room regularly, and I knew
11	him to be a sort of a gung-ho investigator as well as a
12	quick wit.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And did you know
14	that he was a local musician as well?
15	MR. MacDONALD: I think I did.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. You didn't go to
17	
18	MR. MacDONALD: No.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: any concerts that he
20	would have put on?
21	MR. MacDONALD: No.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
23	MR. MacDONALD: No.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, he prepared a
25	Will-State in early 2000, and he set out in some detail his

1	meeting with you, and I just want to take you there if I
2	can.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And that's Exhibit 579.
5	It's Document Number 728943, and the Bates page that sets
6	out the meeting
7	MR. MacDONALD: Can you bring it up on the
8	screen, too?
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah, we'll put it up on the
10	screen in just a minute. Madam Clerk is just going to get
11	you the hard copy and then she'll pop it up on the screen.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you. The tab?
13	MR. ENGELMANN: It's
14	MR. MacDONALD: Oops, sorry.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: page 10 of 110. Madam
16	Clerk, the
17	MR. MacDONALD: What's the Bates number?
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Bates page number 911. So
19	the full Bates page is 711
20	MR. MacDONALD: No, got it, thank you.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: 4911. I'm just giving
22	that to the Clerk. You have it on the screen as well, sir.
23	And he says at paragraph numbered paragraph 20 that:
24	"On September 29th, '93, I met with
25	Senior Crown Attorney Murray MacDonald

1	and showed him the DS statement."
2	Now, do you recall him having a copy of the
3	statement with him, the handwritten statement that you had
4	seen earlier?
5	MR. MacDONALD: I believe he did.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. Now, he says:
7	"I called him the previous evening at
8	his residence"
9	MR. MacDONALD: That's not true.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: "requesting a meeting
11	with him. I considered Murray a
12	friend. Along with dealing with him as
13	a police officer, we also hunted and
14	socialized on occasion."
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah. He didn't phone me at
16	home the night before.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, so you say that
18	you didn't get a call the evening before.
19	MR. MacDONALD: I was surprised when he came
20	in with this statement and this concern. I was it was
21	totally a total surprise to me.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So again, when
23	he says in the next paragraph:
24	"Murray told me to meet him on the
25	fourth floor of the Justice Building,

1	the same building that houses our
2	police station."
3	That you're saying that was a chance
4	encounter.
5	MR. MacDONALD: That's either an egregious
6	error or a bold-faced lie.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. He says:
8	"This is not the regular Crown's
9	office, but an office that is used by
10	the Crown when attending court."
11	That's correct?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And:
14	"He attended with a copy of the
15	victim statement, placed it on Murray's
16	desk, went through the allegations that
17	were made in the statement, along with
18	the names that were mentioned of
19	suspected pedestrian files."
20	MR. MacDONALD: We didn't he waved the
21	statement at me. I don't know if it was the first one or
22	the Ronnie Lefebvre/Kevin Malloy one. He had a statement
23	in front of him, and I said I stopped him and I said, "I
24	know about it." He was he thought he would read to me
25	for the first time information with respect to this

1	occurrence, and I stopped him and said, "I know about it.
2	There's not a conspiracy, because I'm in on it."
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. He thought you
4	didn't know about it. He thought the Crown's office didn't
5	know.
6	MR. MacDONALD: But he didn't read it to me
7	in detail at all.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: No, he thought
9	MR. MacDONALD: I stopped.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: He thought you didn't know
11	about it.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Right, he thought I didn't
13	know.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
15	MR. MacDONALD: Correct.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And you told him you did.
17	MR. MacDONALD: Correct.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And in fact, he
19	says in the next paragraph:
20	"The Crown attorney informed he was
21	aware of the Father Charles MacDonald
22	allegations"
23	And that's true?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, I stopped him
25	before he read it, I said, "I know about it."

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah. But he then goes on
2	and goes:
3	"but was not aware of the
4	allegation of sexual assault against
5	Ken Seguin."
6	MR. MacDONALD: That's we I don't know
7	I don't recall Ken Seguin's name coming up. I may he
8	may have referred to Seguin, I may and it was a
9	conversation that took about three minutes, so it would
10	have been something or maybe five minutes, so I would
11	have dismissed the Seguin allegations as something I was
12	aware of, too.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, well, he says:
14	"The allegation against Ken Seguin was
15	made in the same statement. I pointed
16	out the exact location in the statement
17	where the allegations against Ken
18	Seguin's sexual assault had been made
19	by the victim."
20	MR. MacDONALD: He didn't
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember that?
22	MR. MacDONALD: He didn't point anything
23	out.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
25	"Murray did not read the

1	statement at this time."
2	And that's true?
3	MR. MacDONALD: That's what I earlier said.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: "He said he had spoken
5	to Malcolm MacDonald, lawyer, former
6	Crown attorney, currently representing
7	Father Charles MacDonald."
8	Now, we know you had spoken to him, but do
9	you recall if you had told Mr. Dunlop that, or Constable
10	Dunlop that?
11	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall. I do recall
12	directing him to Staff Brunet.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And he says:
14	"Malcolm MacDonald indicated to Murray
15	about a week prior to our meeting that
16	the investigation was over and that a
17	settlement had been reached. I find it
18	hard to believe that the Crown was not
19	aware of the allegations against
20	Probation Officer Ken Seguin, as it was
21	mentioned in the victim statement."
22	And you're saying that you were aware.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I didn't elaborate on
24	Seguin other than saying I knew about it.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.

1	MR. MacDONALD: Had I elaborated, of course,
2	I would have said that the complainant didn't want to make
3	allegations at this time against him.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: You were also aware, and
5	you've told us this, that these allegations weren't really
6	set out in that statement, it was just the fact that he had
7	been sexually abused or assaulted by Mr. Seguin, that he
8	didn't go into the detail.
9	MR. MacDONALD: We didn't go into any detail
10	about Seguin.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: No, I'm talking about that
12	handwritten statement. But it's fine, we'll move on.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: He does say at the bottom of
15	the page:
16	"Senior Crown Attorney Murray MacDonald
17	stated to me at our meeting that Staff
18	Sergeant Brunet was on top of this
19	investigation and maybe I should speak
20	to him."
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: And that is true.
23	MR. MacDONALD: That's the key message,
24	that's the take-home message from our meeting.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry, and that was
2	to see Sergeant Brunet?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I urged him to see
4	Sergeant before you anyway right away and yeah.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, sir, I also understand
6	that the following day you met with Chief Claude Shaver on
7	September 20th, 1993. And if you don't recall the date,
8	would it be fair to say that that you would have
9	MR. MacDONALD: Late September.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: met with him shortly
11	after you met with Mr. Dunlop?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, just before or just
13	after I met with Dunlop, I saw Chief Shaver.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, do you recall what
15	you said or what happened at that meeting? And if you want
16	to, you have a reference to this in your OPP statement at
17	1233.
18	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Exhibit 1233.
20	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Bates page is 887, if I've
22	got it right.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Before we go there, did
24	you after Dunlop left, did you phone up Brunet saying,
25	Dunlop is going to come and see you?

1	MR. MacDONALD: I believe I did. I said, I
2	believe, "He's coming down right now and he thinks that
3	there's a conspiracy. Straighten him out, Luc."
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: You've got a reference to
6	this. It's actually starting on Bates page 886.
7	MR. MacDONALD: I don't think I have
8	THE COMMISSIONER: No, I what exhibit are
9	we in?
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Twelve thirty-three (1233).
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Twelve thirty-three
12	(1233), you should
13	MR. MacDONALD: Oh, okay, thank you.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. So now we're going
15	to your conversations with or, no
16	MR.ENGELMANN: With Shaver.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: No.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: And that meeting is on
19	THE COMMISSIONER: The interview
20	MR. ENGELMANN: on September 30th.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: The interview report with
22	Claude Shaver.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Okay, thank you. Can I have
24	the tab number for that?
25	MR. ENGELMANN: I don't know the tab number.

1	It's
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, that's the exhibit
3	number.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Sorry, the Exhibit number's
5	1233.
6	MR. MacDONALD: Okay, thank you.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: And it's page 52 and 53,
8	starting at Bates page 886.
9	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And it appears you're
11	saying at the bottom of the page that you received a
12	telephone call from him?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Bottom of 886?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: "Called me. Said,
17	'Listen, I just heard about the civil
18	settlement reversing the case against
19	Father MacDonald. I think it stinks'.
20	I remember Claude expressing to me he
21	was very sincere, very concerned about
22	seeing that his Police Service did the
23	right thing."
24	Then you say:
25	"I have no criticism about the bona

1	fides of the officers involved, from
2	the constable investigating through to
3	detective sergeant."
4	This is presumably you telling this to
5	Clause Shaver?
6	MR. MacDONALD: I may have said that face-
7	to-face as opposed to over the phone. I don't recall.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
9	"He told me that he did not like my
10	opinion."
11	Rather, he did not like.
12	"The word he got was the Crown is not
13	recommending a prosecution, not
14	recommending a charge. So I explained
15	to him why, reiterated that before you
16	can get to the charge state, whether
17	you've got a reluctant witness or not
18	after charge, the point is your
19	officers didn't even form RPG here. I
20	you don't have RPG, if you have a
21	reluctant complainant, you can't at
22	law you can't go any further. It's an
23	abuse of process. Rather, it's a
24	malicious prosecution."
25	Okay? So this is a recount of some of what

1	you would have told to Chief Shaver?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah. I don't think that it
3	came up connected that way when I actually spoke to Claude
4	Shaver, but that's a very summary recap of it.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: And would you have indicated
6	to him that continuing the investigation because at this
7	point you knew he was angry. He knew there had been this
8	settlement. He was I think he indicated to you, or may
9	have indicated to you, he was going to go off and see the
10	Bishop or see some Church officials.
11	MR. MacDONALD: Or he just may have seen one
12	of them, I'm not sure.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you ever suggest that it
14	would be malicious prosecution if he continued with his
15	investigation or reopened the investigation?
16	MR. MacDONALD: No, I said if he charged
17	somebody without RPGs, it's a malicious prosecution.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
19	And it appears, according to your note on
20	the following page, Bates page 888, about a third of the
21	way down:
22	"He inquired"
23	I presume that's Claude Shaver.
24	"about charging the complainant and I
25	explained to him that there'd have to be,

1	you know, some key evidence on the issue
2	of obstructing justice or public
3	mischief, none of which seemed to exist,
4	at least for in terms of what the police
5	were aware."
6	MR. MacDONALD: I'll just repeat what I
7	mentioned to His Honour before the recess.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, okay. All right.
9	So you recall that being discussed with
10	Claude Shaver as well?
11	MR. MacDONALD: I don't, but I must have.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Wait a minute. So I'll
14	go back.
15	What about launching an you're saying
16	here, "Don't have enough facts, not what we know". What
17	about launching an investigation?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Into obstruct justice?
19	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
20	MR. MacDONALD: I said to him he has a right
21	to seek a civil settlement if he wishes.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
24	And it does say a little later on the next
25	page, top of the page 889:

1	"Likewise, he felt very upset about the
2	Church being involved, doing the end
3	run around the Cornwall Police Service
4	as well."
5	MR. MacDONALD: That was the bulk of our
6	upset that we shared.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, did he ask you he
8	said he was upset about it. Did he ask you about possibly
9	looking at a charge for them or for some officials from the
10	Church?
11	MR. MacDONALD: No. The Church would be
12	would have been entitled to, you know, pursue civil
13	discussions with the complainant.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, but not if those
15	discussions
16	MR. MacDONALD: Not if there was a gag order
17	in place.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, depending on what was
19	in the document itself; correct?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Well, the only thing in the
21	document that would have made it a crime is a prohibition
22	on cooperating with the police.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
24	MR. MacDONALD: And I didn't expect and
25	I'd never seen one, and knew it to be unlawful, and the

1	last thing I expected was for that condition to be there.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, if we could look very
3	briefly at Exhibit 1789, and that's Mr. Shaver's statement
4	to his lawyer that was given to the OPP. It's Exhibit
5	1789, Document Number 715814.
6	The second paragraph from the bottom, first
7	page, Bates page 712, middle of the paragraph:
8	"I met with the Crown on the $30^{\rm th}$ of
9	September, '93 and he explained we
10	could not proceed based on the
11	information at his disposal."
12	And, sir, just to make clear on that, that's
13	proceed with a charge or is that not proceed with any
14	investigation?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Proceed with a charge.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
17	So you did not tell Chief Shaver that the
18	police could not proceed with an investigation or reopen an
19	investigation?
20	MR. MacDONALD: No, I did not. In fairness
21	to Chief Shaver, I would have left him with the impression
22	that there was nowhere to go without a victim.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
24	Sir, I understand you also met with Claude
25	Lortie at some point in the fall of 1993.

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I recall meeting with
2	Claude.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And do you recall
4	approximately when that would have happened or how it was
5	set up?
6	MR. MacDONALD: It was after the meetings
7	with Perry Dunlop and Claude Shaver, and I don't know if it
8	was a question of days or weeks; I don't recall.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Do you recall
10	what it is he wanted to discuss with you about this matter?
11	MR. MacDONALD: He and he was with
12	someone else. It was either Mike Quinn or John Parisien,
13	and I believe that three of them are two or three of
14	them, or two of those three, were members of the Police
15	Association executive at the time.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
17	MR. MacDONALD: And the his meeting with
18	me was a short one because I had the impression that it
19	I was going to be drawn not that I'm suggesting bad
20	faith on Claude's part but I just was not comfortable
21	being drawn into what I thought was a labour management
22	dispute, and so I probably didn't give Claude much
23	direction other than, "Sorry, I'm not in a position to
24	comment".
25	MR. ENGELMANN: When he met with you did he

1	express concerns about Chief Shaver's management of this
2	file?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And when he
5	testified here, he said that he was with Constable Dunlop
6	when he met with you.
7	MR. MacDONALD: I'm certain that's not the
8	case because I never spoke to Perry again after that one
9	meeting that I had with him alone in my in the room at
10	the fourth floor. Perry may have been out in the hall or
11	thereabouts, but I believe Claude to be mistaken. I think
12	I thought it was with one of those other two gentlemen,
13	but it definitely wasn't Perry.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
15	And, sir, when you first learned about the
16	actual content of this settlement and illegal provision, if
17	I can call it that, that would have been as a result of
18	media in January of '94 or was it through other means?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Well, the first recollection
20	I have is getting a call from a television
21	MR. ENGELMANN: A reporter?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, known to have a beat
23	that his Mr
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Would this have been Charlie
25	Greenwell?

1	mr. macDONALD: Mr. Greenwell, yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
3	MR. MacDONALD: He tried to tape record me
4	on the call and I don't recall if I gave him the typical
5	Crown Attorney response to the media, "Thank you for your
6	information".
7	He had given me the information and I seem
8	to think that I'd known already, there was wind in the
9	media, or certainly that I'd heard from police personnel,
10	that there was a cover-up and a gag order clause or
11	something.
12	So he was repeating that for me and saying,
13	"I have information for you. What do you have to say to
14	this?" And then I heard the click and the tape-recorder go
15	on, so I said, "Thank you very much for bringing this to my
16	attention".
17	MR. ENGELMANN: And that's the first time
18	you learned of the provision?
19	MR. MacDONALD: I don't that's the first
20	recollection I have but I don't think I was entirely
21	surprised by the call, so I must have been told about the
22	illegal clause before then by someone, but it was at the
23	same time, you know, within I suppose days of or a day
24	of the call.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: So this is sometime in

1	January of '94?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I guess so. Is that what I
3	say in my statement?
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, it would have been
6	several months after my several weeks or months after my
7	meeting with Chief Shaver that I've just articulated.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
9	And, sir, I understand as well in January of
10	'94 you were interviewed by the Ottawa Police Service with
11	respect to this matter?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And what, if anything, do
14	you remember about that?
15	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't think it was an
16	interview.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. It was a short
18	interview?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. It was less than 15
20	minutes. I recall that both attended and had called in
21	advance
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
23	MR. MacDONALD: to meet with me, and I
24	met with him at our office, the County Court building, as
25	it then was. I remember asking them inviting them to

1	tape-record the meeting and one of the gentlemen said it
2	wasn't necessary, and that left me with the impression that
3	I was getting a report back, and I recall asking them,
4	"Well, what's going on? Is somebody you know, is there
5	any truth to a cover-up in the in any context?" and they
6	said no.
7	They said that I think they said one
8	of them said, in their view a charge could have be laid in
9	January or February of '03 of '93, and I didn't respond
10	to that.
11	Then they asked the thrustI guess the
12	main reason for their attending was to inquire about "the
13	conflict" as they described it, and I may even have if I
14	described it as a "conflict" I meant "bias" but, at any
15	rate, that topic came up again.
16	I explained to them that there was no way
17	that I have ever perceived that anybody would think that I
18	would ever, you know, try to cover up allegations against a
19	priest.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Would it be fair
21	to say they would have asked you about contacts with
22	Officers Sebalj and Brunet
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: during the
25	investigation, and the issue of the Diocese committee would

1	have come up in your conversation with them? Your work on
2	that committee
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: and the reason for the
5	perceived
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: conflict?
8	MR. MacDONALD: That was the bulk of the
9	meeting, was that they asked wanted to know about, it
10	was that.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. I note the hour,
12	sir.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
14	Let's take lunch and come back at 2:00.
15	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
16	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. A
17	l'ordre; Veuillez vous lever.
18	This hearing will resume at 2:00 p.m.
19	Upon recessing at 12:33 p.m./
20	L'audience est suspendue à 12h33
21	Upon resuming at 2:04 p.m. /
22	L'audience est reprise à 14h04
23	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
24	veuillez vous lever.
25	This hearing is now resumed, please be

1	seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Proceed, Mr.
3	Engelmann.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Good afternoon, Mr.
5	Commissioner.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, sir.
7	MURRAY MacDONALD, Resumed/Sous le même serment:
8	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR.
9	<pre>ENGELMANN (cont'd/suite):</pre>
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Good afternoon, Mr.
11	MacDonald.
12	Sir, when we left off, we were in early
13	1994, and we had talked about your brief meeting with a
14	couple of officers from the Ottawa Police.
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And during the calendar year
17	1994, you were aware that after the Ottawa Police were
18	here, the OPP came to investigate in the form of Detective
19	Inspector Smith and a Detective Constable Fagan?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: And, in fact, they
22	interviewed you, and we've been to that statement a few
23	times, in July?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, were you advised before

144

1	that investigation that it was going to occur? Or how do
2	you recall being advised of it?
3	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall. I knew it
4	was coming well in advance of the July interview, but I
5	don't recall who or how I was advised.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Were you at any time
7	consulted with respect to that investigation?
8	MR. MacDONALD: By Officer Smith?
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, or
10	MR. MacDONALD: By that by that time
11	well before July of that year, the regional director
12	was had instructed me. He and I I informed him
13	of I contacted him, initially, to
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
15	MR. MacDONALD: inform him of things
16	as early in the autumn, as things were getting
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes. That was Mr.
18	Griffiths.
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
21	MR. MacDONALD: And, from that point on, he
22	was providing, or arranging for the provision of legal
23	advice by other Crowns on anything relating to that cluster
24	of initially, those two cases.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: So Mr. Griffiths was aware

1	of the 1994 OPP investigation and would have been ensuring
2	that there were other Crown offices involved
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: if those officers needed
5	advice?
6	MR. MacDONALD: If and when need be, yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. Because he knew that
8	part of the investigation was looking into your contacts
9	with the lawyers involved in the settlement and things of
10	that nature?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. I would have been I
12	presume, before anyone even informed me, I it was
13	obvious that I would be a key Crown witness as against Mr.
14	MacDonald or whomever was the suspect of the illegal gag
15	order
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
17	MR. MacDONALD: the gag clause.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: And I suppose the worst case
19	scenario, they thought you might have been involved in
20	putting together that settlement and they could have
21	considered you as a suspect? In 1994.
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I guess so.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes. But, in any event, you
24	understood you were "a person of interest", if I can use
25	that term?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Fair enough.
3	And, sir, aside from the meeting with the
4	Ottawa Police and the meeting with the OPP in July, you
5	indicated to us that you had one other meeting with the
6	police, and that was with respect to allegations against
7	your father?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: And that was in February of
10	'94?
11	MR. MacDONALD: I think so.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, I'd just like
13	to
14	MR. MacDONALD: Late February or early
15	March.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And I have that statement
17	and I want to take you there but just before I do, we heard
18	some evidence during the institutional response of the
19	Children's Aid Society, of some rumours and/or innuendo
20	that some child welfare workers were hearing out of
21	the I believe it's the Town of Lancaster.
22	I just want to show you a note if I can and
23	ask you if you had any knowledge of the matters set out
24	therein, and it is it's Exhibit 2326. It's Document
25	115857.

1	And just by way of context, Mr. MacDonald,
2	it's a note from a worker by the name of Garrahan to the
3	Executive Director, Mr. Abell. It's dated February 7 th , '94
4	and she's referring to a conversation she had with him a
5	couple of weeks earlier about things she was hearing from
6	the Town of Lancaster.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Two-three-two-six (2326)?
8	MR. ENGELMANN: That's correct, sir.
9	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
10	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
11	MR. ENGELMANN: And we'll avoid using if we
12	can, the names of the of the mother involved.
13	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, were you aware of any
15	of the rumours that were set out in this memo?
16	MR. MacDONALD: No.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Sir, I
18	understand that you became aware, at least of some of this
19	issue, during a phone call you had with your father, with
20	Milton MacDonald, on February 11 th , 1994?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Not about what's set out in
22	this letter, but I learned about my father's criminal past
23	from as a result of a phone call I received from him on
24	a Friday I think it was a Friday afternoon in early
25	February of '94.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, you set this out I
2	think in some detail in the statement and I thought maybe I
3	could just take you there and ask you to confirm if that's
4	how you became aware of this.
5	It is Exhibit 2599. I don't know if the
6	witness has that binder.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Twenty-four-ninety-nine
8	(2499)? No.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Counsel, it's Document
10	Number 714173.
11	And, Mr. MacDonald, just to situate you,
12	this is an interview report that you would have given at
13	your home on February 16 th , 1994 to two OPP officers, one
14	named Hurlbut and the other Beatty.
15	MR. MacDONALD: I think that was in Long
16	Sault Detachment where they interviewed me.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. It says oh,
18	perhaps you're right, sir. Yes, you're right, absolutely.
19	I apologize.
20	The interview report appears to set out in a
21	narrative fashion your recollection of the events of
22	February $11^{\rm th}$ and $12^{\rm th}$, and your growing awareness of issues
23	concerning sexual misconduct and your father's involvement
24	in same.
25	MR. MacDONALD: M'hm.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Is that fair?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: And just if you could just
4	have a quick look at that and perhaps tell us if the
5	statement accurately reflects what you would have learned
6	over those two or three days?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
9	And, sir, I understand after speaking with
10	Milton MacDonald you would have conducted Randy Millar,
11	who's your brother-in-law and also a local OPP officer.
12	MR. MacDONALD: No, I contacted my mother
13	after I spoke with
14	MR. ENGELMANN: No, fair enough. And you
15	contacted your mother, you also spoke to your sister and
16	then you spoke to Randy Millar?
17	MR. MacDONALD: I spoke to Randy and my
18	sister in the same phone call, yeah.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, you indicate at
20	Bates page 003 that:
21	"Randy and I talked about the
22	precarious position that he and I were
23	in, being a police officer and a Crown
24	attorney."
25	And that was a concern you had, and perhaps

1	a concern he had as well, given the nature of what you were
2	being told.
3	MR. MacDONALD: He was less concerned than I
4	was. I didn't want my conduct or his to be seen as
5	interfering or trying to intimidate the person who may or
6	may not be a complainant, and he said not to worry, "I know
7	what I'm doing. I'm going to speak to his father. I know
8	his father, former neighbours, and if he has an allegation
9	to make it will be" Randy would turn it over to his
10	supervisor and if he didn't have an allegation to make, the
11	message was to not to harass my father.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
13	And, sir, I understand from your statement
14	that you became aware of trouble that he'd been in your
15	father had been in, in the late sixties, only at this time.
16	MR. MacDONALD: When I phoned my mother
17	back.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: And you had been completely
19	unaware of a conviction for a similar type of offence in or
20	around 1969?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Completely.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, to your knowledge
23	and we know that a number of victims were identified and
24	the matter was dealt with in the court system. To your
25	knowledge were any of the victims of your father connected

I	to Project Truth or the other investigations that were
2	being looked at by the OPP?
3	MR. MacDONALD: I believe there's no
4	connection.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And, sir, when you
6	say no connection, neither with the victims nor any linkage
7	between him and any of the perpetrators or alleged
8	perpetrators that you understand to be part of what was
9	being investigated by the OPP?
10	MR. MacDONALD: I understood I knew from
11	the detective inspector investigating my father's case that
12	my father operated alone.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
14	And, sir, after you spoke to your brother-
15	in-law, he spoke to one of the parents, and then these two
16	OPP officers that you met with on the $16^{\rm th}$ of February began
17	investigating your father for these issues. Is that
18	correct?
19	MR. MacDONALD: On the same yeah, on the
20	same weekend that Randy spoke to Mr. So-and-so
21	THE COMMISSIONER: The victim's father?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Victim's father, I'm sorry.
23	I don't know his sobriquet.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: No no, that's the way
25	we'll do it; all right?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Okay.
2	Randy then reported it to the Randy and I
3	conferred and he said, "There is an allegation," and so we
4	decided that Randy would report it to the 11 District
5	Superintendent, OPP, and I would take my father to the
6	psychiatric hospital in Ottawa because he'd had a nervous
7	breakdown that weekend when I confronted him with this.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: And you set that out in the
9	narrative, in the interview.
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
12	Sir, I'd like to take you to another area
13	now, if I may, and that
14	MR. MacDONALD: Project Truth?
15	MR. ENGELMANN: that is the Project
16	Truth investigation.
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, I just want to
19	show you a memo. It is Exhibit 228, if I may.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Maybe we should close
21	that off a little bit.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Eventually your father
24	pleaded guilty or was found guilty, sir?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Pleaded guilty.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. And he was
2	sentenced?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: And was he given any a
5	period of incarceration?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Twenty-two (22) months.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: All right, thank you.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, this was handled
9	by a different Crown attorney's office?
10	MR. MacDONALD: The Crown attorney from I
11	think western Ontario I think is where she was out of.
12	Mary Lou Dickie was her name.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
14	MR. MacDONALD: Is her name.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Commissioner, then if we
16	could turn to
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: matters dealing with
19	Project Truth. And, sir, if we could start with Exhibit
20	228. It's Document Number 113942. It is a memo from
21	Robert Pelletier to Peter Griffiths, dated April 2 nd , 1997.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Madam Clerk, do we have
23	that; 228?
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Exhibit 228, sir.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, 228. No, I don't

1	have it. Do you have it, sir? Two two eight (228), sorry.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Two two eight (228),
3	Document Number 113942.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, 228.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah.
7	Sir, this is a memo from, as I said, Robert
8	Pelletier to Peter Griffiths, providing a summary and
9	chronology of events relating to the Regina v. Charles
10	MacDonald prosecution and some recent developments and
11	additional complaints. And it's referring to a brief
12	prepared by Mr. Dunlop and/or his lawyer that was given to
13	then-Chief of the London Police, Julian Fantino.
14	MR. MacDONALD: Is this the what you
15	refer was the Dunlop his counsel's name was?
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Bourgeois.
17	MR. MacDONALD: This is the Dunlop-Bourgeois
18	brief you're referring to?
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: And this is a memo where
22	Robert Pelletier is setting out some background about that
23	brief and some of the issues, and he's writing to Mr.
24	Griffiths and he's confirming that there's going to be a
25	meeting to deal with these issues on April $24^{\rm th}$, 1997.

1	And, sir, even though this is not copied to
2	you, I believe this was sent to you. Is that your
3	understanding?
4	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall; possible.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. It's just I'll
6	just be a moment.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Bob spoke to me about its
8	contents, so I may have been copied as well.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: If you just look at
10	MR. MacDONALD: He phoned me before I would
11	have received this in hard copy.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay; 109360.
13	This is just the fax cover sheet I believe
14	that went with this document.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Exhibit
16	Number 2922 is a document sent to Mr. Murray MacDonald on
17	April 3 rd , 1997.
18	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2922:
19	(109360) - Fax cover sheet from Crown
20	Attorney L'Orignal to Murray MacDonald dated
21	03 April 97
22	MR. ENGELMANN: It's from the Crown Attorney
23	L'Orignal, at the top. It refers to 11 pages with the
24	cover and
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah?

1	MR. ENGELMANN: we have the 10-page
2	letter, which is Exhibit 228.
3	Now, I'm sure that a copy that you would
4	have received, sir, would not have had the handwritten note
5	on the first page that says "Hallett copy."
6	MR. MacDONALD: No, no.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, all right.
8	So in this email, first of all, do you know
9	why you were being sent a copy of this?
10	MR. MacDONALD: This was right after at
11	least Bob and I and Mr. Griffiths, and I presume everybody
12	in the Criminal Law Division after we learned that the
13	conspiracy theorists were accusing me of being part of a
14	criminal conspiracy.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
16	And so you would have had some discussions
17	with Mr. Griffiths and/or Mr. Pelletier about that?
18	MR. MacDONALD: I got a phone call from Bob
19	saying "You wouldn't believe what's just come to my
20	attention or come across my desk," and he described to me
21	the extract in those materials referencing me.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
23	And, in fact, some of those are in the
24	letter itself. And I'm just going to turn you to them very
25	briefly, if I may, at Bates page 946, which is page 4 of

1	the letter. This is a summary of some allegations that are
2	contained in an amended Statement of Claim. And on that
3	page there's a reference to you and I'm looking at Bates
4	page 946, about halfway down, it says you're named in
5	various paragraphs in the context of various clandestine
6	meetings and arrangements involving certain named
7	defendants and others. And you were made aware of this,
8	sir, by Mr. Pelletier and of course by way of this letter.
9	MR. MacDONALD: Correct.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Would this have been the
11	first you knew about these allegations?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Right. Basically Bob was
13	telling me that Dunlop was accusing me of one of the
14	indirect being one of the indirect members who support
15	the clan, whatever this clan is.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
17	On page 947, the next page were you aware
18	that it was alleged that you were in attendance at a summer
19	residence of Malcolm MacDonald on Stanley Island it's
20	set out there on the next page about two-thirds of the way
21	down with a number of other people?
22	MR. MacDONALD: I learned of that allegation
23	for the first time in either Bob's telephone call or seeing
24	this letter or actually Bob may also have forwarded to me -
25	- or Peter may have Griffiths may have forwarded to me a

I	copy of the actual
2	MR. ENGELMANN: The amended Statement of
3	Claim?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Dunlop/Bourgeois
5	document that referenced me.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
7	MR. MacDONALD: As far as my attendance at
8	that cottage is concerned, you can be safe in concluding
9	that this is fantasy island.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, I'm just going to ask
11	you some questions about that because it comes up in an
12	interview. The page Bates page 949, there are other
13	references to you in this, again, brief prepared by
14	Bourgeois that are referenced at the bottom, and you're one
15	of a list of people
16	MR. MacDONALD: I don't think this was
17	prepared by a lawyer. I think Dunlop prepared this
18	himself.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. All right.
20	So you're saying the brief prepared by
21	Bourgeois should say the brief prepared by Dunlop?
22	MR. MacDONALD: This obviously isn't a legal
23	brief.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Well, what we're
25	looking at, sir, is the letter where Mr. Pelletier's

1	summarizing
2	MR. MacDONALD: No, I realize that.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: some of what he's read.
4	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: And I just want to
6	understand what you received. You just received this
7	letter or did you receive parts of this brief that had been
8	prepared as well?
9	MR. MacDONALD: I saw the parts of the brief
10	that referenced me.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Possibly my father at that
13	time.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
15	MR. MacDONALD: I mean, I've seen it again
16	since in anticipation of testifying in these proceedings
17	_
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
19	MR. MacDONALD: more recently. But I
20	believe I first saw the actual extracts from the Dunlop
21	amended Statement of Claim around the time of this letter.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And there are
23	references here to photographs of various individuals, and
24	various individuals being referred to as members of a clan.
25	That's what he sets out here.

1	And, sir, again, on the following couple of
2	pages there's again a reference to this summer residence on
3	Stanley Island on Bates page 950, and then there's
4	references to you on that page and also on the following
5	page with respect to a decision not to pursue criminal
6	charges, et cetera, et cetera.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, conspiracy
8	conspiracy to obstruct justice I think is what the
9	allegation was.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: So Mr. Pelletier is advising
11	you by phone he's sending you a copy of this letter to Mr.
12	Griffiths and you are being asked to be in attendance at a
13	meeting on April 24 th , 1997; correct?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I know Bob was I
15	didn't realize that this letter actually scheduled a
16	meeting but either Bob or Mr. Griffiths, or both, told me
17	to attend that meeting.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
19	So prior to the meeting you didn't have a
20	copy of the full brief but you had some copies of excerpts
21	that referred to you
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: and you had this letter?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: And you'd spoken to Bob

1	Pelletier. Had you spoken to Peter Griffiths as well?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall. I must I
3	think I'm not sure.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
5	And who was it that asked you to be at the
6	meeting, or did you ask to be there?
7	MR. MacDONALD: No, I was I thought that
8	it was Mr. Griffiths but it may have been Bob and Peter
9	together who recommended it.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And in doing so and
11	recommending or asking you to be there did they tell you
12	why they wanted you to be at the meeting, if you can
13	recall?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Well, it was a generally
15	it was generally in the context of what will the
16	authorities, police, and Criminal Prosecution Service do in
17	light of allegations that, you know, are have gone to a
18	broad sweeping obstruction of justice by members of the
19	criminal justice system or attempt to obstruct justice.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, did you feel any
21	discomfort, if I can use that term, in being asked to
22	attend this meeting, given that in part they were going to
23	be discussing investigating you and others?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Only after I had left the
25	meeting and personally while I was there. Before attending

162

1	the meeting I was so focused on I was so angry about
2	these false, malicious, mean-spirited allegations by Mr.
3	Dunlop that that's really about all I was thinking. Until
4	I got to the meeting and I walked got to the meeting and
5	it had already taken place, and so I realized I wasn't the
6	
7	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sorry; the meeting had
8	already taken place?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Had commenced. Sorry.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh, it had started
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: before you got there?
13	MR. MacDONALD: I was brought into the
14	boardroom. I was Mr. Griffiths told us all Mr.
15	Griffiths had already, I think, met with the officers but
16	I'm not sure. At any rate, I was when I got to the
17	boardroom the others were there. I was told that this was
18	the that the plan was that every stone would be unturned
19	and that I would including any all of my involvement
20	would be reviewed as well by the police.
21	I remember I'd never met Pat Hall before and
22	I remember him looking at me with what I now know to be
23	Pat's sort of hard glare poker face and it was rather
24	then it started to hit me as I looked at Pat and as I
25	realized in the environment that I'm here for a courtesy

1	notice and then I left before the others left. And I
2	remember walking in the parking lot of the basement parking
3	at the court the parking at the City Hall parking area
4	next to the courthouse, that not only is it was insult
5	to injury. Not only was Mr. Dunlop making these cruel
6	allegations but that I was going to be put once again under
7	the microscope by the you know, the police microscope,
8	and I had the feeling that it would never end.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: And when you say "once
10	again" you were referring to the fact that you were
11	interviewed back in 1994?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, and well, was it
13	late '93 that the Ottawa officers met me early
14	MR. ENGELMANN: January of '94.
15	MR. MacDONALD: Early '94, yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And then July of '94 by
17	Detective Inspector Smith.
18	MR. MacDONALD: And February '94 by the
19	other case.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
21	So we've heard that Peter Griffiths, Robert
22	Pelletier, Pat Hall, Tim Smith, Don Genier, Mike Fagan were
23	all there.
24	MR. MacDONALD: I believe so.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: And what you're telling us

1	is they were meeting before you got there and that they
2	continued to meet when you left?
3	MR. MacDONALD: I recall I may have
4	walked in with Bob Pelletier. We didn't travel together.
5	We came from two different directions. And they were
6	already there and there was a very brief exchange of
7	pleasantries. I don't recall if it was in the hallway or
8	the boardroom but there was a very brief exchange. Then
9	Peter laid down the plan, including that I was, of course,
10	to stay away from continue to stay away from all
11	providing any legal advice to in respect to this new
12	range of potential suspects and cases, and also that my
13	conduct would be reviewed I remember looking at the
14	officers and saying, "Review it vigorously or review it
15	quickly? Let's get to the bottom of this. I've got
16	nothing to hide."
17	I did what every good criminal lawyer does
18	and forgot to remember the right to you know, the right
19	to keep my own I told them that I'd be anxious to give a
20	statement and to do it quickly, and then you know about the
21	next meeting that I had with Tim Smith.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. Sir, were these
23	officers known to you?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Not I didn't know Pat
25	Hall, but I knew the others.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, because they were
2	from local OPP detachments?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Tim Smith and
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh, I'm sorry, Tim Smith was
5	not.
6	MR. MacDONALD: Tim Smith and
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Mike Fagan. He interviewed
8	you
9	MR. MacDONALD: Mike Fagan and Tim Smith and
10	I had worked together as part of the Alfred the St.
11	Joseph's boys' School
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
13	MR. MacDONALD: prosecutions.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And they had interviewed you
15	back in '94?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: And Don Genier, was he known
18	to you?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. Don was from was or
20	had been a part of the one of the detachments in my
21	jurisdiction.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you have a sense,
23	sir, as to how long you were there at that meeting?
24	MR. MacDONALD: It didn't I wasn't my
25	counsel wasn't sought, so it was probably a short period.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: So you were there to listen
2	more than anything else?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And do you
5	recall, other than advising them to investigate you quickly
6	and vigorously, if you gave any other instructions or had
7	any other input during the course of the meeting?
8	MR. MacDONALD: We may have discussed
9	administrative components of what role I would play, but
10	I that's just speculation, and I shouldn't speculate.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Just give me a
12	moment, sir? I just want to very briefly refer to a couple
13	of the officers' notes, if I may.
14	You didn't take notes at the meeting;
15	correct?
16	MR. MacDONALD: No.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: If we could look briefly at
18	Tim Smith's notes, Exhibit 1803? The Bates page, for the
19	screen, is 1054263.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: If we could just blow up the
23	writing? This is easier to read on the screen, sir. Just
24	under the word "decision". So:
25	"Finish preliminary witnesses.

1	MacDonald and Silmser ask for
2	adjournment prior to decision. Police
3	investigate new allegations.
4	Disclosure Dunlop brief to Neville.
5	Investigate all allegations. Letter of
6	request to be made to Superintendent
7	Larry Edgar by Peter Griffiths"
8	This is for a special project or
9	prosecution. I'm not sure what that next word is.
10	"MacDonald next court date 9 May '97,
11	to be spoken to. Finish meeting."
12	Sir, do you recall being briefed, sort of
13	generally, on what we see here?
14	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
16	And, sir, your office was advised that you
17	were not going to be prosecuting any cases out of Project
18	Truth. Do you recall that?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. That was yes, I was
20	advised of that; it might have been at that meeting.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. And nor were you to
22	provide legal advice to any of the Project Truth officers?
23	MR. MacDONALD: That's right.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And that was
25	because there would be a perceived or real conflict?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: And that was explained?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: I understand, sir, that your
5	office did have to handle some disclosure issues of Project
6	Truth cases, however? Is that correct?
7	MR. MacDONALD: As a way-station only.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
9	And just by way of one example, if we can,
10	if we can look at Document Number 109262?
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
12	Exhibit Number 2923 is a letter dated $13^{\rm th}$ of
13	July, 1998, to Mr. Murray MacDonald from Detective Sergeant
14	Pat Hall.
15	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2923:
16	(109262) - Letter from Pat Hall to Murray
17	MacDonald re. Assignment of a Crown Attorney
18	to Project Truth - dated July 13, 1998
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, would this be an
20	example of one of the times when your office was receiving
21	briefs from the OPP and forwarding them on to defence
22	counsel involved in some of these cases?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I presume so.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. I didn't review the

1	correspondence or the contents of the disclosure, except,
2	you know, we put them in mailing packages and or else
3	had someone pick them up at the desk.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: I just note on the second
5	page of the letter, it says:
6	"On July $8^{\rm th}$, we were advised that a
7	Crown Attorney had been assigned from
8	Toronto, however, after discussing the
9	matter with Ruth Neilson and Kerry
10	Hughes of the Crown Law office,
11	Toronto, it appears there was some
12	indecision on this matter. Therefore,
13	I've been instructed by Detective
14	Inspector Smith to deliver to your
15	office the Crown briefs in the
16	aforementioned cases so they may be
17	provided to the assigned Crown
18	Attorneys."
19	Do you recall, sir, there being some delay
20	or some difficulties in getting Crowns assigned or were you
21	aware of that, to do these Project Truth cases?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I have some
23	recollection of that.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And consequently
25	some of the matters that would have normally been disclosed

1	by assigned prosecutors, were handled by your office?
2	MR. MacDONALD: In order in efforts to
3	expedite, yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, did you have any
5	involvement, sir, in attempting to find them a Crown
6	counsel to
7	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: actually do this, or was
9	that done by someone else?
10	MR. MacDONALD: That was done by others,
11	yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Outside my office.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And I understand aside from
15	disclosure issues, from time-to-time there may have been
16	some pre-trial appearances such as adjournments which were
17	handled by someone from your office when other Crowns were
18	not available? Do you recall that, sir?
19	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall, but that's
20	likely.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
22	And, sir, just another issue with this
23	point. If we could look at Document Number 109273.
24	It's a new document, sir, it's coming to
25	you. I just wanted to give you an example of the

171

1	appearance issue.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
3	Exhibit 2924 is a letter dated August $5^{\rm th}$,
4	1998, memorandum to Murray MacDonald from Robert Pelletier.
5	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2924:
6	(109273) - Memorandum from Robert Pelletier
7	to Murray MacDonald dated August 5, 1998
8	MR. ENGELMANN: This is a memo from
9	Mr. Pelletier to yourself, essentially indicating
10	difficulty in enlisting the services of a prosecutor from
11	outside the region to work on these cases, and he's asking
12	that matters be adjourned with an indication to the court
13	that a prosecutor from outside the region will be enlisted?
14	MR. MacDONALD: We call this an agency
15	letter, "agency instruction letter", yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Would this be an example of
17	where your office might have had to go and attend in court
18	because of some difficulties in getting an outside Crown
19	assigned? Is that
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: fair?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, and to repeat the
23	wording in the letter:
24	"and confirming to the court that
25	we're appearing as agent for that

1	purpose."
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
3	And just one more example of the disclosure
4	issue, if I may, 111694?
5	This is a letter from Detective Sergeant Pat
6	Hall to you concerning disclosure in a number of cases.
7	It's dated October 22 nd , 1998.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 2925.
9	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2925:
10	(111694) - Letter from Pat Hall to Murray
11	MacDonald re. Order for the Release of
12	Videotaped Statements for Disclosure
13	Purposes - dated October 22, 1998
14	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, it appears Detective
16	then Detective Sergeant Hall is sending you a number of
17	materials for disclosure purposes in a number of cases, and
18	he's saying:
19	"Crown Counsel Shelley Hallett and
20	Alain Godin are in agreement that this
21	disclosure be made through your office
22	to Defence Counsel Don Johnson."
23	Fair enough?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.

1	And, sir, this may have become a bit of an
2	issue, this assignment of outside Crown, and I just want to
3	have you look at a letter from Mr. Johnson to yourself.
4	It's Document Number 109267. It's dated July 20 th , 1998.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 2926.
6	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2926:
7	(109267) - Letter from Don Johnson to Murray
8	MacDonald re: Disclosure dated 20 Jul 98
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, this is a disclosure
10	request, is it not, from Mr. Johnson?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: He's acting for Harvey
13	Latour, requesting disclosure.
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: This is one of the initial
16	Project Truth suspects?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: And this letter is coming to
19	you, is it not, because there was no outside Crown
20	assigned?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Do you recall what
23	you did with requests of this nature, sir?
24	MR. MacDONALD: They were immediately
25	forwarded on, either by fax or mail to the I believe

1	they were all going through the Director's office in 1998.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. I may have an
3	example.
4	Yes, if the witness could be shown Document
5	Number 702428.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Exhibit 2927
7	is a letter dated July 23^{rd} , 1998 to Mr. Robert Pelletier
8	from Murray MacDonald.
9	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2927:
10	(702428) - Letter from Murray MacDonald to
11	Robert Pelletier re: Harvey Latour dated 23
12	Jul 98
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, I believe you've
14	received Mr. Johnson's letter requesting disclosure and
15	you're now sending it off to Mr. Pelletier. Is that fair?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah. I see Bob was the
17	Acting Director then
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
19	MR. MacDONALD: during the interregnum
20	between Mr. Griffiths' departure and Jimmy Stewart's coming
21	on board.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, if we could
23	quickly look at 109271. This is a follow-up letter from
24	Mr. Johnson to yourself. It's dated August $4^{\rm th}$, 1998.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Exhibit

Number 2928 is a letter to Murray MacDonald from Donald W.
Johnson, August 4 th , 1998.
EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2928:
(109271) - Letter from Don Johnson to Murray
MacDonald re: Regina v. Harvey Latour
MR. ENGELMANN: Just a follow-up letter from
Mr. Johnson, indicating he hasn't received a response and
he'd like one; correct?
MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, this is what you
passed on to someone else to deal with?
MR. MacDONALD: Yes. It would have been
would have been immediately transferred on.
MR. ENGELMANN: Right. And, sir, there's a
further letter from Mr. Johnson. That's 109276. It's
dated August 26 th , 1998.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you, from Mr.
Johnson to Murray MacDonald, August 26 th , '98.
MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, the exhibit number?
MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, my comments
THE COMMISSIONER: Two nine two nine (2929).
MR. ENGELMANN: Two nine two nine (2929)?
THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2929:
(109276) - Letter from Don Johnson to Murray

1	MacDonald re: Regina v. Harvey Latour
2	MR. MacDONALD: Comments similar to the last
3	one.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So you're as
5	soon as you're getting these letters you're passing them on
6	to Mr. Pelletier's office?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir. Some of them I
8	didn't see myself. Guy Simard likely saw some and would
9	have forwarded them off of his own initiative.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: But you would have had
11	instructions for your staff that these were to go off to
12	someone else to respond to?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. There were standing
14	orders on that regard for all staff.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: And timely disclosure to
16	defence counsel is important, is it not?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. I believe we managed
18	to get things in and out as quickly as they came to us.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: But if there isn't timely
20	disclosure that can have an impact on a it can
21	potentially have an impact on a prosecution.
22	MR. MacDONALD: It can.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: But in these cases, because
24	they didn't have an assigned Crown and because of the
25	restrictions or circumscription on your office, you were

1	not to be responding to these directly?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Correct.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, sir, I understand that
4	at some point in time you became aware of some material
5	posted on a website or websites. Is that correct?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: And did you have some
8	contact with Project Truth officers as a result, and in
9	particular Pat Hall?
10	MR. MacDONALD: I thought it was Pat or one
11	of the other Project Truth constables who I'm personally
12	acquainted with more personally acquainted with who
13	phoned me and told me; that I took it initially, you know,
14	as a courtesy/sympathy call.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. I think we have
16	some officers' notes on this. If we could look at it's
17	Exhibit 2750. Counsel, it's Document Number 727751.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Merci.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, if I could just have a
20	moment.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, Bates page 097.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: These are notes of Officer
25	Hall from March 18^{th} , 1999. He's referring to the fact

1	this is sometime between 8:00 and 11:05:
2	"Call from Murray MacDonald about press
3	clippings."
4	Do you know, sir I don't know if this is
5	related to the website or if this is related to matters
6	that are appearing in the newspaper. Can you help us at
7	all on that with respect to that date?
8	MR. MacDONALD: I'd speculate.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. You don't recall
10	what that might have been referring to at the time?
11	MR. MacDONALD: I think they were referring
12	to both.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
14	And then he has other notes this is
15	Exhibit 2754. It's Document Number 727756 and the Bates
16	page is 574.
17	Mr. MacDonald, is it fair to say there was
18	not only some information on websites but there was also
19	some information in the media, in the print press,
20	et cetera, about
21	MR. MacDONALD: The website
22	MR. ENGELMANN: some of the allegations
23	from the Dunlop-Bourgeois brief?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And on occasion

1	some of this media or the websites would refer to your
2	name as being involved; correct?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Certainly the websites did.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: So Exhibit 2754?
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: And we've got it on 575
8	or 574?
9	MR. ENGELMANN: It should be Bates page 574.
10	If we could blow up the bottom of the page.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: I believe it says:
13	"Paged by Murray MacDonald. Concerned
14	about Project Truth website. Had
15	reporter visit him yesterday wanting a
16	comment on same. Also felt"
17	I believe it's:
18	"Leroux witness may have violated
19	disclosure order."
20	Do you remember, sir this is now the
21	summer of 2000.
22	MR. MacDONALD: May have violated what
23	order?
24	THE COMMISSIONER: That a reporter hang
25	on, first of all let's start:

1	"Phoned by Murray MacDonald. Concerned
2	about Project Truth website. Had a
3	reporter visit him yesterday waiting
4	wanting a comment on same. Said I
5	would wholly be"
6	MR. ENGELMANN: "probably be
7	Contacted"
8	THE COMMISSIONER: "Please" no.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: "Plus felt also felt
10	Leroux"
11	THE COMMISSIONER: "witness may have
12	violated disclosure order."
13	MR. MacDONALD: Can you bring that next page
14	
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, yes
16	MR. MacDONALD: up now?
17	THE COMMISSIONER: yes, yes, exactly.
18	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you. I see.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, do you recall
20	contacting Pat Hall about this issue?
21	MR. MacDONALD: No, no, I don't. I was
22	calling Pat or the other constables from time to time;
23	essentially pleading for information as to what the hell's
24	going on here, you know.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you ask them if they

1	could possibly investigate a means or some kind of way to
2	have this website either shut down or these concerns about
3	you taken off the website? Do you recall if you would have
4	asked Pat Hall for that?
5	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall. I don't
6	know that Pat was Pat Hall had the authority to do that.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Fair enough. I'm just
8	wondering if you might have asked him for assistance.
9	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't make any efforts to
10	get it off, like personally.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
12	Exhibit 2755, which I think is the next
13	perhaps the next tab in the binder, sir; Bates page 589. I
14	was just looking for references and contacts that you might
15	have had with the investigators concerning this issue.
16	There seems to be a reference next to 8:45. I believe it
17	says:
18	"Website taken down. Call to Murray
19	MacDonald on same. Discussed Hallett
20	and review of Crown brief."
21	Do you recall, sir, if Officer Hall would
22	have contacted you to advise you that, in fact I think
23	this was Project Truth the first one was taken down?
24	MR. MacDONALD: ProjectTruth.com.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah, and would he have

1	discussed with you issues concerning the timing of the
2	brief on his investigation? There's a reference to Hallett
3	and discussed
4	MR. MacDONALD: No, there wouldn't have been
5	I don't think I have no recollection of timing of
6	briefs as our discussion. Maybe the briefs were coming.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
8	Okay, and
9	MR. MacDONALD: But it that you know,
10	Pat Hall when he I called him I must have called him
11	at some time on the topic of ProjectTruth.com. He called
12	me on or spoke to me in the proverbial hallway on more
13	than one occasion because he I had the feeling that he
14	genuinely felt had sympathy for the fact that this was
15	going on and dragging my name into it and so he's making
16	reference to this, I think he wasn't calling me in a
17	legal context to inform me. It was more of a sympathy
18	call, I think.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, all right.
20	And you were aware, sir, that he was
21	investigating a broader conspiracy and that there were
22	allegations that you were, to some extent, involved so he
23	interviewed you as a result in December of 1998?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, but this notebook's in
25	the year August 2000, I think.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah, no, fair enough. Fair
2	enough. I'm moving we're still in that broader context,
3	but just off the website for a minute if I can. That he
4	would have interviewed you in mid-December of 1998?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Is that the second interview
6	that Tim Smith was involved with as well?
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: And I believe, sir, they
10	interviewed you and the tape malfunctioned and they had to
11	re-interview you.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you recall that?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
16	And that is Exhibit 2683.
17	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, just on the first page
19	towards the bottom, they appear to be confirming that
20	they're re-interviewing you because of the problem with the
21	tape the day before.
22	MR. MacDONALD: Correct. I probably wore it
23	out.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you recall that, sir?
25	They're just indicating at the bottom that they're doing it

1	again; fair enough?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: And then on the second page
4	at least at the start Inspector Smith is indicating
5	to you what it is they need to talk to you about:
6	"certain allegations made in the
7	statement and Affidavit by Ron Leroux."
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And do you recall,
10	sir, with a number of the witnesses that they interviewed,
11	there was a prepared set of questions that were either
12	given at the time of the just when the interview started
13	or perhaps a day or two before. Was that done with you?
14	Do you recall if you were given a list of questions?
15	MR. MacDONALD: No, I don't believe I was.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
17	What about at the interview itself?
18	MR. MacDONALD: No.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And sir, you were
20	asked a number of questions about whether you had been to
21	certain locations, and if we could just look at that
22	briefly. On Bates page 397, you are asked, near the bottom
23	of the page, if you had ever attended dinner parties at St.
24	Andrew's parish.
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: And you said, "No, I
2	haven't." You did talk about the fact you were at a
3	wedding reception there once in the early eighties.
4	MR. MacDONALD: I think it was St. Andrew's
5	parish, but I don't recall being in the church, but I think
6	one of my cousins was married there.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
8	And do you stand by that answer today, sir?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, on Bates page 398, you
11	were asked if you'd ever been to Ken Seguin's residence in
12	Summerstown.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Never.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And you said, "No, I
15	haven't." Do you stand by that answer today?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, never.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, you were asked whether
18	on that same page whether you'd been to Malcolm
19	MacDonald's cottage on Stanley Island.
20	MR. MacDONALD: Never.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: And you stand by that answer
22	today?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, you were asked whether
25	you'd ever been at a gathering or party at or near

1	Cameron's Point and you said, "No, I haven't." Do you
2	stand by that answer?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: You were asked, sir, on that
5	page whether you'd ever been to the Saltaire Motel in Fort
6	Lauderdale, Florida.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Never.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
9	And that's the answer you gave at that time;
10	wasn't it?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, you were also asked if
13	you knew a number of people. Is that correct?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Probably, yes.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, if we look at
16	MR. MacDONALD: Somewhere in there.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: just starting on the
18	next page sorry, at the bottom of page, Bates page 398,
19	you were asked if you knew someone by the name of Ron
20	Leroux.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: And you say:
23	"Don't recognize these names unless,
24	possibly, I've dealt with him in a
25	professional capacity as an accused or

1	a witness."
2	MR. MacDONALD: I don't I
3	MR. ENGELMANN: You didn't know Mr. Leroux?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Don't know them, no.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
6	And you were asked about Claude Shaver.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I know Claude Shaver.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you stand by
9	the answer you gave there, sir?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: You had several dealings
12	with him in respective, professional capacities.
13	MR. MacDONALD: I stand by that.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you ever socialize with
15	him, sir?
16	MR. MacDONALD: I went to lunch with him
17	about once a year.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
19	You were asked about a person who's
20	identified by a moniker here as C-8. You say that name
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, "Do you know a"
22	MR. ENGELMANN: doesn't ring a bell.
23	MR. MacDONALD: "Do you know a" yeah.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
25	MR. MacDONALD: I don't know that man.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
2	And you're asked questions about a number of
3	other people
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: over that page and the
6	next page and, in fact, several pages. You've had an
7	opportunity to review this statement, sir?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, a few a few months
9	weeks ago, yeah.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
11	Anything inaccurate or anything you'd want
12	to change about the answers you gave with respect to your
13	knowledge of those individuals?
14	MR. MacDONALD: No, I I don't recall
15	planning on making any changes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
17	There's nothing that came to mind that was
18	inaccurate when you reviewed it?
19	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall anything that
20	I would change.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, at Bates page 404 right
22	at the bottom and on to the following page, Detective
23	Inspector Smith indicates that you were interviewed in 1994
24	about your knowledge of the settlement between Mr. Silmser
25	and the Diocese.

1	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: And he says he doesn't plan
3	to re-address that issue with you.
4	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you see that?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: You were, however, asked a
8	few questions about the 1993 investigation into Mr.
9	Silmser's allegations against Father MacDonald
10	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: correct? Over the next
12	page or two.
13	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And, for
15	example, Detective Inspector Smith asks you some questions,
16	starting at about the middle of Bates page 406 about the
17	Father MacDonald investigation, correct?
18	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: And you were asked a few
20	questions about the settlement dealing with that
21	investigation, starting at the bottom of page 407?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Okay, I'm there.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you'd agree
24	that you were asked a few questions about the settlement
25	itself?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Two questions?
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, at the bottom of Bates
3	page 407 and on to Bates page 408.
4	MR. MacDONALD: M'hm.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: And you answer in the
6	affirmative to a couple of the questions that Mr. Smith
7	or Detective Inspector Smith puts to you.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, I see that, yeah.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Anything that you want to
10	change about your answers there, sir?
11	MR. MacDONALD: I haven't I haven't come
12	prepared for any to recommend any changes today.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
14	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall
15	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm just wondering if
16	MR. MacDONALD: making note of any.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And, sir, it
18	appears that on Bates page 410, the officers give you an
19	opportunity to comment on your position with respect to
20	sexual abuse or sexual assault within your jurisdiction and
21	some of the things you'd have to do with the prosecution of
22	same, including the case involving your father.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I got a little hot
24	under the collar there.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Sir, I want to

1	talk to you about Constable Dunlop, and you refer to him
2	there, and the allegations. Did you have any meetings or
3	discussions with him between the meeting you would have had
4	at the end of September of 1993 up until the time that
5	these allegations came out
6	MR. MacDONALD: No.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: about you and others?
8	MR. MacDONALD: No.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
10	MR. MacDONALD: I may have you know, it
11	seems to me I saw him once on the sidewalk when he was on
12	sick leave and I wished him well or hurry up back to work.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
14	MR. MacDONALD: And that would have been the
15	extent of it.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. And you were aware
17	of some of the allegations that obviously were contained in
18	his brief, and we looked at some of those
19	MR. MacDONALD: I haven't spoken to him
20	since I saw that brief.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And, sir
22	MR. MacDONALD: We've exchanged glares.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, one of the things that
24	happened after you became aware of these allegations is you
25	wrote a letter to the Police Chief, Tony Repa

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: at the Cornwall Police.
3	This was after after Constable Dunlop was back at work
4	in 1997?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: And if we just take a brief
7	look at that, that is Exhibit 1546.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: It's just a letter?
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: So I don't need it, Madam
11	Clerk; you can put it on the screen.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: It's just a one-page letter.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Maybe we could just look at
15	it on the screen.
16	Sir, it's a letter dated January 7th,
17	1998. It's to Tony Repa from yourself regarding Constable
18	Perry Dunlop, and in the letter you request that Constable
19	Dunlop deal with your colleague Guy Simard if he needs to
20	consult with Crown counsel and that all arrangements for
21	contact between Constable Dunlop and your office be made
22	through Kevin Malloy and that who's a constable at CPS?
23	MR. MacDONALD: After Perry Dunlop came back
24	to work, he worked at the front desk for a while and wasn't
25	involved in occurrences that would result in criminal

1	cases.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
3	MR. MacDONALD: But for a term, they did put
4	him back on the road or at least got him involved with
5	criminal cases, and one came up one particular morning that
6	I hadn't been I didn't know was out there, and I
7	realized I can't talk to the man, and if he needs to speak
8	to a Crown in respect to a non-Project Truth matter that's
9	presently before the courts, I refused to talk to him. And
10	so I conferred with Mr. Griffiths and we agreed that Guy
11	Simard should provide legal advice. Guy didn't know that
12	until after we'd sent this letter.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Sir, I
14	understand, given the allegations that were out there, why
15	you wouldn't want to meet with him personally. I'm
16	wondering why you felt it necessary for him to be
17	accompanied by his supervisor or Constable Malloy when they
18	were meeting with another Crown?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Because I knew him to be a
20	liar.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, well, if you were
22	concerned about him in that sense, could you not have just
23	asked Mr. Simard to go in with one of your colleagues?
24	MR. MacDONALD: No, I thought that a police
25	officer should be present, not a lawyer.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, you indicate in
2	your letter this recommendation was developed in
3	consultation with the office of the Regional Director of
4	Crown Operations?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I think it was Mr.
6	Griffiths then.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Yes, he was
8	still in that role until about May of '98. And were the
9	Cornwall Police Service agreeable with your proposal?
10	MR. MacDONALD: I received correspondence
11	from them confirming compliance. I believe that was from
12	Richard Trew.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Right, and it's the very
14	next exhibit, Number 1541.
15	And maybe we could just close this off
16	sir, before break.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: And that's Document Number
19	728108. And, sir, I believe this is a letter where
20	Inspector Trew advises you that he's advised Constable
21	Dunlop of the procedures as outlined in your earlier
22	correspondence?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, that's the letter.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: To your recollection, did
25	this procedure ever have to be followed?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Never had to be followed, to
2	my knowledge.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Sir, one other
4	very brief matter. There was a paragraph in Mr. Dunlop
5	Constable Dunlop's Will-Say, dated April 7th, 2000, wherein
6	he comments on seeing you and some others have lunch
7	MR. MacDONALD: I know that of that
8	extract.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: And that's May 30th, '97.
10	And he observes you with Jacques Leduc, Guy Simard and
11	André White?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And having lunch at the
14	restaurant in town.
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Was that accurate, sir?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you recall the
19	circumstances to why you were together?
20	MR. MacDONALD: I do. Mr. Leduc was an
21	executive member of the local Law Association and he
22	telephoned me or spoke to me in person and asked me to
23	asked me why other members of the why the Crown
24	Attorneys' Association and SD&G had a long-standing
25	practice of their employees not being members of the local

1	Law Association, their legal stail not being members of the
2	local legal fraternity.
3	I had I was a member, and so Mr. Leduc
4	asked for me to have my legal staff join him for lunch and
5	he proposed invited André and Guy to join. And in their
6	diplomatic fashion, they declined. And then I recall the
7	discussion went to the topic of Guy Simard trying to
8	arrange a date with André White and Mr. Leduc's office
9	assistant.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And André White was
11	one of your colleagues, sir?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
14	MR. MacDONALD: A single man.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Perhaps we could take
16	the afternoon break.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, let's take the
18	afternoon break.
19	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
20	veuillez vous lever.
21	This hearing will resume at 3:25 p.m.
22	Upon recessing at 3:10 p.m./
23	L'audience est suspendue à 15h10
24	Upon resuming at 3:31 p.m./
25	L'audience est reprise à 15h31.

1	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. A l'ordre
2	veuillez vous lever.
3	This hearing is now resumed. Please be
4	seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. So, just so
6	that we can make arrangements, I'm prepared to sit until
7	six o'clock this evening, so let's see where we go.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Thank you.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: And if you can keep up
10	with that and see what we can do.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Thank you.
12	MURRAY MacDONALD, Resumed/Sous le même serment:
13	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR
14	MR. ENGELMANN (cont'd/suite):
15	MR. ENGELMANN: I have just a few discreet
16	areas and I'll try and do them with some context if I can.
17	One of them that I wanted to deal with was a
18	it's a fellow by the name of Nelson Barque.
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: And just by way of
21	background, he was a probation officer here in Cornwall.
22	In 1982, the Ministry of Corrections conducted an
23	investigation into the allegations that he was supplying
24	alcohol to, and was sexually involved with, some
25	probationers who were clients of his on his list, and he

1	resigned prior to the conclusion of that investigation.
2	And we know, sir, as well, that he was
3	charged with abusing a probationer by the name of Albert
4	Roy who testified here. He was convicted of that in 1995,
5	and he was being investigated by Project Truth. And just
6	before he was charged with four new charges involving two
7	alleged victims he committed suicide, and that was in June
8	of '98.
9	So that's just by way of background. We
10	also know that there were a number of civil lawsuits
11	against the Ministry about him and a former colleague of
12	his by the name of Ken Seguin.
13	So as part of the investigation in 1982 the
14	Ministry of Corrections actually wrote to then-Crown
15	attorney Don Johnson. And I'm just wondering, sir, if you
16	might have been apprised of that at all when you became a
17	prosecutor here in Cornwall?
18	MR. MacDONALD: No, the only I became
19	apprised of it when Mr. Barque if you could refer to the
20	letter
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
22	MR. MacDONALD: Are we allowed to do that?
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, let me just show you a
25	couple of letters, if I may. And, sir, your office would

1	have been involved in the prosecution of Mr. Barque in the
2	mid-'90s?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Did you know Mr. Barque,
6	sir?
7	MR. MacDONALD: I knew of him. I didn't
8	I don't I don't recall if he was a probationer officer
9	when I was
10	MR. ENGELMANN: He stopped being a probation
11	officer in 1982.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, I knew of him, I knew
13	what he looked like, I don't recall why or how.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
15	MR. MacDONALD: I do recall that the rumour
16	mill that you can never count on was that he that I was
17	told, you know, prior to Project prior to 1993 that Mr.
18	Barque had left that Ministry under very embarrassing
19	circumstances relating to his lifestyle.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
21	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't know the extent to
22	which the Ministry had investigated him.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
24	So let's look at just a few documents. And
25	if you can, it might be faster to do it on the screen, and

1	I'm not going to go into great detail, I can assure you
2	that, sir.
3	MR. MacDONALD: No, I'm fine with the
4	screen.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
6	Exhibit 903, it's Document Number 115960.
7	Mr. Commissioner, if you don't mind my doing it that way I
8	think it will speed things up. And I won't go into detail
9	on this.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: No, if they're letters
11	that's fine.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Then we can look at them
14	and
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, this is just a letter
16	that was sent by one of the Corrections investigators, a
17	fellow by the name of McMaster, to Mr. Johnson.
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: He's enclosing a copy of the
20	investigation report, which is an exhibit here. It's
21	Exhibit 125, but I don't think we need to go there.
22	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: And it's with respect to Mr.
24	Barque. And he says:
25	"As discussed on the phone and due to

1	the nature of the report we would
2	appreciate its return when you've
3	completed your review of same. Also
4	appreciate being advised of your
5	decision in this matter."
6	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: So they were sending it off
8	to Mr. Johnson for his review about possible criminal
9	charges.
10	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
12	And there's a letter back from Mr. Johnson.
13	That is Exhibit 899, sir. It's Document Number 115948.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know if this is
15	it.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Just a moment. I'm sorry.
17	It is Exhibit did I say 899? Yeah, Exhibit 899,
18	Document Number 115948, I believe.
19	MR. MacDONALD: The 22 June letter by Mr.
20	Johnson?
21	$MR.$ ENGELMANN: Right. This is a June 22^{nd}
22	letter from Mr. Johnson to Mr. McMaster. And he's
23	referring to the letter of June $14^{\rm th}$ and he's saying:
24	"I've come to the conclusion that in
25	the circumstances criminal charges

1	would not be warranted."
2	Okay?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And he sets out some of his
5	reasons for that in the letter.
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: And among other reasons he
8	says:
9	"Mr. Barque resigned immediately after
10	being confronted with the allegations
11	and also because one of the
12	probationers allegedly involved was 21
13	years of age."
14	And, sir, had you ever seen this
15	correspondence between Mr. Johnson and the Ministry before
16	your preparation for this Inquiry?
17	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
19	And do you know, sir, I know this is
20	before your time, but would this have been a common
21	practice for a Ministry to refer something like this, an
22	internal investigation, over to a local Crown to review and
23	provide an opinion as to whether charges should be laid?
24	MR. MacDONALD: This would be uncommon, very
25	uncommon.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
2	Is this something you would expect a file to
3	be opened on if it was requested?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Internal office?
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
6	MR. MacDONALD: I presume so, yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
8	Now, moving ahead to 1995 it's my
9	understanding that Mr. Barque was prosecuted by your
10	office?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: And at that point Mr.
13	Johnson's been gone for about three years?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: And he's no longer working
16	as a Crown attorney but he's working as a defence lawyer?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: And he's actually
19	representing Mr. Barque?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you know, sir, were
22	there policies or protocols in place at your office
23	regarding conflicts or potential conflicts of interest
24	particularly since former Crown attorneys may then become
25	defence counsel, work in the same town?

1	MR. MacDONALD: That's a Law Society issue.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So there's no
3	formal office policy or protocol on that?
4	MR. MacDONALD: No, in 1990 sorry, what
5	year was that?
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Nineteen ninety-five (1995).
7	MR. MacDONALD: Ninety-five ('95), the Law
8	Society had commentaries on that.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. You recognize
10	so, sir, that
11	MR. MacDONALD: Or a commentary.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. You recognize, sir,
13	that there could be a potential conflict of interest, a
14	case of this nature?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, the one of the
16	leading cases on point is the 1983 case called Spied, S-P-
17	I-E-D. It's an Ontario Court of Appeal decision that deals
18	generally with the question of a solicitor who has
19	knowledge about a former client who is now in an interest
20	adverse to the interest of that solicitor's new client.
21	This is where the that's the legal issue that arose, and
22	as you know that's the reason why I alerted Mr. Johnson to
23	the letter.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
25	So let's

1	MR. MacDONALD: To that issue.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Let's take a look at I
3	understand, sir, that you sent him a letter.
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: And that is Exhibit 112.
6	It's a one-page letter. If we could just have that on the
7	screen.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: It's Document Number 114249.
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, in this letter you
12	refer to an earlier conversation with him in which you
13	indicate that there may be an appearance of a conflict with
14	Johnson acting as counsel, in light of the fact that he was
15	consulted by probation authorities in respect of charges
16	against the above-noted individual during his tenure as
17	Crown attorney.
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you recall the
20	conversation you would have had with him?
21	MR. MacDONALD: No.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Would it have been any
23	different, sir well, maybe you can't help, but it would
24	have been along the lines of what you say in the letter
25	presumably?

1	MR. MacDONALD: I believe so.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
3	And, sir, do you recall how you became aware
4	at that time of his involvement from 1982?
5	MR. MacDONALD: I believe it was from the
6	investigators
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
8	MR. MacDONALD: on this on that
9	current investigation.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And in the letter you say
11	that Johnson's indicated to you that a plea is anticipated
12	
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: and therefore he feels a
15	potential conflict is not an issue.
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you agree with that,
18	sir?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I didn't say so in
20	writing but I didn't respond because I believed he was
21	correct as far as Spied the doctrine in Spied is
22	concerned.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
24	And so therefore you agreed with him that it
25	was really only going to be a conflict if, in fact, there

1	was a trial that was coming forward?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you recall, sir, why
4	the distinction, if he pleads guilty there's no conflict
5	but if there is a trial there is?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Well, he's not going to be
7	cross-examining anybody.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: His prosecution, sir, wasn't
9	handled by yourself, it was handled by Mr. Simard of your
10	office?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: And if we could look briefly
13	at it's Document Number 115256. Again I think this is
14	just a one-page letter from Mr. Simard to Mr. Johnson,
15	dated February 14 th , 1995.
16	MR. MacDONALD: I recall that.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: If that could be the next
18	exhibit, sir.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, certainly.
20	So Exhibit Number 2930 is a letter of
21	February 14 th , 1999 to Mr. Johnson from Guy Simard.
22	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2930:
23	(114256) - Letter from Guy Simard to Don
24	Johnson re: R. v. Nelson Barque
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. In the letter

1	Mr. Simard writes:
2	"I understand you have an apparent
3	conflict if this matter goes to trial."
4	And he also indicates that:
5	"I've also been advised your client
6	wishes to resolve this by way of early
7	plea of guilt."
8	Do you recall, sir, having any discussions
9	with Mr. Simard prior to his writing this letter?
10	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. You
12	MR. MacDONALD: He and I
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Sorry.
14	MR. MacDONALD: He and I have speculated on
15	it in preparation for this Commission but we can't confirm
16	that we had inferred
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Would it have been the same
18	apparent conflict that you referenced earlier, this 1982
19	request for a review?
20	MR. MacDONALD: I understood that Guy was
21	writing in respect to the fact that Mr. Barque was a former
22	was a former probation officer in the jurisdiction where
23	Mr. Johnson acted as Crown.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. So you're not sure if
25	you would have told Mr. Simard about the request for the

1	opinion from 1982?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall, but I don't
3	believe I told Mr. Simard about that. I'm of the view that
4	I sent the letter off while it was still the letter to
5	Mr. Johnson while the file was in my hands, and after I
6	turned it over to Guy for preparation he it crossed his
7	he made the decision to contact Mr. Johnson when he felt
8	that he should be put on notice if a trial was to proceed
9	with respect to Mr. Barque as former probation officer in
10	the jurisdiction.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, and as a result
12	of Mr. Simard's letter I understand that Mr. Johnson wrote
13	back to you, to your office, and that's Document Number
14	114255.
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: It's a letter from
17	Mr. Johnson actually to yourself, sir
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: dated February 27 th , '95.
20	If that could be the next exhibit,
21	Mr. Commissioner.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly. That will be
23	Exhibit Number 2931.
24	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2931:
25	(114255) - Letter from Don Johnson to Murray

1	MacDonald re: R. v. Nelson Barque dated 27
2	Feb 95.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And again, just in the
5	second paragraph, he acknowledges that he would have a
6	conflict and would turn if the matter went to trial, he
7	would turn Mr. Barque over to another counsel.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: And he does say, however,
10	that at the present time it appears that won't be
11	necessary.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Right. And I concluded
13	likewise with the note that you see the handwritten
14	note. That's my
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
16	MR. MacDONALD: My moniker is Murf.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: And did this concern you at
18	all, sir, that a conflict could force Johnson to remove
19	himself from a case if it goes to trial, and yet he wasn't
20	of the view that it was a conflict if there was just a plea
21	of guilt?
22	MR. MacDONALD: No.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
24	Was there any concern on your part that Mr.
25	Barque may be prejudiced by needing to retain new counsel

1	if the matter went to trial?
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, Mr it didn't.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Fair enough.
4	Did you ever consider, sir, having any
5	obligation to bring this matter to the Law Society's
6	attention or do anything further with Mr. Barque on it
7	or Mr. Johnson?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Not in light of his position
9	that this would be a plea where adverse interests wouldn't
10	be cross-examined.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
12	Now, sir, I understand about a year later
13	Mr. Barque comes to your attention again your office's
14	attention.
15	If we could look at Exhibit 916; it's a
16	letter from Constable Sebalj to yourself, dated February
17	7 th , 1996.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: That's not it. That's
19	better.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: This is a two-page letter,
21	sir, where it starts off:
22	"Further to our conversation in your
23	office on or about January 4 th , 1996,
24	please accept the following report
25	concerning allegations of sexual

1	assault against former probation
2	officer Nelson Barque."
3	Do you have any recollection of dealing with
4	her on this matter? The fellow whose name is there
5	THE COMMISSIONER: C-44, Mr. Engelmann.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: is C-44.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Vaguely.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. It appears you
9	would have asked her to provide you with something in
10	writing before you commented.
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, this was in the nature
12	of one of those scenarios where I would have relayed the
13	question, the legal question the legal advice being
14	sought from the officer to Mr. Griffiths and then I would
15	have either sent Heidi Sebalj a letter from Mr. Griffiths
16	or I believe in this instance Mr. Griffiths phoned me and
17	gave me instructions. But he may have he may have
18	written me and I don't recall.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Can I see the second page
20	here, Madam Clerk? Okay.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: The third page just says:
22	"Trusting this is the information you
23	require. Look forward to hearing from
24	you."
25	MR. MacDONALD: I did not provide a legal

1	opinion of my own on this matter.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, but this is a
3	legal opinion you then requested of your Regional Director?
4	MR. MacDONALD: I believe it was
5	Mr. Griffiths, yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: And was there a change in
7	your practice by this point about requiring police officers
8	to provide you with some written documentation or report
9	before you'd render an opinion?
10	MR. MacDONALD: After all that transpired in
11	the fall of 1993, our office adopted a practice of
12	requiring for of course, in order to ensure that you'd
13	be one would be enlightened in all the facts, and also I
14	suppose an element of CYA for both the officer and the
15	Crown we would require, on many occasions, seeing
16	materials, a Crown brief or the statements.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: So this is something that
18	you required from CPS officers after that exchange you had
19	with them in September of '93?
20	MR. MacDONALD: And they were more inclined
21	more than inclined to reciprocate.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And, sir, in the
23	letter it just explains briefly that C-44 did not want to
24	be involved in the earlier prosecution of with Mr.
25	Barque but now wished to pursue it. And we know he was one

1	of the individual probationers mentioned in the 1982
2	report, and according to the letter Ms. Sebalj encloses
3	that report and she's seeking advice as to whether or not
4	charges should be laid, or could be laid, against
5	Mr. Barque in respect of his allegations. Is that fair?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, I understand you
8	responded with a letter dated March $5^{\rm th}$, 1996, and that is
9	Exhibit 917.
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir. Heidi knew, in
11	sending the previous exhibit letter to me, that it was for
12	the purpose of relaying on to an outside Crown.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you had
14	actually forwarded her materials to the Regional Director
15	of Crown Attorneys, Mr. Griffiths?
16	MR. MacDONALD: I presume so.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: And you would have sent the
18	material she included, including the 1982 investigation
19	report?
20	MR. MacDONALD: I believe I did.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: And Mr. Griffiths advised
22	that with respect to the charge of indecent assault it was
23	lacking some essential elements.
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir. I have three
25	listed there.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: And they're listed in his
2	letter.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And as a result,
5	it was his opinion that criminal proceedings were not
6	available.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you receive anything
9	else from Mr. Griffiths or anything in writing?
10	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you have any
12	recollection of discussing this with him, other than what
13	you've set out in the letter?
14	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, I want to ask you
16	briefly about another matter. It's involving an individual
17	by the name of Gilf Greggain. By way of background, this
18	was a case that Constable Jeff Carroll was investigating.
19	It was a complaint by an individual named Marc Latour
20	against a former teacher of his; this fellow Mr. Greggain.
21	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: And if we can look very
23	briefly at Exhibit 362. These are notes of Officer
24	Carroll. I just want to take you to a couple points, if I
25	may.

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir, they're up here.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: He's got a at Bates page
3	228 there's just a brief reference to speaking he speaks
4	to Guy Simard on January $3^{\rm rd}$, 2003 about these allegations.
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: It appears from the notes
7	that Simard advised Carroll that he'd require a full brief
8	to assess this in terms of a reasonable prospect of
9	conviction; correct?
10	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: And including transcribed
12	video statements?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, do you know if you'd
15	had any contact with Officer Carroll at this point-in-time?
16	MR. MacDONALD: I believe that although I
17	don't have an independent recollection of it, there's
18	correspondence that would cause me to believe that
19	Mr. Simard and I after this meeting, Mr. Simard and I
20	decided to scrum the file and "scrum", meaning a second
21	opinion where we review the session and the evidence
22	together and then determine a legal opinion on behalf of
23	the office.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So to the best
25	of your knowledge if we look at the third page in his

1	notes, it's Bates page 230.
2	There's a reference to a discussion with
3	you, sir, regarding the case. It says:
4	"Murray has reviewed the case video and
5	is of the opinion that no reasonable
6	prospect of conviction exists and feels
7	that my determination that RE&G to
8	lay a charge has not been established."
9	Do you see that?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So after your
12	scrum, you would have given this opinion to Officer
13	Carroll?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Simard was also
15	preparing for a homicide preliminary hearing or trial in
16	February, and so I presume that is why I got back to
17	Sergeant Carroll.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And, sir, I
19	understand that after this, Sergeant Carroll would have
20	written a letter to you just confirming this, and that's
21	Exhibit 1689?
22	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: It's a one-page letter.
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I've seen that letter.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: And, again, just confirming

1	that no reasonable prospect of conviction exists; correct?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: And, in addition, as I
4	indicated in the review of the notes, confirming the
5	officer's belief about reasonable and probable grounds?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. And, sir, I want to
8	then ask you
9	MR. MacDONALD: You've noted another change
10	in practice there that we since the 1993 investigation,
11	we've now in our office, and elsewhere in the Province,
12	taken making the assume the practice upon request of
13	providing our comments on the objective component of RPGs,
14	and explaining the subjective component when asked.
15	MR. MacDONALD: All right. Sir, prior
16	to
17	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry? Say that
18	again? Can you say that again, sir?
19	MR. MacDONALD: We would venture an opinion
20	on RPGs. We would, if asked now, venture an opinion on
21	RPGs
22	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm?
23	MR. MacDONALD: especially on
24	particularly evidentiarily complex cases.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm?

1	MR. MacDONALD: We were not inclined to do
2	that back in prior to 1993.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, prior to the note that
4	we looked at of January $3^{\rm rd}$, 2003, we know this matter was
5	with the Cornwall Police Service for some time before then
6	and there were at one point-in-time, the complainant was
7	reluctant to come forward and then wanted to come forward.
8	To your knowledge do you have any
9	knowledge of involvement with your office before that note
10	we looked at, in January, 2003?
11	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
13	Sir, I want to ask you a few questions about
14	Earl Landry, Jr.
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Your office was involved in
17	that prosecution?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Lynn Robinson was, yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. And this was not a
20	Project Truth case. It was a case investigated by the
21	Cornwall Police Service?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: And if we could look briefly
24	at it's tab sorry, it's Exhibit 1611.
25	This is a one-page note to file from

1	yourself, I believe? I'm sorry, it's a memo from Lynn
2	Robinson
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: a one-page note from her
5	to you.
6	MR. MacDONALD: Pre-email days.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. I remember them
8	fondly.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't.
10	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
11	MR. ENGELMANN: No, I'm sure you don't.
12	This is a memo to you from Lynn Robinson, in
13	which she outlines some issues she's having with the
14	Cornwall Police Service?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And she's apparently written
17	to Constable Snyder on July 7 th , 1997
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: asking him why he's
20	attempting to obtain counselling records or assessments
21	about the victims?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: And requesting that he have
24	one information laid with all counts?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: On October 1st, 1997, I
2	understand she wrote a follow-up letter to Constable
3	Snyder, and she's noting that here?
4	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: And she's saying that it was
6	not responded to?
7	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: And she's got two concerns:
9	"Why no response to my letters and if
10	documents obtained a year ago, why only
11	disclosed to Crown now?"
12	Do you see that?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And she wanted
15	you to address this with someone at the CPS?
16	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: And why would she be asking
18	you to be involved?
19	MR. MacDONALD: I'm not sure. It may be
20	because I told her to draft me a memo that invited me to do
21	so and lay out why.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
23	MR. MacDONALD: But I'm just speculating
24	there.
25	Otherwise, it would have been wise on her

1	part, of her own initiative, to say, "I want to bring this
2	to Murray's attention now that my responses have gone
3	unheard".
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, clearly, there's been
5	some correspondence between her and the officer.
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: And she's asking you to get
8	involved?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. And she may have
10	spoken to me before this memo, I don't recall
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
12	MR. MacDONALD: on the issue.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you know if there
14	were other issues at the time that she might have raised
15	with you about this
16	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I
17	MR. ENGELMANN: or are these the ones
18	that you remember?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Not necessarily on this
20	file, but I believe when I obviously, as you know, I
21	followed up on this memo with conversation or
22	correspondence, or both, to Chief Repa.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
24	Let's look at Exhibit 1612. I believe
25	that's your correspondence that follows up. It's a letter

1	you write to Chief Repa, May 28 th , 1998.
2	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Is this in fact the letter
4	you write as result of the concerns raised by Ms. Robinson?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: The letter indicates that
7	you had some discussions with Chief Repa earlier about the
8	matter?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Well, in more detail on the
10	subject of that last exhibit.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And, sir, the
12	issues you discussed, were they the issues that Ms.
13	Robinson had set out for you?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: And at the end of the letter
16	you ask that Crown requests for information be acted upon
17	as quickly and reasonably as possible?
18	MR. MacDONALD: I'd given them a couple of
19	other examples, unrelated to this prosecution
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
21	MR. MacDONALD: where timeliness was of
22	concern to me. I brought it to his attention and he
23	intended to do something about it. I believe he did.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you were
25	concerned about the possible impact some of these delays

1	might have?	
2	MR. MacDONALD:	Yes, sir.
3	MR. ENGELMANN:	And, sir, you got a response
4	from Chief Repa. It's Exhibit	1843.
5	MR. MacDONALD:	Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN:	A letter, one-page letter,
7	dated June 9 th , 1988?	
8	MR. MacDONALD:	Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN:	1998, sorry.
10	MR. MacDONALD:	Yes, sir.
11	MR. ENGELMANN:	This is response that we're
12	seeing on the screen oops -	- that we were just seeing on
13	the screen?	
14	THE COMMISSIONE	R: No, it wasn't his
15	response.	
16	MR. ENGELMANN:	Sorry. There we go.
17	MR. MacDONALD:	There it is.
18	MR. ENGELMANN:	Is this the response to your
19	letter to him of May 28 th , sir?	
20	MR. MacDONALD:	Yes, sir.
21	MR. ENGELMANN:	And he requested you and
22	MR. MacDONALD:	He liked to see problem
23	issues, correspondence, go thr	ough his desk or at least
24	through his staff's office.	
25	MR. ENGELMANN:	Right. He's saying he

225

1	wants:
2	"you and/or your staff to forward
3	all correspondence concerning requests
4	for follow-up by our officers to my
5	personal attention."
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And was that
8	practice, in fact, adopted?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And was that of assistance?
11	MR. MacDONALD: I believe it was.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: And there's one other issue
13	I'd like to discuss with you regarding the Earl Landry,
14	Jr., prosecution, and that is in Document Number 129638.
15	I'd like to make that an exhibit, sir. It's
16	a Crown brief synopsis with respect to the Earl Landry, Jr.
17	matter.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
19	Exhibit Number 2932 is a Crown brief
20	synopsis.
21	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2932:
22	(129638) - Crown Brief Synopsis re. Earl
23	Landry, Jr dated September 3, 1997
24	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, I'm interested in the

1	portion near the bottom of the page, and one of the fellows
2	I'm going to use a moniker for.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Okay.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: It says:
5	"On 4 September, 1998, Sergeant Snyder
6	received a statement from Mr. C-54, a
7	victim in a sexual assault incident, in
8	which Earl Landry is the accused."
9	Sir, I don't know if you recall, but there
10	were I believe five or more victims involved here with Earl
11	Landry, Jr.?
12	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
14	You recall there were several, there were
15	more than one?
16	MR. MacDONALD: I think yes. Yeah.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: The statement stated that:
18	"The accused offered the victim a
19	computer in exchange for dropping the
20	charges against him. The computer was
21	going to be used for the victim's
22	schooling. The offer was done on 9
23	June '98. The victim subsequently sent
24	a letter to the accused's lawyer, Mr.
25	Don Johnson, dated 9 June '98, advising

1	that he wished to drop all the charges
2	against the accused Mr. Landry. The
3	victim was advised by Sergeant Snyder
4	that charges would not be dropped. A
5	second letter was sent to the Crown's
6	office, dated July 26th and signed by
7	C-54, stating he wished the charges to
8	be dropped."
9	Okay?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Was that sent by Mr. Johnson
11	or by the complainant himself?
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, the second one appears
13	to have been sent to the Crown's office by the complainant.
14	The first one was sent from Mr. Johnson's office to your
15	office, but it was signed by the complainant.
16	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, was this matter brought
18	to your attention at the time?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Probably. I don't recall,
20	but
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
22	MR. MacDONALD: I think it's
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Is it likely that Ms.
24	Robinson would bring something like that to your attention?
25	MR. MacDONALD: I expect she would have.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: There would be an issue
2	about perhaps an attempt to obstruct justice?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Or a concern about how to
4	manage a reluctant witness.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And, sir, there's a
6	letter from Ms. Robinson or, sorry. The letter from
7	Johnson to Robinson is Document Number 129702.
8	Sir, the letter references C-54 by
9	name.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah, there'll be a stamp
11	on it as well. Thank you. Exhibit No. 2933 is a letter
12	dated the 9th of June 1998 to Ms. Lynn Robinson from Donald
13	Johnson.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sorry, 2933, sir?
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
16	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. 2933:
17	(129702) - Letter fromDon Johnson to Lynn
18	Robinson re: Regina v. Earl Landry, Jr.
19	dated 11 Jun 98
20	MR. ENGELMANN: So, sir, this is what I was
21	referring to. We have a letter from the accused's lawyer,
22	enclosing a note from one of the alleged victims.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And then, sir,
25	there's another memo to file, if I can call it that. It's

1	129714. And this is a memo from Officer Malloy to Lynn
2	Robinson.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Officer Malloy was a police
4	case manager
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Thank you.
6	MR. MacDONALD: an employee of the
7	Cornwall Police, situate in our office, conducting liaison
8	duties at that relevant time. He still is today.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: So Exhibit 2934 is a memo
11	to Lynn Robertson (sic) from who's that?
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Kevin Malloy, sir.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Kevin. Kevin, right.
14	Dated 29th of January 1998. Again, there should be a
15	publication stamp on this document.
16	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. 2934:
17	(129714) - Memo from Kevin Malloy to
18	Lynn Robinson re: C-54 dated 29 Jan 98
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Thank you, sir. So it's
20	regarding the Landry, Jr. prosecution, indicates that
21	Sergeant Snyder met at length with C-54, who no longer
22	wishes to proceed, no explanation. And then down below:
23	"Please advise that the Crown will be
24	proceeding and will not withdraw these
25	charges. I imagine that when the

1	victim is so advised, so he will want
2	to meet with me."
3	Et cetera, and that's from Lynn Robinson, right?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: And again, sir, do you know
6	if you had any discussion with her about this or whether
7	this was just something she was handling on her own?
8	MR. MacDONALD: I have some recollection
9	that we were of the view this was not the common reluctant
10	witness scenario, but a witness who Lynn thought she could
11	not rehabilitate, but explain why she intended to
12	continue and that she expected that the person would
13	cooperate.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And, sir, at
15	one more document, if I may, just to give us the flavour.
16	This is 126 sorry, 129699. This is the subsequent
17	letter that's sent, the letter sent directly from C-54
18	it will need a publication ban stamp
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: to your office.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Exhibit 2935.
22	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. 2935:
23	(129699) - Letter from C-54 to Lynn Robinson
24	dated 26 Jul 98
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Thank you.

1	Sir, this is the second letter we referred
2	to earlier, where the complainant is writing directly to
3	your office and he's saying he wishes to:
4	"drop all charges concerning Earl
5	Landry due to stress on myself and my
6	family. I will be seeking counselling
7	in the future to help me deal with my
8	past. I do not wish to be present at
9	any of the court dates."
10	And there's a note, I think from Lynn Robinson to
11	Constable Malloy:
12	"Please have Brian contact this victim.
13	He will be subpoenaed if no plea of
14	guilty."
15	So it appears that she's going to force this
16	fellow on if there's no guilty plea.
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you have any discussions
19	with her about taking the step of issuing a subpoena to
20	C-54 if there was no guilty plea?
21	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall, but it's
22	possible.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Were you aware
24	that she was taking this position?
25	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Now, sir, this
2	is a I realize that charges are laid here. This is
3	somewhat similar to the situation with Mr. Silmser from
4	before.
5	MR. MacDONALD: Well, this was a Lynn was
6	concerned that there was potentially an inducement of some
7	kind in this instance.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, she was concerned that
9	the complainant was receiving something for not proceeding
10	with charges.
11	MR. MacDONALD: Lynn felt that it was
12	that it was possibly, shall we say, improper, bordering on
13	interference. This wasn't a civil a civil resolution.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, he's saying in his
15	letter that it's stress, but she's concerned that he's
16	essentially being bought off?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you have a
19	concern about that, and in this case a desire to push ahead
20	and subpoena the fellow and keep it going.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Right, which
22	MR. ENGELMANN: And you have, to start out
23	at least, a lawyer from the defence counsel enclosing a
24	request from the victim to withdraw and then a direct
25	request from the victim.

1	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And we know in
3	this case that the position that your office is taking is,
4	we're going to proceed in any event.
5	MR. MacDONALD: As it was in 1993. I sent
6	the officers twice to confer with the victim and encourage
7	him to come
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. All right. And
9	that's your position on what happened in '93.
10	MR. MacDONALD: That's what happened in
11	1993.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes?
14	MS. McINTOSH: Well, I think the premise,
15	Mr. Commissioner, being put to the to the witness is
16	unfair, because in this case they knew about the inducement
17	and that was the scenario in which they said, well, we're
18	going to we're going to force this witness on. But in
19	Mr. Silmser's case, there was no knowledge of any sort of
20	improper interference with Mr. Silmser at the time that the
21	decision was made that we wouldn't force him on.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: What was the induce
23	see, I don't know, other than I've read this thing about
24	the computer
25	MS. McINTOSH: Well, the my understanding

1	is that the knowledge of the exchange of the computer to
2	ask this victim to go away was known to the Crown's office.
3	I could be mistaken about that, but I think that's a
4	significant difference in this scenario.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, okay, just a
6	second. Did you know beforehand, before this letter or
7	whatever, why he wanted did he say anything about a
8	computer at this point?
9	MR. MacDONALD: We knew that Lynn knew
10	that
11	THE COMMISSIONER: C-44?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes. Had received this
13	so-called gift, I think.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, 54.
15	MR. MacDONALD: Lynn Lynn had a letter at
16	one point. I don't know if she had it initially, but at
17	one point she had, I think, a copy of a letter from the
18	C-44
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Fifty-four (54). Sorry.
20	MR. MacDONALD: or 54 to 54 from the
21	suspect well, actually, I'm not sure who it was from,
22	but it made reference to a gift.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Sorry. It appears what
24	happened and if we want to look back to 2932, that might
25	be of assistance.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay			
2	MR. ENGELMANN: It appears what happens is			
3	after these letters			
4	MR. MacDONALD: Right.			
5	MR. ENGELMANN: the matter's			
6	investigated			
7	MR. MacDONALD: Right.			
8	MR. ENGELMANN: to see why the fellow's			
9	changing his mind.			
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. So, Ms. McIntosh,			
11	I don't know that your premise is correct. I don't know if			
12	it's incorrect or not correct, but I don't know. I haven't			
13	heard anything so far.			
14	MS. McINTOSH: I'm not sure we're going to			
15	clear it up through this witness either, I guess, but			
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.			
17	MS. McINTOSH: I could be wrong. I			
18	apologize, but I think that			
19	THE COMMISSIONER: But even even there,			
20	even there, what's the difference between I'll give you a			
21	computer or I'll give you money?			
22	MS. McINTOSH: Well, I think the difference			
23	is knowing whether there was an improper inducement as			
24	opposed to a civil settlement. I think that's quite a			
25	different kettle of fish. If a witness is saying, you			

1	know, I don't want to do this anymore; I've got a proper			
2	civil settlement; I'm not interested in proceeding with a			
3	criminal charge as opposed to a gift to someone to induce			
4	them to abandon the criminal proceedings. I mean			
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Kozloff is			
6	MR. KOZLOFF: I'm just going to have to			
7	confer with my friend.			
8	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.			
9	No, no, Ms. McIntosh but unless you know			
10	that I mean, you say there's a letter somewhere along			
11	the line, but before we know of the letter, if somebody			
12	gives somebody a computer as a gift and nothing else, how			
13	are you going to jump to the conclusion come to the			
14	conclusion that it's an inducement?			
15	MS. McINTOSH: Well, I think from the			
16	circumstances, Mr. Commissioner, if an accused is lavishing			
17	gifts on an alleged victim, then I think from those			
18	circumstances one might infer that there was something			
19	improper about that.			
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.			
21	Mr. Engelmann, do you have any last comment?			
22	MR. ENGELMANN: I think the analogy still			
23	stands, sir, and I think what happened here though is if			
24	we look at 2932 for a minute			
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Let's look at 2932, Madam			

1	Clerk.				
2	MR. ENGELMANN: it's clear that this				
3	matter was followed up and one looked behind the settlement				
4	or the reasons and uncovered something.				
5	THE COMMISSIONER: And so you're at the				
6	Crown synopsis?				
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, if we look it says,				
8	"For September".				
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Uh'huh.				
10	MR. ENGELMANN: So this is a couple of				
11	months after the second letter. Sergeant Snyder was able				
12	to get a statement from this particular victim and in the				
13	statement he said the accused offered him a computer in				
14	exchange for.				
15	But back on July 26 th				
16	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.				
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Ms. Robinson is saying				
18	this fellow's going to be subpoenaed if there's no plea of				
19	guilt.				
20	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.				
21	MR. ENGELMANN: So it appears clear whether				
22	it your office has instructions or not, sir, that the				
23	Cornwall Police went back and investigated and looked				
24	beyond the statement coming in saying it's due to stress,				
25	et cetera, and found out the purpose or found out some of				

238

1	the reasons behind his desire to withdraw.
2	MR. MacDONALD: Which I fully expect Lynn
3	would have urged the officer to do.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
5	MR. MacDONALD: And that context I see it as
6	radically different and I'll you and I will have to
7	agree to disagree on your interpretation with respect to a
8	scenario where three lawyers have openly conducted a civil
9	resolution versus a victim receiving a gift from a suspect
10	with the appearance at first blush though this looks
11	like a like a hush gift.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, sir, you could you
13	could say that about both and
14	MR. MacDONALD: Well, we can debate it all
15	day, but I'm right and you're wrong.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: But the difference, sir, is,
17	in this particular case, one looked beyond. And so if one
18	had looked at the settlement document earlier and if that
19	had been investigated and you'd found out about the illegal
20	provision, things would have been much different.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: And it appears, in this
23	case, there was an investigation after the complainant
24	wanted to withdraw and the officer found out that there was
25	a gift involved.

1	MR. MacDONALD: There was an investigation			
2	into an obvious flag that had just waved, not in regards to			
3	expecting lawyers to participate a lawyer or lawyers to			
4	participate in obstruction of justice by putting in an			
5	illegal clause in what otherwise is a standard form of			
6	civil resolution. I see that as again having to refer back			
7	to my analogy of not eating the apple pie had I known what			
8	the baker's assistant had done with the strychnine.			
9	MR. ENGELMANN: But, sir, in this case			
10	and I'll just leave it here one looked beyond the			
11	reasons and there was an investigation.			
12	MR. MacDONALD: One looked to the to what			
13	smelled, as Heidi did or Luc did or both with respect to			
14	approaching the victim and encouraging him to continue			
15	after wanting to assure him that civil settlement or no,			
16	the Cornwall Police intended to continue with their			
17	investigation.			
18	MR. ENGELMANN: And there's no question as			
19	early as July 26^{th} when this letter came in about stress			
20	that the reluctant witness was going to be compelled to			
21	testify if necessary.			
22	MR. MacDONALD: If necessary.			
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. All right.			
24	Sir, if we could change tracks very quickly,			
25	you were aware; were you not, that Malcolm MacDonald was			

1	charged with attempting to obstruct justice for his role in				
2	the settlement?				
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.				
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And your office did not				
5	handle that prosecution?				
6	MR. MacDONALD: No, sir.				
7	MR. ENGELMANN: And just one document that I				
8	wanted to put in, sir, and that is Document Number 715999.				
9	And this is a letter from yourself, Mr. MacDonald, to a Mr.				
10	Robert Wakefield.				
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.				
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Date is February 15 th , '95.				
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.				
14	Exhibit Number 2936.				
15	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. 2936:				
16	(715999) - Letter from Murray MacDonald to				
17	Robert Wakefield re: R. v. Malcolm Macdonald				
18	dated 15 February '05				
19	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.				
20	MR. ENGELMANN: And you're indicating here,				
21	sir, that this matter is not going to be prosecuted by your				
22	office.				
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.				
24	MR. ENGELMANN: And you say, as he is a				
25	member of the local Bar.				

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir. He was writing
2	asking for a disclosure, I presume.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
4	And I'd assume you'd agree that you would
5	not be prosecuting this, not just because he's a member of
6	the local Bar, but because you'd had some conversations
7	with him as well.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I chose not to make
9	that comment.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
11	And sir, just a couple of questions about
12	one other matter and that is a case involving a fellow by
13	the name of Robert Sabourin.
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: And was that a prosecution
16	that was handled by your office as well, sir?
17	MR. MacDONALD: I believe so.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: And I believe you did not
19	prosecute the matter; it was done by Guy Simard; the matter
20	was done in French?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
23	And sir, I believe you were involved in a
24	judicial pre-trial but he took it over and handled the
25	trial?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.				
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.				
3	And did you continue to play any role in the				
4	matter after the judicial pre-trial or was it, essentially,				
5	his file from then on?				
6	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall. The usual				
7	practice I can tell you about and that was that I managed				
8	the bulk of the charges up to counsel and judicial pre-				
9	trial and if it was going to you know, other than a				
10	half-day trial if it was going on to any form of lengthy				
11	proceedings then it would be assigned on to the trial Crown				
12	at that point.				
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And this was back in 1998?				
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.				
15	MR. ENGELMANN: And I'm wondering about				
16	contact with victims. Do you recall whether well, at				
17	that particular point in time, there was no victim				
18	assistance program here?				
19	MR. MacDONALD: Correct.				
20	MR. ENGELMANN: And were you and/or Mr.				
21	Simard tasked with that or did you have officers who could				
22	help? Do you know how that worked with				
23	MR. MacDONALD: We				
24	MR. ENGELMANN: respect to contact with				
25	people?				

1	MR. MacDONALD: We had a practice that
2	should have worked in theory but did not always do so at no
3	fault of I'm not trying to blame the police and I'm not
4	criticizing my assistant Crown Attorneys or we did
5	occasionally miss the opportunity to contact a complainant.
6	Sometimes it was with the crossing of wires between the
7	Crown and the case manager. Sometimes it was a crossing of
8	wires between the case manager and the investigator. There
9	are other reasons. Our system was at the time, it was
10	the worst possible system except for all other systems.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
12	Well, we heard from a couple of the
13	complainants in that matter both who testified here and
14	neither of whom are monikered about their experience and
15	that was Andre Lavoie and Alain Seguin.
16	MR. MacDONALD: As Crown Attorney, I'd like
17	to apologize to both of them.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, I believe in one case
19	and thank you, sir. I believe in one case, Mr. Seguin
20	testified that he just didn't remember anyone from the
21	Crown's office trying to contact him about court dates or
22	the sentencing or the guilty plea and said he was never
23	contacted by the office, nor did he contact the Crown's
24	office because he didn't know what essentially, what the
25	office was or how to do that.

1	He also testified he was not offered any			
2	victims assistance but I think you've told us that wasn't			
3	available in 1998.			
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.			
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.			
6	And that has obviously changed?			
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir, dramatically.			
8	MR. ENGELMANN: With respect to the other			
9	victim, Mr. Lavoie, he testified that he was contacted and			
10	that there was a victim impact statement that was to be			
11	filed in court, and his concern was he wanted to have the			
12	opportunity to actually read his victim impact statement.			
13	And that was his concern, not having the opportunity to do			
14	that.			
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.			
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you know if there is			
17	currently a policy with respect to that in your office,			
18	sir?			
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir. There was one			
20	back then as well but it was another one that was not			
21	foolproof. The current practice the Victim Witness Program			
22	has a double-check system that would preclude that			
23	happening.			
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. MacDonald, that includes			
25	(sic) my questions for you, with the exception of two.			

1	And, sir, what I wanted to ask you and you can feel free			
2	to comment or not we've asked all witnesses, whether			
3	they be victims, alleged victims, people from the community			
4	or people like yourself working for a public institution			
5	about some of the impact and effects that some of these			
6	matters may have had on them and their family. If you wish			
7	to comment on that, please feel free.			
8	And secondly, of course, sir, in your role			
9	as the local Crown attorney we're obviously interested in			
10	any recommendations or suggestions you have to this			
11	Inquiry, given your experience and given what we're trying			
12	to deal with here by way of institutional response.			
13	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you very much for this			
14	opportunity.			
15	I'll say one point on your first question,			
16	and that is that I think it should be noted that my spouse			
17	on many instances, many occasions over the last 15 years			
18	has, because of my distractions relating to this project,			
19	has in many respects been living with less than a full			
20	partner and I think that everybody, at least at counsel			
21	table, should acknowledge her dedication in spite of my			
22	feelings.			
23	I'd like to comment on your second point			
24	the second offer with respect to one potential			
25	recommendation, and it's I think it falls into the			

1 systemic response context.	1	systemic	response	context.
------------------------------	---	----------	----------	----------

2 MR. ENGELMANN: All right.

MR. MacDONALD: I'll preface it by noting
that yesterday before becoming a witness I peeked into the
media room and inquired as to what media agencies were
following these proceedings and there were two. I presume
that's the same case today. That's the local daily
newspaper and the local radio station. And as you know the
local cable television network is broadcasting this.

And I think it's unfortunate that now that we're getting to, and have been for the last several months, the institutional evidence and responses to the highly newsworthy, shall we say, initial allegations of the conspiracy theorists, it's unfortunate that those other broader-ranging media outlets are not here to follow as closely the responses and the real evidence.

And I think it should be noted that the local newspaper and radio and cable television stations have probably throughout been attempted to be the most objective journalistic journal creatures that we've seen, and that must have been difficult for them to do from time to time. But I recall reading evidence of a report earlier in this Commission hearing from an expert on media who was less than impressed with the local -- I think it was a newspaper or radio station. It was one of the local two.

And I'd just like to note that had she been writing the report today she would have made the same observation that I believe I'm making now about the broader context of obligation for journalistic responsibility.

It's a long preface but my recommendation is going to be shorter, sir. And that is sub judice is -- I looked at the law on point, particularly Lord Denning's comments in a 1973 case of AG v. London Times Inc. That case was -- of course everybody at counsel table knows that if it's from Lord Denning it must be good law. And that case, as you can imagine, was approved by Justice Borins in an Ontario Court of Appeal decision from 2003. I think it's called Rogacki v. Belz. The doctrine of res of sub judice applies to both parties to litigation counsel, as well as to the legislature.

rule is that counsel are not permitted to publicly comment on cases that are before the court in a matter that might prejudice the outcome of the case pursuant to the *sub judice* rule. And it's for the integrity of the evidence and the administration of justice that, of course, the *sub judice* rule has been created and that prosecution service in Ontario and the OPP and the other institutions I think involved have -- and from my impression -- endeavoured to comply with the rule and in doing so have left the field

open to the conspiracy theorists and to a member of -former member of the Ontario legislature to comment on at
length and at will. And you in the room all know that
programs like <u>Pamela Wallin Live</u> and national newspapers,
regional newspapers, other CBC television outlets have
enabled these other folks to go -- to have a national forum
-- an international forum to make all comments that they
felt appropriate and clearly they weren't concerned about
sub judice.

I guess the problem that this has created, other than bad press for me, is -- the big problem, is that there maybe are occasions when the administration of justice, the criminal law division and the Ontario Provincial Police should denounce the lie even at risk of being accused of getting close to the line of *sub judice*. This is probably one of those cases.

And this is where I ask the Commissioner to consider -- because I don't have the perfect suggestion myself -- we think of CNN and retired generals telling us how the war in Iraq is devolving or should devolve or why Afghanistan has not been -- you know, retired generals are great at detailing for us stuff that current members of the officer or ranks are not in a position to comment on, it's not because of *sub judice* but it's sort of based on similar principles.

1	I'm of the view that and I was tempted
2	many times to comment to the media on what I know to be
3	what I knew to be the truth, and perhaps I should have done
4	that, but I still believe that I would have been too close
5	to the line and sub judice myself, having been involved in
6	the proceedings.
7	And perhaps other agencies, other
8	institutions here were also inclined to do so from time to
9	time, and perhaps the media should have been more
10	responsible in the some of the media on certain
11	occasions should have been more responsible in given
12	degree of one-sided grandstanding that the conspiracy
13	theorists were granted.
14	I'm not sure what the Commissioner's
15	ultimate findings will be, but I know the facts as I lived
16	them, and there was no conspiracy involving the Crown
17	Attorney's Office and I don't believe I don't know all
18	the facts but I don't believe likewise with the Cornwall
19	Police or the OPP.
20	Your Honour, I'm not trying to prejudge your
21	findings but that's my sentiment.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: That's fine.
23	MR. MacDONALD: So I'd ask that we give some
24	consideration as a group to that problem as I've just set
25	it out, and thank you for listening.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.
2	So before we start I think we'll take the
3	what will we call that, the first evening break? And we'll
4	come back in 15 and then we'll go straight till 6:00; all
5	right?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
7	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre
8	veuillez vous lever.
9	The hearing will resume at 4:50 p.m.
10	Upon recessing at 4:33 p.m./
11	L'audience est suspendue à 16h33
12	Upon resuming at 4:51 p.m./
13	L'audience est reprise à 16h51
14	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre
15	veuillez vous lever.
16	This hearing is now resumed. Please be
17	seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
18	MURRAY MacDONALD Resumed/Sous le même serment:
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
20	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR
21	MS. DALEY:
22	MS. DALEY: Mr. MacDonald, my name is Helen
23	Daley. I am counsel to Citizens for Community Renewal,
24	which is a local group of citizens with an interest in the
25	reform of institutions.

1	MR. MacDONALD: Hello.
2	MS. DALEY: And I have to apologize; I have
3	a very bad voice, and if you're lucky it will just stop
4	altogether.
5	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
6	MS. DALEY: Let me just start with a few
7	questions for you concerning the matter of Barque and
8	Mr. C-44 you recall who that individual is and your
9	role in that matter. If you want to just have it handy on
10	the screen, your letter to Officer Sebalj is Exhibit 917.
11	I guess I was just wondering, sir, whether
12	you played any role in this matter other than as a conduit
13	between Officer Sebalj and it was Mr. Griffiths who
14	provided the ultimate opinion. Was that the sum total of
15	your role?
16	MR. MacDONALD: A conduit only.
17	MS. DALEY: All right.
18	Just a few questions on the matter, sir.
19	Did you make Crown Griffiths aware that Barque had in fact
20	pleaded guilty in August of 1995 to a similar offence in
21	similar circumstances, that being the sexual misconduct
22	with Albert Roy, another probationer?
23	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't have any separate
24	discussion on this file other than relaying the message
25	that you see in front of you.

1	MS. DALEY: All right.
2	It follows from that then that you didn't
3	have an opportunity to tell him that this that Mr.
4	Barque had pleaded to a similar offence the year prior?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Well, you can be sure that
6	he would have known that from the police.
7	MS. DALEY: How do you think he would have
8	known that, sir?
9	MR. MacDONALD: From the police.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Griffiths? I'm
11	sorry, Mr. Griffiths would have known, sir?
12	MR. MacDONALD: From that Mr. Barque was
13	convicted pleaded guilty earlier?
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Uh'huh.
15	MR. MacDONALD: I presume that the police on
16	I presume he would have recognized that Nelson Barque
17	was the same Nelson Barque that had come up before.
18	MS. DALEY: I'm not clear how you how it
19	is you believe he would have been aware of the prior Barque
20	matter.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: "He" being Griffiths.
22	MS. DALEY: "He" being Mr. Griffiths.
23	MR. MacDONALD: I was of the impression that
24	the first Barque matter had been brought to Mr. Griffiths'
25	attention in when it was initially investigated.

1	MS. DALEY: But not by yourself?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Not by myself, no.
3	MS. DALEY: So if that occurred it would
4	have been Mr. Simard or someone else in your office who
5	informed Crown Griffiths about the Barque plea?
6	MR. MacDONALD: No, I don't think it would
7	have been Mr. Simard. I would have thought it would have
8	been the police from the 1995 investigation or the Project
9	Truth officers that handed this current case off to Heidi
10	Sebalj. You know, I'm speculating but that's likely what
11	- the way it was. I guess Mr. Griffiths, Judge Griffiths,
12	will have to answer that.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, let's just maybe
14	short-circuit it.
15	If you were passing on a Crown brief to Mr.
16	Griffiths Crown brief normally contains a criminal
17	record of the accused?
18	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: So presumably if the
20	criminal record is up to date it would be there.
21	MR. MacDONALD: I presume so, yes, sir.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, so
23	MS. DALEY: Right. Sir, then I'm going to
24	need you to look at the second page of 916 because this is
25	the letter that Sebalj sends to you. These are what she's

1	giving you and the very bottom what she tells you is she's
2	giving you for transmission the Ministry's investigative
3	report, and we know that's the 1982 document, and
4	correspondence from then-Crown Johnson, and she's giving
5	you the statement of C-44 taken at Cornwall on December 21,
6	'95. I have the exhibit reference handy. I can assure you
7	that that document does not reflect Mr. Barque's guilty
8	plea in the Albert Roy matter in 1995.
9	So, first of all, are we correct that these
10	are the materials that you had to hand up to Crown
11	Griffiths?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.
13	MS. DALEY: All right.
14	MR. MacDONALD: Or yes, Ma'am.
15	MS. DALEY: Okay. It's the voice thing;
16	right?
17	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
18	MS. DALEY: All right.
19	So if that's the sum total of what Crown
20	Griffiths had, are we agreed that that material didn't
21	reflect the prior guilty plea?
22	MR. MacDONALD: It may not have.
23	MS. DALEY: Just one further question, sir.
24	I take it you didn't read C-44's statement yourself?
25	MR. MacDONALD: No, Ma'am.

1	MS. DALEY: But you, in your response to
2	Officer Sebalj what you're communicating is that Griffiths
3	Crown Griffiths has read it and he sees no coercion or
4	threats, and I take it you're just the messenger on that
5	point. He's said, "No coercion or threats," and so that's
6	what you write to Officer Sebalj?
7	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir Ma'am.
8	MS. DALEY: Okay, so
9	MR. MacDONALD: It's not the voice, it's
10	just bad memory.
11	MS. DALEY: So to the extent that indeed the
12	statement, Exhibit 1276, did contain information that was
13	reflective of coercion, that's a matter we have to take up
14	with Crown Griffiths. You have no knowledge of that?
15	MR. MacDONALD: That's right.
16	MS. DALEY: And did you know what the age of
17	consent was for this offence this potential offence?
18	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't know the facts.
19	MS. DALEY: Fair enough.
20	So again, that reason as to why there's no
21	charges, that's simply Crown Griffiths' view which you're
22	transmitting?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, Ma'am.
24	MS. DALEY: Okay.
25	Now, I want to turn and speak with you at

1	some length about the role that you played in the Silmser
2	investigation, and let me just start by reminding us that
3	at that point in time I take it, sir, you had been a Crown
4	attorney for approximately five years for them in Cornwall?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, Ma'am.
6	MS. DALEY: And to the extent that you were
7	a relatively junior lawyer at that time, did you have
8	available to you other people with whom you could consult
9	on difficult matters of judgment?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I did. I didn't
11	perceive myself as a relatively junior lawyer then. I do
12	now but I didn't then. And I had commonly folks like Bob
13	Pelletier in L'Orignal, and I didn't know Peter Griffiths
14	that well because he was new to the regional director's
15	position when then Norm Douglas went left the office
16	Norm Douglas as he then was.
17	And so I contacted Mr. Douglas frequently,
18	shortly after my appointment at Crown attorney, and began a
19	practice of I think it was fair to say that I would have
20	conferred more frequently with Bob Pelletier than with
21	Peter Griffiths in that for Peter's first couple of
22	months on the job.
23	MS. DALEY: All right.
24	I take it, sir, there was no restriction or
25	no limit on your ability to consult with Mr. Pelletier or

1	Mr. Griffiths to the extent you felt necessary?
2	MR. MacDONALD: No restriction.
3	MS. DALEY: They were always available to
4	you when you needed them?
5	MR. MacDONALD: I knew that.
6	MS. DALEY: All right.
7	Now, it strikes me that the role that you
8	played with Officer Sebalj, the seven to 10 consultations
9	in which you're giving her advice that relates to her
10	investigation, that must have been an unusual circumstance?
11	MR. MacDONALD: It was unusual that an
12	officer would have to see me that often
13	MS. DALEY: Yes.
14	MR. MacDONALD: for investigative
15	assistance. Just because this was not your run of the mill
16	assault case or violence case, you know.
17	MS. DALEY: And was it unusual the amount of
18	guidance that this officer required then? Is that the gist
19	of how you saw it?
20	MR. MacDONALD: She was a qualified officer
21	with a case that would have challenged the best of them.
22	MS. DALEY: All right.
23	So this case the inherent complexity of
24	the case she was dealing with, in your mind, justified the
25	amount of contact that you had?

1	MR. MacDONALD: It was becoming more complex
2	every time we'd speak.
3	MS. DALEY: Apart from complexity well,
4	let's come at it this way. Did you consider it a factually
5	complex case to investigate?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Well, factually not in terms
7	of volume but in terms of surprises as to where and how
8	things were evolving and how the information that was
9	coming to me through Heidi was surprising Heidi and me, I
10	believe.
11	MS. DALEY: All right.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Legally it wasn't complex at
13	all.
14	MS. DALEY: But it took twists and turns?
15	MR. MacDONALD: It sure did.
16	MS. DALEY: And I would imagine a lot of
17	those twists and turns were on account of Mr. Silmser
18	himself and the way in which he interacted with Officer
19	Sebalj?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I think I was I
21	think some of those twists and turns and have been a little
22	harsh on Mr I was a little harsh on Mr. Silmser about,
23	but, you know, some of them were twists and turns based on
24	steps he'd taken.
25	MS. DALEY: Correct.

1	Let me try let me see if I can give you a
2	bit of an analogy or a framework to help us understand the
3	nature of this case as opposed to more garden variety
4	cases. I take it what was let me ask this question;
5	was Sebalj also seeking your guidance because this was a
6	high profile matter, she had a potentially very high
7	profile accused if not two high profile accused?
8	MR. MacDONALD: I believe so, yes.
9	MS. DALEY: And in that circumstance if she
10	were to lay a charge against a public figure or two public
11	figures and was unsuccessful, several things would follow:
12	One is there would certainly be media attention to the
13	trial and the outcome; correct?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
15	MS. DALEY: And there could well be
16	criticism of CPS if the outcome was not successful?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Quite possible.
18	MS. DALEY: And in addition, you've referred
19	from time to time about the tort of malicious prosecution,
20	individuals who are high profile individuals who have been
21	accused and acquitted might avail themselves of a tort
22	action as well.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Tort actions are not
24	uncommon in Ontario and their success is not common, as
25	against the Crown, and I think the police too but I'm not

1	sure, but they're common and they're actions as I always
2	tell the officers, I'm not going to give you advice on a
3	civil law but check with civil counsel if what you're doing
4	could go into that risky realm.
5	MS. DALEY: Would you agree with me that the
6	probability of bad publicity and tort actions is much
7	higher if the individual accused is a prominent person, as
8	opposed to, for example, say, a 20-year old fellow who's
9	charged with a break and enter offence and he's acquitted
10	at trial?
11	MR. MacDONALD: It's more likely with a high
12	profile, you know, financially well-established type of
13	suspect, yeah.
14	MS. DALEY: Right. And I have no particular
15	information about Father Charles' finances but he was
16	certainly a very high profile individual in this community
17	and Officer Sebalj would have recognized there'd be media
18	attention to any charges she laid?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
20	MS. DALEY: Now, to try and boil everything
21	down into a fairly small nutshell
22	MR. MacDONALD: Good luck.
23	MS. DALEY: Well, maybe you'll agree with
24	this: To lay a charge against Father Charles Officer
25	Sebalj had to believe Mr. Silmser when he said that Charles

had abused him?

2	MR. MacDONALD: Well, the police and Crown
3	believe every complainant. You start with the assumption
4	every complainant is believable. The question now is to
5	whether it's provable in terms of grounds and then as far
6	as my role in terms of prospect is different from do you
7	believe the person or not. I've even had defence counsel
8	tell me "Well, we believe something happened to this guy,
9	now, can you prove it or not?" you know. They wouldn't say
10	that on the record but that's
11	MS. DALEY: All right. But let me ask you
12	this, sir; did Officer Sebalj ever say "Listen, Murray, I
13	absolutely believe something happened to Mr. Silmser. I
14	believe Father Charles abused him"?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, by the time that Lucien
16	Brunet and Heidi and I were conferring in August we
17	believed something happened, some form of sexual contact
18	happened between
19	MS. DALEY: Silmser and Father Charles?
20	MR. MacDONALD: Right. Whether it was
21	consensual lawful contact or not we weren't sure; more
22	probing was required before you could get to that but it
23	was that was our impression. I expected Lucien would
24	have said the same thing and I know that I believe Heidi
25	would if she were here.

1	MS. DALEY: So based on your opportunity to
2	interact with Heidi Sebalj you're fairly firm in the view
3	that you thought that she had a subjective belief that
4	Silmser had been abused by Father Charles or that there'd
5	been some sort of interaction but she wasn't sure if it
6	would qualify as an offence or not?
7	MR. MacDONALD: She believed that we all
8	believed there was some form of sexual contact.
9	MS. DALEY: The issue the open question
10	was did it constitute an offence or was it consensual in
11	nature; was that your issue?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, one of the main issues,
13	yeah.
14	MS. DALEY: All right.
15	Sir, you alluded in passing to your own
16	prior encounter with Mr. Silmser professionally and
17	MR. MacDONALD: I'm not sure if I did
18	prosecute him or deal with him as a witness in a past. I
19	don't recall.
20	MS. DALEY: Do you not recall?
21	MR. MacDONALD: No.
22	MS. DALEY: One of the documents that we
23	have here as an exhibit
24	MR. MacDONALD: Everybody with a criminal

record in Cornwall since 1988 has probably directly or

1	indirectly, you know, dealt with me as prosecutor.
2	MS. DALEY: If we can take just a very quick
3	look at Exhibit 228 on the screen I can find it for you
4	the second page, second paragraph. Sir, remember this
5	is the memo that you spoke about earlier this afternoon?
6	Slightly more than halfway down it says:
7	"Silmser's credibility"
8	MR. MacDONALD: Is this Bob Pelletier's
9	memo?
10	MS. DALEY: I'm sorry?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Is this Bob Pelletier's
12	memo?
13	MS. DALEY: It is, sir, yeah.
14	Within that paragraph it says that:
15	"Silmser's credibility was questioned,
16	bearing in mind the suspicious nature
17	of certain of the allegations, lack of
18	corroboration and Silmser's criminal
19	record, including dozens of convictions
20	involving dishonesty."
21	Was that something you were aware of, sir
22	_
23	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
24	MS. DALEY: when you were helping Ms.
25	Sebalj?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
2	MS. DALEY: So you knew that Silmser had a
3	lengthy record for crimes of dishonesty?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
5	MS. DALEY: Is that an element that, based
6	on your discussions with Officer Sebalj, she was mindful of
7	in dealing with Mr. Silmser's complaint?
8	MR. MacDONALD: I believe she was mindful of
9	it. I have some recollection that we referred to the
10	criminal record his criminal record and concerns about
11	reliability, you know, especially with crimes of
12	dishonesty, but that wasn't high on our I don't believe
13	it was high on her priority list of credibility concerns at
14	that point.
15	MS. DALEY: I'm assuming that
16	MR. MacDONALD: Throughout.
17	MS. DALEY: Sorry. Her credibility concerns
18	stem from other behaviour as well?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
20	MS. DALEY: Did
21	MR. MacDONALD: Or other information that
22	didn't turn out that didn't follow up as
23	MS. DALEY: Do you remember, sir, in any of
24	the seven to 10 meetings you had with her, talking about
25	his criminal convictions and his

1	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall but we
2	probably did.
3	MS. DALEY: That you think you probably did?
4	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, I don't I'd be
5	surprised if we didn't, but I don't recall.
6	MS. DALEY: All right.
7	I take it, sir, from your perspective on
8	this matter, the core fact is that Officer Sebalj, the
9	investigating officer, simply never formed RPG in relation
10	to Silmser's allegation about Father Charles?
11	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
12	MS. DALEY: She never got there?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
14	MS. DALEY: And that was so not withstanding
15	that she did obtain some evidence about some homosexual
16	encounters involving Charles with younger people; correct?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Right. There was certainly
18	suspicion based on that.
19	MS. DALEY: All right.
20	So the state of qua non, if you will, of why
21	no charges brought, from your perspective, is that the
22	police officer does not have RPG to believe an offence has
23	occurred?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
25	MS. DALEY: Now, let me I want to explore

1	with you just a little bit Malcolm MacDonald's role in the
2	investigation itself?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
4	MS. DALEY: And let me just preface it by
5	asking you this question, sir. You did testify to a
6	certain agree about this in-chief. I think what you said
7	is that you were aware that Luc Brunet was extremely busy
8	and that he wasn't necessarily available to Officer Sebalj
9	to help her with the investigation. Was that your
10	understanding of the circumstances?
11	MR. MacDONALD: He would have made himself
12	available, but I knew that he was otherwise very much
13	occupied and Heidi had a lot of other matters on her plate
14	too.
15	MS. DALEY: Did it ever occur to you in your
16	dealings with Officer Sebalj to perhaps call up Mr. Brunet
17	and say, I think this investigator needs some assistance
18	here?
19	MR. MacDONALD: The I recommended it to
20	her on two occasions, and the second occasion I think
21	that there were two meetings in a row towards the latter
22	part of our contacts, and I believe that after the second
23	meeting she did go to Luc. But that's my impression.
24	MS. DALEY: That would be very close in time
25	to the settlement, sometime in the August time frame?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
2	MS. DALEY: Or do you know?
3	MR. MacDONALD: The first time may have been
4	as early as June.
5	MS. DALEY: All right.
6	MR. MacDONALD: And the second time would
7	have been in August, I expect.
8	MS. DALEY: Did you ever consider, as these
9	matters were unfolding, that perhaps you should speak to
10	the chief or to the Deputy chief about this investigation?
11	MR. MacDONALD: You mean in the context of
12	resources in the CIB?
13	MS. DALEY: Yes.
14	MR. MacDONALD: No.
15	MS. DALEY: Did you ever feel that you
16	should speak to anyone senior to Officer Sebalj about her
17	ability to conduct the investigation?
18	MR. MacDONALD: No. She was she seemed
19	to be complying with my requests and showing due diligence
20	and a keen interest in the case, I believe.
21	MS. DALEY: All right.
22	Would you consider her abilities as an
23	investigator at this time to be simply average?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Well, she was just new to
25	the CIB, so it would be I don't mean to be pejorative in

saying that.

2	MS. DALEY: I'm not inviting you to
3	disparage her, because I know that you don't want to do
4	that. She was a new officer and I guess your perception is
5	that she was of average ability.
6	MR. MacDONALD: She was an officer starting
7	out with average ability who would get, and did get, better
8	as time went by, did get more skilled in the subtleties of,
9	you know, assisting or dealing with victims of sexual
10	violence in particular; she was very good at that by the
11	time she retired.
12	MS. DALEY: All right.
13	Did you ever have the feeling that she was
14	over her head?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, that she she needed
16	guidance from someone else, and I thought that I could
17	assist in her remaining above her head above water.
18	MS. DALEY: I guess, as you would have seen
19	it, but for the fact you were able to give her some
20	investigative help, she would have been drowning in this?
21	MR. MacDONALD: I expect she would have gone
22	to Luc earlier if I hadn't been trying to do so.
23	MS. DALEY: All right.
24	So then, let's just talk for a moment
25	about how Malcolm MacDonald interacts with Officer Sebalj

1	and with you as matters uniold. You did become aware
2	or, did you become aware in dealing with her that she had a
3	number of phone contacts with Malcolm?
4	MR. MacDONALD: I knew that she had a phone
5	contact or contacts. I forget if I knew how many, but I
6	knew that she had. And I had the impression that he
7	initiated them it or them.
8	MS. DALEY: And what was your understanding
9	as to what occurred in those phone calls? Do you recall
10	what she told you?
11	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall the details.
12	My impression from our conversations about Malcolm
13	MacDonald is that he was trying to stay give the
14	appearance of staying of being there's that word that
15	I forgot about earlier.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: High road?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, the transparent.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Transparent.
19	MS. DALEY: So you thought that in his
20	dealings with Officer Sebalj well, sorry. What did you
21	think his purpose was in speaking to her?
22	MR. MacDONALD: To make it clear to the
23	police that he was conducting this but not attempting to
24	interfere with their side of the investigation. That was
25	my impression with his first phone call.

1	MS. DALEY: Did Officer Sebalj ever tell you
2	that she was giving him information?
3	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall.
4	MS. DALEY: We can do this on the screen.
5	Can we look at Exhibit 298? Let me just make sure you
6	understand what this is, sir. This is a statement that
7	Malcolm MacDonald prepares and he signs.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Uh'huh.
9	MS. DALEY: And Madam Clerk just can show
10	you briefly the signing page so we'll know you'll know
11	what date this is. So you'll see he signed that in June of
12	'94, right?
13	MR. MacDONALD: M'hm.
14	MS. DALEY: Madam Clerk, I need to look at
15	paragraph 4, which is going to be on the first page.
16	He's Malcolm is talking here about
17	interactions with Silmser and the settlement, and then he
18	says:
19	"I may add that since he first
20	complained to city police in January
21	'93, he failed to keep several
22	appointments where he was to disclose
23	details of any allegations and naming
24	witnesses."
25	And, sir, I'm just wondering, it strikes me that

1	the only source of that information in Malcolm's possession
2	would be Officer Sebalj.
3	MR. MacDONALD: I don't know.
4	MS. DALEY: Assuming that she was the
5	source, would that not be a little bit concerning? And
6	what I mean by that is, she's giving him information that
7	suggests that Silmser's not reliable and not co-operating,
8	and that's not Malcolm's business, is it?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Well, assuming that was
10	assuming she was telling him that. I mean, you know, it's
11	a double speculation.
12	MS. DALEY: Well
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, assume for a moment
14	that she did.
15	MR. MANDERVILLE: Mr. Commissioner, it's not
16	been established that the information came from Officer
17	Sebalj, so it is complete speculation.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: That's not quite the way
19	I recall it. We'd have to go back to her notes
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: Correct, sir.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: and look at the
22	conversations.
23	MS. DALEY: Perhaps it's a I know you
24	don't have direct knowledge of whether she told him this or
25	not. If she did, is that information that she ought not

1	have disclosed?
2	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I don't understand why
3	she would have to share these details with him. Maybe they
4	were slipped in the context of other you know, it's not
5	the type of details that normally an officer would want to
6	provide civil counsel.
7	MS. DALEY: Well, look briefly at the last
8	portion of paragraph 6. He says:
9	"I may add that I told the Bishop that
10	from the information I received from
11	city police concerning this
12	investigation, that there would be no
13	problem in getting an acquittal if
14	charges were laid against the priest."
15	Sir, I take it you don't have information from
16	Sebalj as to what she imparted to Malcolm?
17	MR. MacDONALD: No, Ma'am.
18	MS. DALEY: All right.
19	MR. MacDONALD: She may have mentioned
20	references to certain things she told him in the past, but
21	I don't recall anything that startled me.
22	MS. DALEY: Assuming and again it's an
23	assumption that what Malcolm says here is correct, does
24	it not suggest that she has imparted information that she
25	ought not to have?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Well, if he's correct, he
2	may also be taking from his client information to suggest
3	that he could have beat the charges handily.
4	MS. DALEY: I appreciate that. But he
5	attributes it to city police.
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, he does. He also
7	makes comments about me that I know to be untruthful in
8	this statement, so that's why I urge you to be cautious
9	with what you presume is correct there.
10	MS. DALEY: Fair enough, sir.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: So tell me, sir, in your
12	experience you may not know or not know, in the
13	investigative stages does it happen very often that the
14	accused lawyer is phoning the police, the investigator?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Not often. No, only in a
16	scenario like a scenario where a civil action is sort of
17	pending at the same time as a criminal investigation, or a
18	civil discussion, shall we say. I don't think I
19	wouldn't say it's the only time I've ever seen it happen,
20	but it's very rare.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. Okay.
22	MS. DALEY: Given that this was a very
23	unusual, high-profile case, might you have cautioned
24	Officer Sebalj about not speaking with Malcolm?
25	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I told her to keep me

1	apprised of any information he had relayed to herthat
2	he'd be inclined to relay to her. I didn't I wouldn't
3	have discouraged her from talking to him. You know, I
4	probably would have said, use him as a conduit of
5	information, if you
6	MS. DALEY: But did she ever get any
7	MR. MacDONALD: Or a source of information.
8	MS. DALEY: Did she ever come back to you
9	with any information that he had provided to advance her
10	investigation?
11	MR. MacDONALD: I don't think he provided
12	anything. I had the impression he didn't provide anything
13	to help her with her investigation, except for offering
14	polygraphs or
15	MS. DALEY: All right.
16	MR. MacDONALD: interview.
17	MS. DALEY: Sir, in the meetings you had
18	with her do you recall if Officer Sebalj ever sought any
19	advice or help from you as to how she might persuade
20	reluctant witnesses or reluctant possible victims to become
21	involved in her investigation?
22	MR. MacDONALD: That's likely that I did. I
23	don't recall specifically but it's entirely likely that I
24	did.
25	MS. DALEY: You were taken, in the testimony

1	in-chief, to two withesses that Officer Sepaij dealt with.
2	They were C-3, who was disclosing abuse but was very
3	reluctant to get involved if you want to check do you
4	need to check the moniker list to know who I'm talking
5	about?
6	MR. MacDONALD: No. If you can tell me the
7	I don't the names don't mean
8	THE COMMISSIONER: It's going to take less
9	time just to show you the monikers.
10	MS. DALEY: Just show him the list.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
12	MR. MacDONALD: It's not so much the names
13	as to their sort of roles and what they told Heidi that
14	matters to my to me in terms of my memory.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: So which one are we
16	looking at now?
17	MS. DALEY: C-3 and C-56. Those are both
18	individuals that Heidi dealt with in her investigation.
19	You recall that?
20	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't recall their
21	names.
22	MS. DALEY: Do you recall her giving
23	apart from the names, do you recall her coming to you
24	saying, "I found somebody"
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.

1	MS. DALEY: "who has a similar story to
2	tell. In fact I found two somebody's"?
3	MR. MacDONALD: She I believe she told me
4	that I have some recollection that she told me "I've
5	found somebody that I think may have something", but the
6	impression of the two early pieces of information you
7	provided were that it didn't pan out.
8	MS. DALEY: I understand. So we've got four
9	people in total: two that you learn about early on but
10	they're not helpful, and then two that you learn about very
11	close to the end that are helpful.
12	MR. MacDONALD: Well
13	MS. DALEY: Is that right?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Not helpful on helpful to
15	the extent that it suggested that something that there
16	was some degree of corroboration as to something had gone
17	on between the complainant and this and those other two
18	people.
19	MS. DALEY: Okay.
20	MR. MacDONALD: Or the one other person for
21	sure that gave a statement.
22	MS. DALEY: All right.
23	So you didn't become aware from Officer
24	Sebalj, until very close to the time of the settlement,
25	that she had two individuals who had similar allegations to

1	make about Father Charles? You didn't know that good fact
2	until the end?
3	MR. MacDONALD: Near the end, right. I
4	don't think she really she described them to me as the
5	way I don't I didn't get any clear indication that
6	they were good witnesses until then. If she'd mentioned it
7	before in another context, I missed it or we didn't we
8	weren't on the same wavelength.
9	MS. DALEY: I'm presuming if she'd mentioned
10	it in March when she first encountered these individuals,
11	you could then have given her further investigative help as
12	to how to deal with them; how to bring them into the
13	investigation?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, that's a safe
15	presumption.
16	MS. DALEY: And that in fact didn't happen?
17	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't I don't recall
18	speaking of these two prior to August.
19	MS. DALEY: Do you have any, in your own
20	mind, explanation as to why she came across good
21	information but didn't share it with you until very close
22	to the end to the settlement?
23	MR. MacDONALD: Probably because she thought
24	they were good that there were good components to it but
25	weak components to it as well, as in the one person who

1	refused to give a statement. Probably that's why she
2	didn't tell me earlier is because she didn't have a
3	statement to work with.
4	MS. DALEY: But we know we know you
5	didn't see it but she did have a statement from C-56
6	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
7	MS. DALEY: who was willing; correct?
8	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
9	MS. DALEY: Let me ask this question. When
10	it became obvious that Silmser would no longer cooperate
11	and you wrote the opinion, was any thought given to you
12	directing Officer Sebalj to continue on with C-56; consider
13	laying a charge on his information?
14	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
15	MS. DALEY: Did you discuss that with her?
16	MR. MacDONALD: I believe I did.
17	MS. DALEY: Do you recall the outcome?
18	MR. MacDONALD: No, but I
19	MS. DALEY: Certainly I take it that's
20	something you would have encouraged her to do?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, and I'd be I would
22	have encouraged her to do it, and she may have told me she
23	already did or that she would try. Those were the two
24	responses that I expect I got, but I can't recall.
25	MS. DALEY: You can't recollect?

1	MR. MacDONALD: No.
2	MS. DALEY: But you're fairly certain that,
3	rather than close the book entirely on Father Charles as a
4	possible suspect, you told her to carry on with C-56 and to
5	see if charges were layable?
6	MR. MacDONALD: I expect I did, yes. I
7	expect that she probably did it even before me telling her,
8	you know.
9	MS. DALEY: All right.
10	And do you recall, sir, understand just
11	if you'll accept from me that C-3 was the other person with
12	a similar allegation who was reluctant. When Silmser
13	disappeared as a complainant do you know if you told her,
14	"Go back to C-3, and here's some tips for persuading him to
15	become involved"? Did that happen?
16	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall. I think
17	that we talked about C-3 before that point.
18	MS. DALEY: All right.
19	Can I ask you to turn your mind back to the
20	second conversation that you had with Malcolm; the one that
21	you found concerning?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
23	MS. DALEY: And did you get the impression
24	at all in that conversation that Malcolm's frame of mind
25	was, "Settlement or otherwise, there's just not going to be

1	any charges here because I know the officer has no RPG"?
2	MR. MacDONALD: I don't know if I don't
3	know if that was I didn't get that impression from
4	Malcolm's conversation.
5	MS. DALEY: I take it the impression you
6	took away was that because there was a civil settlement he
7	was taking it as a given there would be no criminal charge?
8	MR. MacDONALD: He was taking it as a given
9	that a settlement would either discourage the complainant
10	or the police from continuing. I didn't know which but he
11	just seemed to think that the civil settlement would likely
12	put an end to the criminal case.
13	MS. DALEY: Now, when you say "discourage
14	the complainant" are we moving in an area where, you know,
15	perhaps there might have been a red flag for you that he's
16	trying to get the complainant to agree not to come forward?
17	MR. MacDONALD: No. I thought that he had
18	the impression from the discussions or from the
19	discussions with the complainant or his lawyer that if he
20	got the settlement that that's all he wanted.
21	MS. DALEY: So the complainant would
22	voluntarily not proceed; not that there would be an
23	agreement that required him not to proceed?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
25	MS. DALEY: All right.

1	And to the other piece of it, that it would
2	discourage the police, I take it Malcolm very
3	experienced Crown attorney, very experienced prosecutor
4	his reasoning probably was, "If we pay money to this man,
5	given all the other circumstances, the Crown is probably
6	going to think that that was his motive all along and not
7	go forward."
8	MR. MacDONALD: Or the Crown would think
9	that, "He's got his money. If he's willing to continue it
10	shows, you know, bona fides." It could have cut either
11	way, and he cut that way.
12	MS. DALEY: All right.
13	But in any event this is the conversation in
14	which you tell him in no uncertain terms, "That's not the
15	way it's going to work." Did you leave him with the
16	impression that there would be charges?
17	MR. MacDONALD: No, that the investigation
18	would continue and there may be charges.
19	MS. DALEY: All right.
20	So that was your message and he got that
21	loud and clear?
22	MR. MacDONALD: Oh yeah.
23	MS. DALEY: And
24	MR. MacDONALD: He responded, "Oh yes, yes,
25	yes, yes, I know," words almost to that

1	MS. DALEY: And II I understood your
2	evidence correctly, within a week or so of that you
3	received a phone call from Jacques Leduc and you have this
4	a similar conversation with him?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Well, yes, Mr. Leduc didn't
6	necessarily comment on what he show his cards as to
7	whether he thought the civil thing would end, but I still
8	made that made a point of making the caution to him too
9	the warning too that the criminal case will continue,
10	and he also said he understood.
11	MS. DALEY: Well, was there something in
12	what he said to you that made you believe you needed to
13	give him that warning?
14	MR. MacDONALD: No, it was still the
15	lingering concern from the conversation with
16	MS. DALEY: With Malcolm?
17	MR. MacDONALD: With Malcolm, that I
18	thought, "I'll make all the lawyers aware of this."
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Refresh me a little bit.
20	Why did Leduc call you?
21	MR. MacDONALD: He called me to say that the
22	Church had reached a resolution with him.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
24	MR. MacDONALD: And I thought that when
25	Malcolm called he was calling on behalf of the Church, but

1	he was actually acting for the priest. So I guess he was
2	trying to show, as the other litigant or potential litigant
3	in the civil resolution, that he was trying to be
4	transparent with the police.
5	MS. DALEY: But you didn't really have a
6	need to know that information, did you?
7	MR. MacDONALD: No, I just thought it was
8	_
9	MS. DALEY: Your only concern would have
10	been with Father Charles because he was the potential
11	accused?
12	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
13	MS. DALEY: Isn't that right?
14	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't have a need to
15	know. I had the sense that in a small town with a small
16	local Law Association the members were trying to be
17	transparent with one another.
18	MS. DALEY: I take it you never got the
19	sense that you were being manipulated by either of those
20	gentlemen?
21	MR. MacDONALD: Not until afterwards.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: But okay, not till
23	afterwards. So explain that. Now do you see it in a
24	different light or
25	MR. MacDONALD: When I saw or was told about

1	the contents of Malcolm MacDonald's statement, as well, of
2	course, is the fact that there is a gag clause in there,
3	that's when I realized that someone at least Malcolm was
4	manipulating me.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, "gag clause"
6	let's be specific.
7	MR. MacDONALD: Stop proceeding with the
8	police investigation.
9	` THE COMMISSIONER: Right. M'hm.
10	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. You realize that
12	now?
13	MR. MacDONALD: I realize that now, and I
14	realized it, I think, as soon as I heard there was a gag
15	order in there.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Illegal settlement?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Illegal settlement in there,
18	sorry.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Because a gag order
20	is is something different. A gag order is to say, "I
21	will not speak of the settlement publicly".
22	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
24	MR. MacDONALD: I don't mean gag order in
25	that context.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: No.
2	MR. MacDONALD: I'll refer to it as a
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Illegal settlement.
4	MR. MacDONALD: All right.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: So my question was
6	MR. MacDONALD: I forget.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: It's past 5:00.
8	MR. MacDONALD: I think it was relating to
9	when I found out that I'd been manipulated.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
11	MR. MacDONALD: And I would say it was first
12	when I heard about the
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Illegal settlement.
14	MR. MacDONALD: illegal settlement, and,
15	secondly, when I read Malcolm's or it was reported to
16	me, Malcolm's comments.
17	I don't know if I ever read Malcolm's
18	statement, but I believe that one of the officers told me
19	what he said.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
21	Go ahead.
22	MS. DALEY: In your seven to 10 discussions
23	with Officer Sebalj, I presume some of those discussions
24	related to the fact of the settlement, did they, sir?
25	MR. MacDONALD: To the fact that they were

1	negotiating.
2	MS. DALEY: Yes.
3	After the settlement was achieved, did you
4	talk to Officer Sebalj directly about that?
5	MR. MacDONALD: I believe she phoned me and
6	told me and
7	MS. DALEY: She told you the settlement had
8	occurred?
9	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, and we spoke again
10	met again, with Lucien Brunet.
11	MS. DALEY: Right. But I take it there were
12	no circumstances at the time that caused either yourself,
13	as a Crown, or Luc Brunet, as an experienced investigator,
14	to say to one another, or yourselves, "Maybe we should see
15	that document"?
16	MR. MacDONALD: No.
17	MS. DALEY: All right.
18	MR. MacDONALD: In my sending her back, I
19	didn't care what the document said. You know, Luc felt
20	likewise, "Let's to hell with whatever it says, let's
21	just tell this fellow that we're going to continue with the
22	criminal case, anyway."
23	We never thought that the document would be
24	so extreme as to have that type of language in it.
25	MS. DALEY: You were all operating on the

1	assumption that there's no illegality to what he's agreed
2	to, and there's nothing in there that's going to cause him
3	to forfeit his settlement if he continues speaking to the
4	police, right?
5	MR. MacDONALD: Right.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: What about Mr. Leduc's
7	phone call to you? Now that you've heard about Malcolm,
8	how is there any way do you change your
9	characterization of his call to you?
10	MR. MacDONALD: Tim Smith told me that he
11	didn't think after Tim Smith's investigation on that
12	obstruct justice case he told me he didn't think I asked
13	him. I asked Smith, was Jacques Leduc, sort of, in on
14	that, too, and he said he didn't think that Jacques Leduc
15	knew or realized or put the clause in there.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no then why would
17	he be calling you?
18	MR. MacDONALD: I thought it was just to be
19	transparent and showing that "I just want you to know
20	I'm negotiating with these people," and, in fact, I thought
21	he was trying to demonstrate that he wasn't trying to
22	interfere with the police investigation.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: But this was after the
24	settlement.
25	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, after I think it

1	was after, or I don't know if the ink had hit the page
2	yet, but it was just happened or about to be settled.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
4	MS. DALEY: All right.
5	I'm going to move to a different aspect of
6	this the same subject, but a different aspect of it.
7	You recall a number of numerous questions
8	were put to you by my friend, Mr. Engelmann, about things
9	that you didn't know about from Officer Sebalj's
10	investigation at the time you authored your opinion.
11	And I guess the question that occurs to me
12	is this: Given that the given the role that you were
13	playing, in terms of the guidance you're giving her in lieu
14	of Luc Brunet, did you believe that she had an obligation
15	to tell you absolutely everything before you rendered an
16	opinion?
17	MR. MacDONALD: Everything relevant. Yeah,
18	I presumed that she had that obligation, and I presumed she
19	was doing it, and she probably thought she was too.
20	MS. DALEY: Did you feel that you had an
21	obligation, as a Crown, to satisfy yourself that she had,
22	in fact, shared with you everything of relevance to her
23	investigation?
24	MR. MacDONALD: I presumed she had. So I'm
25	not sure how to answer that question.

1	MS. DALEY: Well, one of the things
2	that we know, of course, there's no Crown brief created
3	here until October, which is after it's all said and done,
4	right? And we also know, of course, it wasn't the practice
5	of your office, in '93, to review briefs, in any event, but
6	in these circumstances
7	MR. MacDONALD: Prior to laying charges.
8	MS. DALEY: Prior to laying charges. In
9	these circumstances, did you consider, for example, "Geeze,
10	you know, I'd better make sure I know everything material.
11	Maybe I should look at her notebook and learn everything
12	that she's learned in the course of this investigation"?
13	MR. MacDONALD: No, I'd been relying on
14	officers giving me verbals for five years, in that fashion.
15	It's the way that we commonly worked.
16	The one exception were the homicide cases,
17	where we actually did because of the volume of
18	materials, have to, sort of the officers couldn't
19	remember everything off the top of their head, so she
20	seemed to be remembering it, in this instance.
21	MS. DALEY: I don't mean to suggest by this
22	question that Officer Sebalj was unreliable, but we know
23	she's very junior and she's lesser experienced.
24	Given that circumstance, did you think,
25	"Maybe I'd just better see everything she's got because

1	there may be things that are material that haven't occurred
2	to her that way", right?
3	MR. MacDONALD: She had answers for every
4	question I put, so I had the impression that she was being
5	diligent in telling me the
6	MS. DALEY: All right.
7	MR. MacDONALD: the stuff. Maybe
8	she you know, there's stuff I don't remember that maybe
9	she told me that I took explained to me that I didn't
10	take in the same light as I would today as I read it. You
11	know, I
12	MS. DALEY: I take it, sir, for sure you
13	would have you would have assumed that if she had an
14	individual like C-56, who had similar allegations, who was
15	prepared to go ahead either as witness or complainant, she
16	would have told you that?
17	MR. MacDONALD: If it was that black and
18	white, yes.
19	MS. DALEY: Okay.
20	MR. MacDONALD: If she had concerns that
21	there was something more about C-56's reliability or
22	usability, then she would have had cause perhaps to hold
23	off before bringing it to my attention.
24	MS. DALEY: All right.
25	Another topic pertaining to this is what I

1	will call well, I don't have to call it anything. But
2	would you agree with me that there was bit of a disconnect
3	between you and Officer Sebalj on this issue of the
4	independent Crown opinion; that is to say, the Pelletier
5	opinion?
6	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't think so at the
7	time, but it appears so today.
8	MS. DALEY: Given how we know things
9	unfolded, and how we know Officer Sebalj communicated with
10	Luc Brunet about that point, you and she were not on the
11	same page?
12	And what I mean by that, sir, is you hadn't
13	told her to lay down her tools and to just to wait for
14	an appointment with Pelletier?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Right. Nor had she asked
16	for one, so we
17	MS. DALEY: Right.
18	MR. MacDONALD: Her impression of things, as
19	she as written in that sentence, is not my impression
20	was not my impression.
21	MS. DALEY: So, if I'm right, perhaps what
22	we have is this type of situation: You, as Crown, are
23	waiting for her to develop RPG; if she does, to lay a
24	charge, which you then would have Pelletier review for RPC,
25	okay? Is that the gist of it?

1	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, Ma'am.
2	MS. DALEY: She had to make the first move.
3	She had to have RPG, lay her charge, and then you would
4	have Pelletier review that; correct? That's your mindset
5	as to what's happening?
6	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, Ma'am.
7	MS. DALEY: Her mindset as to what's
8	happening is that she's waiting for you to organize a
9	meeting with Pelletier, in which Pelletier will tell her
10	whether she has RPG to lay a charge?
11	MR. MacDONALD: That appears to be the case
12	But I just want to caution you that she's writing this
13	stuff up after well after the fact, that I've that
14	we've discussed or, you know, the future arrangements
15	for counsel.
16	So I have the impression that she's just at
17	that instance mixing up and throwing into the hopper,
18	quickly, stuff that if she had occasion to sit and think
19	and talk about and write about it, she would have
20	articulated it differently.
21	MS. DALEY: And when you say there was a
22	time gap, the gap is between the time you first spoke to
23	her about Pelletier, which was early days, and August when
24	she writes it up in her response to Luc Brunet?
25	MR. MacDONALD: I didn't first refer to

1	Pelletier. The Pelletier comment probably came around
2	April-ish, or early May.
3	MS. DALEY: Yes, all right. So it's the gap
4	between April and August?
5	MR. MacDONALD: At least. At least.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Those are in her what
7	did we call those notes?
8	MS. DALEY: Dedicated notebook.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Dedicated note no, the
10	notebook and the was it what if in the notebook, in
11	her daily notebook, that there's a reference there, then
12	that would and I have to check that.
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Then that would counter
15	your suggestion that she mixed it up?
16	I mean, if there's a notation in the book
17	
18	MR. MacDONALD: In April or something.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, then I'm wrong.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
22	MS. DALEY: All right. Let me ask you this,
23	sir. And again, I'm not inviting you to be critical of
24	Officer Sebalj, but
25	MR. MacDONALD: I won't be.

1	MS. DALEY: did it occur to you that she
2	was offering that as a bit of an excuse to Luc Brunet as to
3	why her file was still open in late August?
4	MR. MacDONALD: An explanation. An excuse.
5	That may be strong language, but I think that she was
6	trying to
7	MS. DALEY: She was trying to explain the
8	fact that
9	MR. MacDONALD: There was a lot going on it,
10	it wasn't just recklessness on her part.
11	MS. DALEY: Right.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, but let's
13	again, it's very late, but if Luc Brunet was looking at
14	clearance rates and that kind of stuff and he sits down
15	with her and says, "Well, you know, you're not laying
16	enough charges," that kind of stuff
17	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: then could you see
19	that
20	MR. MacDONALD: I suppose, yeah, yeah.
21	MS. DALEY: Just one question about your
22	interaction with Chief Shaver. You remember he comes to
23	meet you
24	MR. MacDONALD: Yes, ma'am.
25	MS. DALEY: afterwards. And I hope I

1	can find a document reference if I need to, but I think you
2	may remember this. Again, you have a bit of a push-pull
3	with him, because he has the understanding that it's the
4	Crown who's decided that there shouldn't be any charges,
5	and you have to say to him, "No, sir, the problem was your
6	officers never got RPG."
7	MR. MacDONALD: No, he when I said that,
8	he you understood it, though. Like, it's not like it
9	wasn't a revelation to him that
10	MS. DALEY: I appreciate, but he walked into
11	the meeting with you believing that there had been no
12	charges laid at that time as a result of a Crown opinion, a
13	Crown view that charges weren't appropriate.
14	MR. MacDONALD: He walked in with the view
15	that the case had been derailed by the Church.
16	MS. DALEY: Sorry, by?
17	MR. MacDONALD: The Church, by the Diocese.
18	MS. DALEY: All right. You said to him
19	that, "The point is that your officers never had RPG and we
20	no charge was laid for that reason."
21	MR. MacDONALD: I probably went over and
22	detailed with him, you know, my involvement or knowledge of
23	the case.
24	MS. DALEY: Yes.
25	MR. MacDONALD: I don't know, I don't recall

1	exactly how that rolled out.
2	MS. DALEY: All right. I'm not going to
3	
4	MR. MacDONALD: It's hard to
5	MS. DALEY: take the time to pull you
6	back into the document, because you do speak to that in
7	your interview at 1233
8	MR. MacDONALD: I see.
9	MS. DALEY: and 1233 is accurate, so we
10	can we can rely on that.
11	All right, just one final question or
12	two. Just a few questions about the inception of Project
13	Truth and the meeting that occurs in April of 1997 that you
14	attend briefly. Do you remember we spoke about that?
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
16	MS. DALEY: And it's reflected in
17	Exhibit 288.
18	Madam Clerk, if you can just get 288 up
19	momentarily, I want us to have a brief look at page 9.
20	I meant to say 228. If I said 288, I
21	was wrong. That's the one.
22	Now, sir, I will take you to some comments
23	that are made on this page, but before I do, obviously,
24	when you were informed about this allegation concerning
25	you, obviously, you knew it was a fantasy that you hadn't

1	gone to the Island, that you had connived to suppress a
2	charge. And I have to assume that you communicated that to
3	Mr. Pelletier?
4	MR. MacDONALD: I'm sure. I'm sure I did,
5	yeah.
6	MS. DALEY: Right, okay. No reason why you
7	wouldn't have, I don't imagine.
8	MR. MacDONALD: Right. It probably was
9	interesting the way in which I did it, too, but I don't
10	recall how I did it.
11	MS. DALEY: And in the second paragraph on
12	that page, the very first sentence is, he says:
13	"Needless to say, I'm not convinced
14	that these allegations are
15	well-founded."
16	Now, sir, is that a thought that he shared with
17	you?
18	MR. MacDONALD: I don't recall.
19	MS. DALEY: Did he give you any comfort
20	did he or Griffiths give you any comfort that, "Murray, we
21	don't believe the Fantasy Island story either, but Dunlop
22	has brought it forward, so we must deal with it"?
23	MR. MacDONALD: I thought Peter put it as,
24	"Murray, you're a good Crown, you've been a good Crown, but
25	we're going to get to the bottom of this." So it wasn't

1	there was a bit of comfort, but not much.
2	MS. DALEY: But you didn't feel comforted by
3	whatever words were said to you.
4	MR. MacDONALD: Well, I was comforted just
5	that they acknowledged my the reputation as they as
6	he knew me, but he also said, "But, you know, we're going
7	to get to the bottom of this." And, I mean, I wasn't
8	afraid that they were going to, I had nothing to be afraid
9	of, but it still he let it be known, you know.
10	MS. DALEY: I take it were you expecting
11	a searching, probing interview or investigation of your
12	role?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
14	MS. DALEY: And just to wind up on this
15	point, it appears in this document and other places, and
16	perhaps you'll agree, that the entire premise of connecting
17	you to this conspiracy rests on two concepts: One is
18	Dunlop is using guilt-by-association reasoning in relation
19	to your father's circumstances.
20	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, and homophobia.
21	MS. DALEY: Correct. And secondly, he's
22	relying on the fact that no charges were laid against
23	Father Charles from your office. Is that the gist of it?
24	MR. MacDONALD: Right.

MS. DALEY: And so, with those two elements,

25

1	he's constructed an allegation that you're part of a
2	conspiracy.
3	MR. MacDONALD: Right. And as he you
4	know, I'm not initially in his conspiracy, as far as I
5	understood, but as the conspiracy required conspiracies
6	grow exponentially, right? And there was a point where his
7	conspiracy needed the Crown to be involved; otherwise,
8	logically, it didn't work. So that's also how a third
9	piece as to the manner in which I would
10	MS. DALEY: All right. So you think he was
11	also practising sort of ex post facto reasoning and saying,
12	"Wait a second, Crown had to have been involved; oh, yeah,
13	I get it, that's Milton MacDonald's son, and he's the one
14	who didn't charge Father Charles."
15	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, that's reflective if
16	you read the materials, as I recall them, in his in the
17	brief
18	THE COMMISSIONER: His Will-State?
19	MR. MacDONALD: Yes.
20	MS. DALEY: Yes.
21	MR. MacDONALD: Actually, no, the amended
22	Statement of
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Claim.
24	MR. MacDONALD: Claim.
25	MS. DALEY: Right.

1	MR. MacDONALD: And you'll see the way he
2	refers to me, and I think I'm in the chapter next to my
3	father.
4	MS. DALEY: Yes.
5	MR. MacDONALD: And the clear implication is
6	that I would be I was inclined to protect my father or
7	any other sex offender.
8	MS. DALEY: And, eventually you spoke
9	briefly about the website that Mr. Nadeau operated.
10	Eventually, did you learn that those allegations were
11	posted on that website; that being Mr. Leroux's allegations
12	that you were part of this conspiracy?
13	MR. MacDONALD: Right. It was in piecemeal,
14	as I discovered what was in that conspiracy, you know.
15	MS. DALEY: Right. Did that have an impact
16	on your ability to function as a Crown in this town?
17	MR. MacDONALD: I endeavoured to ensure that
18	it wouldn't.
19	MS. DALEY: You could never be sure that it
20	wouldn't.
21	MR. MacDONALD: I endeavoured to ensure that
22	it would not
23	MS. DALEY: All right.
24	MR. MacDONALD: affect my function. I
25	never I did not let it enter my you know, the

1	exercise of my professional discretion. If there were
2	instances where a complainant didn't want to have me as
3	prosecutor, it would be reassigned or I would stay away
4	from it.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Did that happen?
6	MS. DALEY: Did that in fact happen? Sorry
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Great minds
8	MS. DALEY: Great minds
9	Did that occur?
10	THE COMMISSIONER: And others seldom differ
11	though.
12	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
13	MS. DALEY: Were there people that you
14	otherwise would have been dealing with professionally as
15	complainants or witnesses or otherwise who said, "Listen,
16	I've read about you on the website and I don't like what I
17	read, I don't want to deal with you"?
18	MR. MacDONALD: As a victim, I believe so
19	but I don't recall. I mean, there were many incidents
20	where I'd be walking down the hallway in the courtroom and
21	I would hear some of the regular suspects, usual suspects,
22	unrelated to the conspiracy theorists', comment about me
23	being a, you know, a criminal in the context of Project
24	Truth.
25	I had my key my car keyed twice. I had

1	other incidences like that where that I had reason to
2	believe were associated to persons who were angry with me.
3	But any instance where I thought my discretion could be in
4	any way encumbered, I wouldn't touch the case. And I think
5	there were a few. I don't recall them. I can't recount
6	them to you, but I was always careful to make sure that
7	wouldn't happen.
8	MS. DALEY: So you dealt with it by taking
9	the high road and absenting yourself from a situation in
10	which the website allegations
11	MR. MacDONALD: Yeah, I don't want to
12	MS. DALEY: would impact
13	MR. MacDONALD: sound to be holier than
14	thou, but I kept an arm's length. That's probably the way
15	to
16	MS. DALEY: Right. Those are my questions.
17	Thank you.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr. Lee? No.
19	we've got ten minutes, I don't think it's worth for that.
20	So why don't we take our evening leave and
21	come back at Mr. Engelmann?
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Thank you.
23	Sir, I'm interrupting not to ask questions
24	of Mr. MacDonald just worried about tomorrow.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: You're worried about

1	tomorrow?
2	MR. ENGELMANN: I always worry.
3	And I'm just wondering, sir, if you want to
4	start at the usual time or if you want to start somewhat
5	earlier?
6	THE COMMISSIONER: No, I think I'll start at
7	9:30. That will give me more time to get here, given that
8	there's a storm warning on, Mr. Engelmann.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh, I thought that was in
10	Toronto, sir.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, no, it's not only
12	
13	MR. ENGELMANN: For a change.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: It's not only Toronto
15	that gets the good weather. Sometimes it comes here.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Nine thirty (9:30),
18	please.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Thank you.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: But we will sit a full
21	day.
22	Thank you.
23	MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.
24	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
25	veuillez vous lever.

I	This hearing is adjourned until tomorrow
2	morning at 9:30 a.m.
3	Upon adjourning at 5:50 p.m./
4	L'audience est ajournée à 17:50
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

305

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	ed a wd
18	
19	Dale Waterman, CVR-CM
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	